

A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE JAPANESE PARTICLE *sa*

Todd Squires

1. Introduction

With the need to know more about how each participant in a conversational framework achieves his/her goals through the interaction with other participants in the conversation, the study of the mechanisms that facilitate the flow of conversation becomes ever more important. The way a conversation develops is a continual negotiation of each participant's goals with those of the other participant(s). In this paper I will examine how the speakers use the particles *sa* and *ne* to achieve a desired effect. The Japanese particle *sa* effects a personal view on the information conveyed in the utterance. This use of *sa* contrasts with the use of *ne* which speakers use to create an empathic common ground with the hearer regardless of whether or not the information contained in the utterance is exclusively held by either participant.

Japanese grammars have traditionally referred to *sa*, *ne* and other particles as either sentence-final particles (*syuuzyosi*) or interjectional particles (*kantoozyosi*). Research on these particles up until the last decade has focused primarily on syntactic and semantic parameters with little regard to how the particles are actually used in a true conversational exchange (Konoshima 1966; Hashimoto 1969; Matsushima 1969; Martin 1975). However, the focus in recent research is concerned with how these particles are actually used (Ishikawa 1988; Cook 1990; McGloin 1990; Suzuki 1990). In my analysis I will focus on the utterance-internal usage of the particles *sa* and *ne* in natural conversational settings. The utterance-internal usage of the particle *sa* has not been examined in great detail by previous research. First, I will outline the questions which I address in my analysis. Second, I will give a brief overview of the previous research that proved to be helpful in formulating my own hypotheses about the use of *sa* and *ne* in the actual conversational data. Third, I will present a synthesis of the previous research outlined in the second section. Finally, I will provide extensive an analysis of the data collected for this study.

2. Areas of inquiry

In the course of my study several basic questions arose about how to approach an analysis of the particle *sa*. First, I addressed the question of whether my goal should be the definition of the inherent meaning of *sa*, as in previous studies, or a description of how *sa* is used in context. For the sake of clarity, I use the term "usage" here not with the traditional implication of "meaning" as in earlier research,

but rather to refer to the kinds of work that the particles do and the situations in which they occur. In the earlier research on particles, linguists tried to pinpoint exact meanings which they claimed were inherent in sentence-final and interjectional particles. I argue that these particles as such have no "meaning" outside of the context in which they are used, and therefore any attempt to assign them some type of meaning in and of themselves runs counter-intuitive. For this reason I have divorced the concept of "meaning" from my analysis and instead focus upon the concept of "usage."

Next, I addressed the question of in what types of situations the particle *sa* was used. Areas identified in my analysis were situations involving information clarification, rebuttal and correction, interruptions and attention requests, the expression of opinions, and narration of personal experiences.

Detailed investigation of the data suggested an additional need to address the question of how the use of *sa* contrasts with the use of *ne* as well as with the absence of particles. This was necessary because *ne* and *sa* occur in similar contexts with the same types of information. (1) and (2), given below, are examples in which *ne* and *sa*, respectively are used with information held exclusively by the speaker in a clarification context.

In example (1), N and A are talking about places at which to have a party with their friends. A suggests a certain restaurant, however N has heard that the restaurant is undergoing some redecoration at the present time, and for this reason suggests that the prices at the restaurant have probably risen.

The information preceding each use of *ne* in example (1) above is information that is held exclusively by the speaker. Speakers also often use the particle *sa* with this type of information in similar contexts of rebuttal and personal experience.¹

(1)

1N: Kinoo ka ototoi kara ka

2A: Un.

3N: Kaisoo na n datte.

4A: A soo na no?

5N: Un.

6A: De mo *ne*, asoko no okonomiyaki² tte, betu ni, hutuu da yo?
anmari. De *ne*, kekko minna ga, soo iu zya

¹ Notes on the transcription method used in this study.

(0.0) pauses or gaps in what is very approximately tenths of seconds

? not a punctuation mark, but a rising intonation contour

. not a punctuation mark, but sentence-final, falling intonation contour

() uncertain passages of transcript

{ } non-linguistic, sounds like laughter

// a slash indicating the beginning and end of the part of the current utterance which is overlapped by that transcribed below

I use the New Official style of Japanese romanization for the transcriptions. Within the English text I use the Hepburn system of romanization. In the transcriptions as well as in the text I will use A through M for female speakers and N through Z for male speakers.

² Okonomiyaki is a type of Japanese food.

- 7N: N.
 8A: **Da kara, takaku nattyatte ne.**
- 1N: Since yesterday or the day before yesterday.
 2A: Uh huh.
 3N: They say that they've been redecorating
 4A: Oh, is that so?
 5N: Uh huh.
 6A: But **ne**, the okonomiyaki² there isn't anything special, you know.
 Very much. And **ne**, everyone says that, don't they quite a bit.
 7N: Uh huh.
 8A: So, it's gotten expensive and **ne**.

Example (2) illustrates how sa is used in rebuttal contexts similar to that in example (1) where A used ne. In (2), N and A are talking about an upcoming marathon that is going to be held. N is trying to persuade A to join the marathon.

- (2)
- 1N: **Kamon, kamon {laugh} isyoo ni ikimasen ka?**
 2A: **Uun, ikitai na, de mo sa, hutu-ka no asa ni kaette kuru no tte tyotto sore muboo desyo.**
 3N: **De mo sa , nagai yo, kekko datte sa**
 4A: **Un.**
- 1N: Come on, come on {laugh} Won't you come along?
 2A: Yeah, I want to go [na], but **sa**, it's a bit reckless to come back on the morning of the second, isn't it?
 3N: But **sa**, it's long, they say quite a bit, but **sa**.
 4A: Uh.

A expresses her reservation about going to the marathon in 2A. In return N mentions that there may be a problem since the marathon is rather long. N uses sa with kekko datte "quite a bit they say" in 3N, i.e. with information that he holds exclusively and he uses sa with these utterances. In both examples (1) and (2) the speakers use sa to rebut or correct their hearer by giving information that is exclusively held by the speaker. This similarity in usage is a point that I will examine in detail in my analysis of additional conversational data below.

In addition to the above usages of the particles sa and ne, there were rebuttal or correction contexts, as in (3), where no particle, that is, neither sa nor ne, were used. In example (3), there is a misunderstanding between H and S. S offers to give her kerosene stove to S since she is going to move back to her parents' home before she gets married. S however thinks that she is moving to a new apartment and is therefore confused about why H has offered to give her kerosene stove to him since he thinks H will need it.

(3)

1H: **Da kara, Ken ni yuzutte ageyoo ka tte itta n zyan.**2S: **Hikkosu tte, atarasii toko ni hikkosu yoo ni natte no da to.**3H: **Uun, datte rainen ni wa yome ni iku no ni sonna ni nan-do mo hikkosi suru hodo okane nai no.**

1H: So, isn't it that I said I'd give it to Ken (you).

2S: When you said you were moving, I thought you meant to a new apartment.

3H: Mmm, hey even though I'm getting married next year, I don't have enough money to move that constantly.

In 3H, H clarifies for S the reason why she is able to give the kerosene stove to him. This context is similar to examples (1) and (2) because H, expresses her personal information in the course of rebutting or correcting the hearer. However, she uses no particle, i.e. neither *sa* nor *ne* with this information.

My final area of concern relates to what factors affect the use of *sa*, *ne*, and the lack of these particle in contexts where they are used with types of information similar to that illustrated above, that is in contexts of rebuttal and correction. As I will demonstrate, these differences have to do with linguistic factors such as speaker's strategies, i.e. how the speaker wishes his/her utterance to appear to the hearer.

3. Previous research

In this section I will briefly summarize some of the previous research that relates to my analysis of the usage and functions of the particles *sa* and *ne* in Japanese conversations. In particular I will focus on four areas of research interest, namely, 1) previous analyses of the *sa* and *ne* particles in traditional and current research (Konoshima 1966; Hashimoto 1969; Matsumura 1975; Martin 1975; Ishikawa 1988; Cook 1990; McGloin 1990; Suzuki 1990), 2) power and "powerful" and "powerless" speech styles (Brown and Gilman 1969; O'Barr and Atkins 1980; Hengeveld 1984; Wetzel 1990), 3) the theory of territory of information (Kamio 1979, 1991), and 4) conversational devices and speaker's strategies (Tannen 1984).

3.1. Previous analyses of *sa* and *ne*

3.1.1. Analyses of *sa*

In both the traditional and recent research on particles, *sa* is characterized as "imposing" (Suzuki 1990: 1), "ego-assertive" (Martin 1975: 918), and "insisting" (McGloin 1990: 26). These analyses make the general claim that the particle *sa* is basically a "powerful" particle and because of that underlying powerful meaning *sa* is used by speakers when they want to be assertive. Research on particles has not been extensive to date, but the usual approach is to make broad and general

statements concerning their meaning and their general syntactic uses rather than to analyze actual usage in context.

Martin (1975: 918) suggests that the origin of the sentence-final particle sa is the deictic sa/so. Konoshima (1966: 412) draws a semantic connection between the particle zo and the particle sa. He observes that the modern use of sa in phrase-final position is similar to the classical use of zo, which is only used in sentence-final position in modern Japanese. However, at the same time, Konoshima admits that it is impossible to construct a hypothetical evolution of the deictic use of sa in the classical language to its modern usage which is evidenced as appearing in the latter part of the Edo period.

Suzuki (1990) investigated the usage of sa, ne, and other particles in her conversational analysis of Japanese gossip discourse. Her analysis represents a major step towards understanding how particles are used by the speaker in a conversational context. She concludes that sa has three uses in gossip discourse: 1) to keep the attention of the hearer, 2) to criticize the hearer, and 3) to influence the hearer with opinions.

My analysis supports the general conclusions of Suzuki, however I disagree with her hypothesis that sa is an 'insisting' particle and that utterances with sa are assertive. As I will demonstrate, opinions uttered with sa are much lighter in tone than are opinions that are uttered with ne.

3.1.2. Analyses of ne

In contrast to the limited research which has been conducted on the particle sa there has been an extensive body of linguistic work on the functions and usage of the particle ne. Previous analyses have shown that ne expresses rapport between the speaker and the hearer (McGloin 1990: 42; Ishikawa 1988: 32) and invites confirmation of the hearer (Ishikawa 1988: 32). Cook (1990) demonstrates that ne is a tool for cooperation between participants in Japanese conversations. Specifically, ne is used to negotiate cooperation in social interaction, indicate affective common ground between the speaker and the addressee, and signal intimate relationships (Cook 1990: 42). I will build on these analyses of the uses and functions of the particle ne in my demonstration of how sa alternates with ne and no particle in similar contexts. This view of sa, ne and no particle as alternates in similar contexts has not been addressed by previous analyses.

3.2. Power in speech and 'powerful' and 'powerless' speech styles

In this section I will discuss the notions of power and 'powerful' and 'powerless' speech styles as they relate to particle usage as well as conversation in general. Notions of power and 'powerful' and 'powerless' speech styles are relevant because previous analyses of the particle sa have characterized this particle as giving a strong feeling of assertion to the utterance.

The relation between "power" and speech was first demonstrated by Brown and Gilman (1960) in their study of pronouns. Brown and Gilman's study was based on the assumption that all social life is divided into two dimensions, power and

solidarity. Power is defined as the degree that one is able to control the behavior of another, thus making the power relationship between two people non-reciprocal (Brown and Gilman 1960: 255). Solidarity on the other hand expresses symmetrical relationships in contrast with the asymmetrical and non-reciprocal ones (258).

Research on "powerful" and "powerless" language grew out of studies which were concerned with differences between masculine and feminine speech styles. The work on this aspect of language (O'Barr and Atkins 1980; Maltz and Borker 1982; Hengeveld 1984; and Wetzel 1990) is relevant to the present work because the distinction between seemingly masculine and feminine speech in English has recently been shown to relate to the distinction between "powerful" and "powerless" styles. O'Barr and Atkins (1980) showed that what has been generally classified as feminine speech style is also used by males in relatively powerless positions. On the other hand, women with more powerful roles in society, due to educational background and occupation, did not exhibit the types of speech styles identified as particularly feminine. This raised the question of whether strictly feminine or masculine language exists.

Hengeveld (1984) suggests two equivalents of the English word "power" in Japanese, *tikara* and *kenryoku*. Wetzel (1990) comments that these two words fail to adequately describe inter-personal power relationships in Japanese society. She suggests that analysis of power relations and the language used in "powerful" and "powerless" speech styles is misleading if we assume that there is a parallel distinction between those relations in Japanese society and in Western societies (127). For this reason cultural differences in relationships should be taken into account when analyzing speech styles.

Understanding the difference between Japanese and Western ideas of power is essential to an analysis of the particle *sa*. Japanese textbooks in English refer to the particle *sa* as assertive, however this representation is not an accurate definition since the power of the particle *sa* is defined in Western terms and not in Japanese terms.

3.3. *Kamio's theory of the territory of information*

Because a large portion of my conclusions will be based on Kamio's (1979, 1991) theory of territory of information, I will briefly summarize his work on this topic. Kamio claims that a speaker cognitively assesses the information that his or her utterance contains before expressing it. This assessment relates to both the speaker's and hearer's territory. Kamio identified the following six basic conditions for determining where the information lies in the speaker/hearer territory framework.

- 1) the speaker/hearer's internal direct experience
- 2) professional or other expertise of the speaker/hearer
- 3) the speaker/hearer's direct external experience
- 4) information about persons, objects, events and facts close to the speaker/hearer
- 5) the speaker/hearer's plans, actions and behavior
- 6) geographical relations to the information

Kamio claims that speakers evaluate whether the information contained in their utterances is closer to the speaker or the hearer based upon the above conditions. Kamio also distinguishes six cases of information which he describes in relation to speaker/hearer territories and corresponding grammatical forms.³

Case A - the information is completely in the speaker's territory (direct form, ne optional)

- (4) **Watasi, atama ga itai (ne).**
I have a headache (ne).

Case B - the information is equally in the speaker's and the hearer's territories (direct-ne form)

- (5) **Ii tenki desu ne.**
It's a beautiful day ne.

Case CB - the information is in both the speaker's and the hearer's territories but to a greater extent in the speaker's territory (daroo form)

- (6) **Kono kyoku, ii kyoku daroo.**
This melody is really nice, isn't it.

Case CB - the information is in both the speaker's and the hearer's territories but to a greater extent in the hearer's territory (daroo form)

- (7) **Anata wa, Yamada-san desyoo.**
You are Mr./Ms. Yamada, aren't you.

Case C - the information falls completely in the hearer's territory (indirect-ne form)

- (8) **Hitati-tte kekkoo ooki na mati rasii ne.**
Hitachi seems to be a fairly big city ne.

Case D - the information is in neither the speaker's nor the hearer's territory (indirect form, ne optional)

- (9) **Alaska no huyu wa monosogoi rasii yo/tte (ne).**
It seems/I hear winter in Alaska is terrible (ne).

³ In Kamio's examples, () indicate optionality. "Direct form" indicates predicates which do not include any modal elements which express the speaker's supposition or conviction about the truth of the dictum. According to Minami's sentence structure the direct form would correspond to levels A and B (however, Kamio's examples include the topicalization marker wa which Minami does not include in levels A or B. "Indirect form" is indicated by modal elements which mean "I heard that...", i.e. modals which indicate that the dictum is hearsay. Desyoo is the polite form of daroo.

Kamio's analysis is predicated on the assumption that the speaker makes an objective assessment of information before choosing a particular utterance that is independent of other linguistic and non-linguistic factors in the conversational context. Furthermore, he firmly denies that the hearer has any influence on the speaker at all in his claim that "it is the speaker's cognitive function that carries out all of this [application of the conditions] process." (1991: 40) This characterization ignores the interactive nature of conversation. The dynamic nature of conversation is enhanced by the use of particles such as *sa* and *ne*.

In addition, the inclusion of particles as grammatical forms which correspond to information territories is confusing. Kamio claims that "obligatory *ne*" and "optional *ne*" are used with direct forms (predicates with no modal⁴ elements) and indirect forms (predicates with modals). I find his discussion of "obligatory *ne*" and "optional *ne*" difficult to apply. His account of the usage of "optional *ne*" with information that falls entirely in the speaker's territory as well as with information that falls neither in the speaker's nor the hearer's territory is descriptive but fails to give reasons why *ne* has this distribution pattern. I will account for these uses of *ne* in my analysis of the data below.

3.4. *Speakers' strategies*

The final piece of previous research I will add before I look at the entire particle puzzle, including the usages of particles in actual conversations, relates to the stylistic strategies used in conversations. Tannen (1984) indicates that "individual stylistic choices are not random but constrained by overriding stylistic strategies that are conventionalized ways of serving identifiable universal human need" (11). She emphasizes the fact that participants in a conversation do not exist within a vacuum and that their styles arise as a response to those strategies used by the other participants (19). Thus there are a variety of factors at several levels at work in the speaker's choice of a particular utterance. How certain information is perceived by the speaker relative to the hearer's knowledge (or how the speaker perceives the hearer's knowledge) affects how the information is presented.

4. Japanese definition of power and information territories

In this section I will be looking at how power is defined in Japanese society. In turn I will also show how the definition of power relates to how speakers use language in conversation, especially how this definition relates to information territories. In addition, I will be looking at how speakers use strategies which enable them to manipulate information territories in order to make the information contained in a

⁴ Opinion varies among Japanese linguists about what modality is in Japanese. Kamio refers to modal elements as Teramura (1984) does including *daroo*, *yoo da*, *rasii*, *hazu da*, *mono da*, *no da*, *ka mo sirenai*, etc.

particular utterance appear to be either shared information or exclusively held information.

In order to understand the dynamics of Japanese conversation it is important to first come to an understanding of Japanese interpersonal relations. The most important factor in the make-up of these relations is what Doi (1971) refers to as *amae* "dependence." *Amae* is most evident in the psychological dependence of a younger protege, *kohai*, upon his senior, *senpai*. From the Western point of view this type of relationship may seem on the surface to be a rather one way affair, however after a closer look the relationship is in fact much more accurately described as a mutually beneficial one. In return for the *senpai*'s information, expertise and assistance, the *kohai* offers his/her sincere loyalty.

How then can power be described in the Japanese context? The notion of power in the Western sense, that is of having authority or domination over someone or something is not appropriate since the Japanese power structure is based upon mutually beneficial relationships. Assessment of distance or deference relates to whether or not a person is considered to be in the speaker's in-group (Wetzel 1990: 21), or whether the other person has, or is perceived to have, more knowledge or experience. For example, Kamio cites the example of a travel agent or experienced traveller talking about flights to Paris. In example (10) below the travel agent or experienced traveller uses the direct forms of the predicate suggests that he or she has more experience or information than the addressee about travelling.

- (10) **Pari e wa tyokkoobin ga benri desu.**
To go to Paris, a direct flight is convenient.
(Kamio 1991: 57)

However if the same utterance was said by one travel agent to another travel agent, then the utterance would include the particle *ne* after the direct (non-modal) form of the predicate as in (11) below.

- (11) **Pari e wa tyokkoobin ga benri desu *ne*.**
To go to Paris, a direct flight is convenient *ne*.

Thus power, defined as having more information than the other person, is relative and is independent of overt hierarchical relationships.

The relationship of Kamio's theory of territory of information to particle usage is confusing. Consider the next example (12) where A is asking B where he/she was born.

- (12) **A: Kimi wa doko no umare na no?**
B: Yamanasi ken desu *ne*.

A: Where were you born?
B: In Yamanasi prefecture *ne*.
(Kamio 1991: 57)

In answering A's question, B uses the direct form of the predicate with the particle *ne*. This would suggest that the information about where B was born is shared

equally by both A and B, and since the information about where B was born is presumably exclusively held by him or her (12) should be very odd. However this is not the case, in fact (12) is a very natural exchange. Kamio refers to the use of ne in situations as in (12), where the speaker holds the information exclusively as "optional ne." He does not however explain why it is used in this way, rather his explanation consists of only a description of its distribution.

Kamio also does not mention that ne is also possible with Cases BC and CB. An explanation of the use of ne with daroo has been offered by Moriyama (1989). He argues that the meanings of daroo and ne are interrelated in that they both take the hearer into consideration. When daroo and ne are used together daroo takes on the meaning of possibility of the information in the utterance and ne retains the function of transmitting information to the hearer. Moriyama illustrates this with the examples (13) and (14).

(13) **Kare wa iku daroo.**
He'll probably go.

(14) **Kare wa iku daroo ne.**
He'll probably go ne.

In (13), Moriyama argues that daroo takes on two functions; expressing the speaker's judgement about the possibility of the proposition *kare wa iku* "he'll go" and also expressing the transmission of this judgement to the hearer. In (14), daroo functions only as an expression of the speaker's judgement of the probability, and ne takes on the function of transmitting the judgement to the hearer (Moriyama 1989: 108, 109).

Moriyama's analysis of Kamio's cases BC and CB supports my argument that the particles (in this paper sa and ne) do not always help to focus the location of the information as Kamio's analysis of ne suggests. I claim that particles in fact function on a different level than the direct and indirect forms of the predicate.

My position that particles are working at a different level than the predicate within the sentence is supported by Minami's (1970, 1974) analysis of sentence structure. He divides the sentence into two categories of meaning, dictum and modus. The dictum of the sentence is what Minami calls the objectively expressed matter (*kotogara*) (Minami 1974: 108). The modus expresses the speaker's attitude about the dictum. The modus is further divided into three levels yielding four levels in the structure of Japanese sentences.

Level A, the dictum/description, includes nouns with case particles *o* (accusative), *de* (instrumental), *ni* (dative), *kara* (ablative). Notice that the subject (nominative case) is excluded from this level. Also included in the dictum are adverbs which modify the state of activities expressed by verbs (e.g. *yukkuri*, slowly), adverbs which indicate degree (e.g. *sukosi*, a little), and verbs, i.e. the verb stem without elements which indicate affirmation, negation, politeness, or tense.

Level B includes the subject with the particle *ga* (nominative case) but excludes the topic which has the particle *wa*. In addition, this level includes modifiers that have the functions of expressing negation and time, modifying the statement expressed by a predicative expression such as *yappari* (after all) and *kitto* (surely). Level B also includes modifiers which express an evaluative view of the

This explanation also applies the situation where, according to Kamio, the speaker has the choice of adding yo on to an utterance which refers to knowledge exclusively by the speaker. The use of so called "obligatory ne" and "optional ne" is similar to the choice the speaker makes to use yo with exclusively held information. The difference between the choice of ne and the choice of yo in this context is that using the particle ne at the end of an utterance is a speaker's primary means for lexicalizing the expression of shared information. Yo does not have a similar function of lexicalizing exclusively held information as Kamio implies in his Case A.

The present study of the particles sa and ne in this paper focuses on utterance-internal uses of the particles not on utterance-final uses. Utterance-internally speakers use the particle sa to indicate that the information is exclusively held by the speaker and the particle ne to indicate that the information is shared between the speaker and the hearer. The function of these particles in utterance-internal position is comparable to their function in utterance-final position.

The use of sa with hearsay-based information makes the information appear to be the speaker's exclusively held information. Sa with shared information would make the information appear to be exclusively held by the speaker. This use of sa was not found in the data for this paper. However, the absence of its use does not rule out the possibility of the use of sa with these types of information.

Ne is used with information that is exclusively held by the speaker as well as with shared and hearsay-based information. The use of ne with information that is not shared information has the effect of making information appear to be shared. Uses of ne with these three types of information were found in the data. Examples of this use of ne will be presented in sections 5.3 (used of ne with speaker exclusive information) and 5.4 (use of ne with hearsay-based information).

The absence of either sa or ne with speaker exclusive information make the information seem objective. Similarly the absence of ne with shared information also makes the information seem more objective.

5. Analysis of the data

5.1. *Background information about the conversations used in this study*

The data consist of five telephone conversations between friends (conversations 1-5 A/N, B/C, D/O, E/P, and F/Q, respectively). In conversations 3 and 5 there is a senpai/koochai relationship between the two participants (D/O and F/Q, respectively). Conversations 1, 2 and 4, are between good friends (A/N, B/C, and E/P, respectively). These data were collected by researchers at the University of Tsukuba during the summer of 1991⁶.

Also included in the data are two excerpts from a forty-five minute conversation between four people at a coffee shop in Tokyo during the winter of 1992. I will refer to the conversation as the "Coffee Shop Conversation." The participants are two women and two men. One woman, G, is a teacher at an English

⁶ The telephone conversation data was collected by Ishida (1992).

conversation school and is in her early thirties. The other woman, H, is in her mid-twenties and a friend of G. R, a male nurse in his late twenties, is a student at the English school as is S, who is a man in his early twenties.

Table 1 is a summary of the background information about the participants in the telephone conversations and the "Coffee Shop Conversation." Included is information about the sex and age as well as the relationship of each to the other participants in the conversation.

TABLE 1

<u>Conversation</u>	<u>Participant</u>	<u>Sex</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Relationship to other participant</u>
1	A	F	early 20's	friend
	N	M	early 20's	friend
2	B	F	early 20's	friend
	C	F	early 20's	friend
3	D	F	early 20's	koohai
	O	M	early 20's	senpai
4	E	F	early 20's	friend
	P	M	early 20's	friend
5	F	F	early 20's	koohai
	Q	M	early 20's	senpai
Coffee Shop Conversation	G	F	early 30's	teacher
	H	F	mid 20's	friend/former student of T
	R	M	late 20's	student of T
	S	M	early 20's	student of T

5.2. Situations in which sa is used

The examination of the data from actual conversations showed that sa was used with information that is exclusively held by the speaker. I further identified the following five general contexts in which speaker's exclusive of information occurred with the particle sa: 1) information clarification, 2) rebuttal and correction, 3) interruptions and attention requests, 4) expressing opinions, and 5) narrating personal experiences.

5.2.1. Information clarification contexts

The first context in which sa was used with speaker exclusive information was the context for clarifying information. In (16), A and N are discussing why some of their friends cannot participate in a marathon with them.

(16)

1N: **Tyotto, tooranakya, mondai da na tte, iu. Un. Tyotto X-san to Y-san kurusii ka mo sirenai kedo,**

2A: **Nan de?**

3N: **Soturon no kankee de sa, seesinteki ni kurusii zyan. Ima.**

4A: **Aa.**

1N: Just, they say if they don't pass it will be a problem. Yeah. Just, X and Y may be hurting a bit but,

2N: In relation to their senior papers sa, It's psychologically rough don't you think, now,

4A: Oh.

N is explaining to A why X and Y are not able to run in the marathon with them. In response to 1N, A indicates that she is not clear about what d means exactly when he says that X and Y may be hurting, so she asks for clarification about why going might be troublesome for X and Y. Since the information in 3N is elicited by A's question in line 2A, A probably does not know about this information or at least it does not occur to her at that point. In this case the information falls only in N territory therefore the use of the particle sa with this utterance seems very natural. Furthermore, the fact that 3N is in response to a question provides evidence for and strengthens the interpretation that the information contained in 3N is exclusively held by N.

5.2.2. Rebuttal and correction contexts

Another common use of sa is in the context of rebuttal or correction of the other participant. In this usage sa is frequently found in utterances which contain conjunctions like de mo or datte, both of which mean "but" or "even so." Sa is also often found with nanka "something." In (17), N is trying to persuade A to run with him on a marathon.

(17)

1A: **Un. De mo watasi mo na ikka ni kaeritaku natta n da yo, nanka.**

2N: **Kamon, kamon {laugh} issyo ni ikimasen ka?**

3A: **Uun, ikitai na, de mo sa, hutu-ka no asa kaette kuru no tte tyotto sore muboo desyo.**

4N: **De mo sa, nagai yo, kekko datte sa.**

- 1A: Mm. But it's that I too [na], it's that it's gotten to the point where I want to go home my parent's house, somehow.
2N: Come on, come on {laugh} Won't you come along?
3A: Yeah, I want to go [na], but sa, it's a bit reckless to come back on the morning of the second, isn't it?
4N: But sa, it's long, they say quite a bit, but sa.

In 2N, N invites A to come along on the marathon. A stresses the reason for her hesitation about going prefaced with a de mo sa "but sa" in 3A. N then counters with his personal reasons using the conjunctions de mo and datte with the particle sa. This type of usage with sa also seems natural given that when the speaker denies or contradicts the other participant he or she often uses reasons that consist of information which is entirely in his or her information territory.

5.2.3. Interruptions and attention request contexts

Frequently sa is used in conversation in utterances which request the other participants' attention and also in utterances used as interruptions. In Japanese conversation words such as nanka "something" and are "that" are often used by a speaker to change the direction of the topic of the conversation or to introduce a new topic of conversation. In example (18) from the "Coffee Shop Conversation," G is trying to get the other participants to look at a foreigner who is wearing a Japanese school uniform outside of the coffee shop. In doing this she introduces a new topic, talking about foreigners, into the conversation.

(18)

- 1G: **Nanka sa, tyotto mite, soto.**
1G: Something sa, take a look out there.

There was a long pause in the conversation before 1G example (18). The use of sa as an attention request in (18) relates to my analysis of how sa is used in conversation as follows. G gives her immediate and emotional reaction to seeing a foreigner in a Japanese school uniform in her utterance with sa. This use of sa in utterances which give natural reactions of surprise further illustrate the tendency to use sa with information that is exclusively in the speaker's territory.

S uses sa in the "Coffee Shop Conversation" when trying to interrupt in the conversation. In example (19), G and R are talking about doctors making house calls in America. R is very involved in the conversation and would like to know more about this subject since he himself is a nurse. S tries to interrupt and introduce a new topic in this utterance but is unsuccessful his first time around.

(19)

1G: America wa oo / sin saa/bisu-sarete ru n yo ne.2S: Are sa⁷

3R: A soo na n desu ka?

4G: Sintai()to onazi yoo na mono

5R: Kangohu wa?

6G: E? Wakaranai, kangohu made.

7S: Kuruma ni sa, 'piin' oite oku to tukamanai tte.

1G: It's that in America they make house calls [yo] [ne].

2S: That sa

3R: Oh, is that so?

4G: It's the same as a physical ()

5R: What about nurses?

6G: Huh? I don't know, about nurses

7S: I hear if you leave a device that goes 'piin' in the car sa they don't catch you.

S's first attempt to interrupt at 2S in (19) is unsuccessful since R and G are mid-topic. S is able to intervene at 7S only after R and G's exchange has come to a conclusion. At this point he says presumably what he started to say at 2S, his comment that there is a device that you can leave in the car so that the police do not catch you parking in a no parking zone. In S's attempt to interrupt mid-topic, he chooses sa to try to draw the other participants' attention to his topic.

5.2.4. Contexts where opinions are expressed

Sa is used in utterances where the speaker expresses his or her opinions. This usage follows from my characterization of sa since opinions are by their very nature information that is in the speaker's territory exclusively. In (20) the participants in the "Coffee Shop Conversation" are discussing a kotatsu⁸ that G is going to give to H. G has the kotatsu in storage at her apartment and can not clearly remember how it folds up. The other participants in the conversation are trying to guess at how the kotatsu might fold up.

(20)

1H: Ano mannaka no tokoro warena i no. Doo natte ru no?

2R: Koo natte ru n zya nai. Katya to koo natte ru n zya nai no?

3G: Nanka, wakaranai kedo,

⁷ S uses the distal deictic are with the particle sa. This could be a case of the usage of the particle sa with shared information. The a-series of kore, sore, and are is used when referring to something that the speaker knows both he or she and the hearer know personally or have shared experience in. The referent of are is the previous topic of conversation dealing with parking privileges in general.

⁸ A kotatsu is a tale with short legs with a heating element underneath.

- 4H: Zya, katagawa ni yotte ru n zya nai.
5R: Iya, tasika sa,
6S: Takaku nai n zya nai no?
7R: Hutuu oritatami tte iu ka sa,
8G: ()
9R: Oritatami mite sa katya tte koo naru n zya nai no?
10S: Iya, mannaka kara ba to naru n da to omou.
11H: Poko to naru n da to omou, domannaka ni.
12R: Toreru no?
13G: Iya, oboete nai.
14R: Soo, iya, katya da yo.

- 1H: Um, is it that it doesn't break down in the middle? How is it that it is put together?
2R: Isn't it like this? Isn't it that it snaps together like this?
3G: Somehow, I don't know but,
4H: Then isn't it that it gathers together on one side.
5R: No, if I'm not mistaken sa,
6S: Isn't it that it isn't tall?
7R: Ordinarily the fold up type sa or,
8G: ()
9R: You look at a fold up type sa isn't it that it snaps together like this?
10S: No, I think the center goes out flat like this,
11H: I think it pops up in the center
12R: Does it comes off?
13G: No, I can't remember.
14R: Is that so, no it snaps together [yo].

In conversation (20) we see that sa is used by R when he is expressing his opinions about the type of kotatsu that he thinks it is. In this conversation R is trying to make up his own mind about the type of kotatsu that G has in her apartment.

It is interesting to note that if we use the traditional analyses of the use of the particle sa we would have to conclude that R is trying to be very assertive about his opinion and is trying to push his opinion on the other participants. However, the use of sa here gives the expression of R's opinions a lighter tone than if he had used the particle ne. Had he used ne here the impression would be one of seeking agreement from the other participants. In contrast, the particle sa expresses the speaker's exclusively held information demanding no such agreement. The use of sa to give opinions a lighter tone is a very important point since previous research on particles concludes that the particle sa is assertive in tone. As demonstrated in example (20) sa can actually have the opposite effect, that is to give a lighter tone to opinions.

5.2.5. Contexts of narration of personal experience

Overwhelmingly the most common use of sa was in narrations of personal experiences. Personal experiences are usually unknown to the hearer, or if known

to the hearer, usually known as a less direct experience. The use of *sa* in these contexts seems to stress the fact that the information was directly experienced by the speaker and thus primarily in the speaker's information territory. In (21) N is trying to explain what happened at a marathon.

(21)

- 1N: Kedo, maa, kyonen no watasi no ree ga aru kara,
 2A: Un (1.0) Kakuzitu ni ikeba,
 3N: Aa.
 4A: Iroiro itte agetara,"kakujitu ni ikeba, dazyoobu yo."
 5N: {laugh} "Watasi no yoo ni ne" tte. De mo, are (0.7) wa watasi wa,
 S-san no seeryoku wa ookikatta to mite ru n desu kedo,
 6A: Aa, aa.
 7N: Datte, mae no ban (0.3) sa, toriaezu kyonen tte tizu ga moo atta
 zyan.
 8A: Un.
 9N: Sore mite sa, S-san ga "koko o koo iu koosu ga kitara, koo iu huu ni
 ikeba ii wa yo" to ka sa, itte kurete sa
 10A: Un.
 11N: "Anata no baai wa, hasiranakute ii kara" maa, I-tyan-tati ni wa,
 ganbanasai mitai na koto itte sa, "anata wa, toriaezu kaette kuru no
 ga muboo desu" mitai na kanzi de,
 12A: Un.
 13N: Kiraku ni sa, "ippo,ippo, ruuto o mo akaenpitu de kaku yoo na kibun
 de, kimete kara ikinasai" to ka itte sa, itte kuretara kiraku ni iketa
 si,
 14N: Un.
- 1N: But, well, there's the example of me last year so,
 2A: Yeah (1.0) If you proceed with assurance,
 3N: Oh.
 4A: Why don't you help out by saying things like, "It will be okay if you
 proceed with assurance."
 5N: (laugh) Say, "like me, right" But, that, I (0.7)It's that I'm seeing it that
 as S had a big influence.
 6A: Oh, oh.
 7N: But, I, the night before *sa* (0.3), last year we already had a map,
 didn't we.
 8A: Uh huh.
 9N: We looked at it *sa*, and S said to me [*sa*] "If you come to this type
 of course here comes up, it's best to go this way [*wa*] [*yo*]," or
 something *sa*.
 10A: Uh huh.
 11N: "In your case it's okay not to run so," well, to me and to those other
 guys she said something like "hang in there" *sa*, something like "For
 you first of all the goal is to make it back."
 12A: Uh huh.

- 13N: Then calmly sa. "Step by step, with a feeling like you are tracing over the course with a red pencil, decide on it, then go," she said sa.
When she said that to us, we were able to go without worry, and,
14A: Uh huh.

Sa is frequently observed in narration of personal experience like that of N in (21), although sa is not used exclusively in this context. For example, N could have chosen to use the particle ne instead of the particle sa, but this use of ne with information that is exclusively in the speaker's territory would signal that the speaker wanted to invite the hearer's empathy. The use of the particle sa with information that is exclusively held by the speaker emphasizes the personal relationship of the information to the speaker rather than inviting the hearer's empathy.

In addition to emphasizing the personal nature of the experience, the use of sa in long narrations such as by N in example (21) signals to the hearer that the speaker has not reached the end of the story. The use of ne would be more likely to elicit a minimal response such as un "uh huh" and invite the hearer to chime into the conversation.

The uses of sa outlined above coincide closely to Kamio's conditions for determining the territory of information. Clarification, rebuttal and correction, interruption and attention requests, expressing opinion, and narration of personal experience, are contexts where the speaker claims the information falls entirely into the speaker's territory. Sa in these cases emphasizes the speaker's possession of the information and in turn the hearer's lack of possession.

5.3. *The usage of ne in alternation with sa*

In this section I will examine those contexts where speakers used ne with information that is exclusively in the speakers territory. These contexts will include information to which the speaker feels the hearer can relate, when the speaker wants to invite the hearer's empathy, and contexts in which the speaker feel that the hearer can make logical conclusions based upon what the speaker has previously stated.

5.3.1. *Usage of ne with speaker exclusive information in utterances towards which the speaker feels the hearer can relate*

The first example of ne with information that is exclusively in the speakers territory is given in example (22). F and Q are talking about a club at the university. Q is F's senpai who graduated from the university the year before. Since Q was a member of the same club, Q can relate to the information through personal experience, although not direct experience of this particular incident. The speaker, F in 6F, acknowledges this by uses of ne instead of sa.

(22)

- 1Q: Sinnyuusei to ka hairisoo
 2F: Soo ne. Sore wa yoku wakaranai. Da kedo, nanka kyoo wa hitori kite ta.
 3Q: Huun. Syuku mawari to ka yatte nai no?
 4F: Uun. Yatte ru yo. Watasi ga yatta tokoro wa oikosi datta kedo,
 5Q: Un. De, doo datta?
 6F: Un. Maa, ano setumeeikai to ka ato, sinkan koosyuukai kite ne to ka ittara, hai, to ka itte kekkoo ne, tegotae aru ka natte kanzi datta n da kedo ne, itan no ko da kara ne,
 7Q: Haa. Haa.
- 1Q: Does it look like any new students will join?
 2F: Umm ne, I don't really know. But one person came today.
 3Q: Hm. Is it that you're not going around to the dorms?
 4F: No, we are [yo]. The place I was doing was oikosi (name of dormitory)
 5Q: Uh huh. How was it?
 6F: Um, well, um, when I said "come to the explanatory meeting," she said "yes" and it's that she seemed quite ne responsive but ne, she was a student from the two year medical college so ne,
 7Q: Oh. Oh.

Since the information expressed by F in 6F is a direct personal experience it is information exclusively in the speaker's territory. The exclusive nature of this information is further reinforced by Q in 5Q with the question doo datta? "How was it?" Despite the speaker's exclusive information in this context F uses ne in 6F because F feels that Q can understand and relate to F's personal experience since Q has experienced similar situations as a member of the club.

5.3.2. *Usage of ne with speaker exclusive information in utterances which invite the hearer's empathy*

In example (23), G is offering to give her pots and pans plus other kitchen items to S and is describing how they are all still in boxes since she moved. She uses ne with information that only she possesses, that is information with which only she is familiar such as the kinds and the amounts of kitchen utensils she has in her kitchen. In the Coffee Shop Conversation none of the participants had the same kind of relationship that G had to the information in (22).

(23)

- 1G: Kittin yoohin nara, atasi ageru wa yo.
 2R: E?
 3G: Kittin yoohin.
 4S: A, kittin yoohin tyoodai yo.
 5G: Onabe to ka, iroiro.
 6R: Kore de, kawanakute sunda.

7n: Agerareru mono nai wa⁹.

8G: Datte, atasi ima kyabinetto nakute, hako ni ireta mama na no ne.
Hikkosite kara ne, hontoo ne, hako ga ne, sugoi no uti. Mae wa kittin
ippai kyabinetto itutu atta desyo. Ima wa ikko da mono. Hako ()
kyabinetto nai kara ireru toko mo nai mono. Hikkosite irai hako ni
haitta mama.

1G: If it's kitchen utensils, I'll give them to you [wa] [yo]

2R: What?

3G: Kitchen utensils

4S: Oh, give me your kitchen utensils [yo].

5G: Pots or a variety of other things.

6S: With this I'll manage without having to buy anything.

7R: I don't have anything I can give [wa].

8G: Hey, I don't have any cabinets now and so it's that they're still in
boxes ne. Since I moved ne really ne, the amount of boxes ne is
amazing at my house. Before my kitchen was full of cabinets, there
were five, you know, but now there's one right. Boxes () since there
are no cabinets, there is no place to put them. They've been in boxes
since I moved.

By using ne in this context G invites the hearer's empathy, an effect she would not have given if she had used the particle sa instead. This function of ne has been explained by Cook as making information appear to be shared even if the information is exclusively held by the speaker (Cook 1990: 41).

Another example of ne used by the speaker to invite the empathy of the hearer is given in (24). H is explaining what she herself must do before moving. She uses ne with her personal information instead of the particle sa to invite the other participants' empathy.

(24)

1H: Ano apaato kite kureru dattara, kagu ippai yaru zo¹⁰.

2S: A, ha, ha, ha.

3H: Atasi ano kagu dasu no ni ne, barasankya-ikenai. Da kara kaitai
sinakya ikenai n da mono. () to ka teeburu to ka.

1H: Um, if you come to my apartment, I'll give you a lot of furniture [zo].

2S: Oh, ha, ha, ha.

3H: I, um, in order to get the furniture out of the apartment ne, I've got
to take it apart. So it's that I've got to disassemble it. () and the
tables and things.

⁹ Notice that R is a man using the particle wa which is commonly used by women exclusively.

¹⁰ H here uses the particle zo which in traditional grammars and other particle analyses is said to be used exclusively by men.

The use of the particle ne in a strategy to include the hearer in the speaker's information territory was quite common in all of the data used in this study. When the speaker uses ne in contexts of exclusive speaker information where sa is often used, the speaker invites the empathy of the other conversational participants. The effect of this invitation is to make the speaker's exclusive information seem to be shared information.

5.3.3. Usage of ne to express speaker exclusive information in logical conclusions or contexts where the hearer can follow the logic

Another use of the particle ne with information exclusively held by the speaker is when the speaker feels that the hearer can follow the speaker's conclusions logically. This usage of ne is most evident in phrases beginning with da kara ne, and in phrases ending with a predicate (verb, adjective, or nominal plus copula) followed by kara ne.

In (25), N makes a conclusion based upon the personal experiences uttered in 7,9,11, and 13N. He uses the construction verb plus kara ne.

(25)

15N: (0.7) **tyanto kakuzitu ni yaroo to omotta kara ne.**

15N: (0.7) Therefore I thought "I'll do it securely" **ne.**

In addition, logical conclusions are often made without an overt expression such as da kara or predicate plus kara ne. In (26) R first corrects (rebutts) H by elaborating an explanation about a rumor that he heard about how the American embassy is dealing with the problem of gasoline being stolen. Background information related to why the embassy had to start pooling gasoline is described with the particle sa. The conclusion of the story is made with an utterance that begins with da kara and contains ne.

(26)

1H: **Gaikookan tokken to ka aru.**

2R: **Soo zya nakute, amerika taisikan de sa, gasorin o nusumareta to ka sawaide ita desyo. Donburi kanzyoo-site te, nanka, dare ka ga sa, ura mawasite te, sore o uttyatta to ka itte,**

3R: **da kara gasorin o puuru site ru kara, taisikan de soo iu, nan dakke, ano kuruma to ka dasu toki no ne, gasorin zibun-tati de tyootatu-site mawasu.**

1H: There are things like diplomatic privileges.

2R: That's not what I mean. At the American embassy [sa] they were making a commotion that gasoline had been stolen or something, weren't they. There was bad bookkeeping and somehow someone [sa] secretly sold some.

- 3R: So since they pool the gasoline, at the embassy when they take out, what do you call it that car **ne** they regulate the amount of gasoline among themselves and send it around.

The use of the particle ne with the speaker's logical conclusions can also be seen in phrases that contain yappari "after all, as you'd expect" and end with ne. In example (27), A and N are talking about the students in their class at the university and about their plans concerning marriage.

(27)

- 1N: Koko wa moo 30 made, suki na koto site kurasu n da.
2A: Aa, ii ne. Amari nanka soo iu kangaetaku nai ne.
3N: Nani ka, de mo sa,
4A: Un.
5N: Mizika ni sematte ru zyan, kekkoo.
6A: Un.
7N: Kekkon suru to ka iu hito mo iru si sa, dookyuusee de mo sa,
8A: Iru kedo sa, de mo nanka yappari (0.7) zibun no koto to site wa kangaetaku nai ne.
- 1N: It's that here I will live doing what ever I like until I'm 30.
2A: Oh, that's great **ne**. I somehow don't want to think about those kinds of things much **ne**.
3N: Somehow , but [sa],
4A: Uh huh.
5N: Isn't it coming close upon us, quite.
6A: Uh huh.
7N: There are people who are getting married and all [sa], even our classmates [sa]
8A: There are those but [sa],but somehow after all, (0.7) as for my situation, at least, I don't want to think about it **ne**.

The speaker's use of ne in this context, invites the empathy of the hearer. In example (27) above, the utterance after yappari expresses both conviction on the part of the speaker to not think about marriage, and also personal feelings that the hearer should understand because of the intimacy of their friendship.

The uses of ne presented here support the conclusions that Cook and Ishikawa have made, specifically that **ne** creates an affective common ground between the speaker and the hearer. In other words use of the particle ne invites the hearer to participate in the feelings of the speaker even if the hearer does not share the information with the speaker. With the particle sa however, the speaker claims that the information expressed is in the speaker's territory and marks it as such.

5.4. *The usage of no particle*

The data also include utterances which the speaker conveys with the usage of neither ne nor sa. In example (28), A and N are talking about their classmates plans after graduating from the university. N is comparing what it is like to become a civil servant with going to graduate school.

(28)

- 1N: (0.5) Kekkoo. Dakara ne, daigakuin ni iku mitai na kanzi ni, na no
 2A: Hoo,hoo,hoo
 3N: Nanka, sotugyoo site te sugu ni kensyuu, tookyoo no kensyuuzyo ni
 hati gatu made ite, hati-gatu zyanakute, siti-gatu, siti-gatu made te
 ite, soko de nanka hooritu to ka benkyoo site te sono ato kakuti ni
 haizoku-sarete ru basyo ni itte nenkan benkyoo-site kite, mada tugi
 no tosi hati-gatu, tuitati kara, tookyoo ni minna atumatte, tugi no
 tosi san-gatu made kensyuu saigo ni ronbun kaite teesyutu-site
 hazimete saiyo tte iu katati.
- 1N: Quite, so [ne], it that it's like going to graduate school.
 2A: Oh, oh, oh.
 3N: Somehow ,right after you graduate you enter training. You are at the
 training center in Tokyo until August, no not August, July. You're
 there until July and there, somehow you study things like law. After
 that you go to the place where you are assigned and study for one
 year, and still on August 1 of the next year everyone gathers in Tokyo
 and until March of the next year you are in training and in the end
 you write a thesis and hand it in, and after that you are employed for
 the first time, that's how it works.

The expression of the information as in 3N above, without any particles, that is without explicit forms on what Minami refers to as the transmission level of the sentence, is common in presentations of hearsay-based or reported information. This is also typical of discourse that is impersonal such as a news broadcast. The absence of the transmission level, that is particles *ne* and *sa*, makes the information seem more objective and neutral.

6. *The distribution of sa and ne*

This study deals with the utterance-internal uses of the particle sa and ne. I have presented examples which show what contexts sa and ne occur, and also contexts where neither ne nor sa occur. In Tables 2 and 3 I present the overall distributional patterns for the usages of sa and ne by women and men in utterance internal and utterance-final position (Table 3) and the breakdown in terms of grammatical construction (Table 4).

TABLE 2

Total Number of Tokens of Sa

	women	men	Total
Utterance-internal <u>Sa</u>	23	65	88
Utterance-final <u>Sa</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>
	26	70	96

Total Number of Tokens of Ne

	women	men	Total
Utterance-internal <u>Ne</u>	122	70	192
Utterance-final <u>Ne</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>172</u>
	222	142	364

TABLE 3

	SA		NE	
	<u>women</u>	<u>men</u>	<u>women</u>	<u>men</u>
<u>Utterance-internal</u>				
Noun Phrase	3(10)*	24(35)	38(17)	19(13)
Conjunction	11(47)	14(20)	42(19)	18(12)
Verb	3(13)	11(16)	18(8)	3(2)
Other**	6(23)	15(21)	24(11)	30(20)
<u>Utterance-final</u>				
Copula	0	0	33(15)	31(22)
Verb	0	0	4(11)	18(12)
Adjective	0	0	11(5)	5(4)
Noun Phrase	0	1(1)	9(4)	0
Conjunction	0	4(7)	14(6)	4(3)
Other Utterance-final	3(7)	0	9(4)	19(13)

*Figures in parentheses are the percentage of total tokens of sa for each sex, figures for ne are for a total of ne tokens for each sex. Therefore, percentages for ne are from a total of 222 tokens used by women and 142 tokens used by men.

**Other includes nanka, are, ano, and etto.

Tables 2 and 3 show that the total number of tokens of utterance-final ne account for nearly half (47 percent) of utterances with ne. Considering only the utterance-internal uses of sa and ne, ne occurred with twice the frequency as did sa.

Sa was used by males in 70 utterances, accounting for 73 percent of the uses of sa. The utterance-internal ne was used by females in 122 utterances and males in 70 utterances, accounting for 64 percent and 36 percent respectively.

In table 4 the differences in usage by males and females is presented.

TABLE 4

Differences in the Usage of Contextual Variants of Utterance-Internal Sa by Men and Women

<u>Context</u>	<u>women</u>	<u>men</u>
Clarification	8	10
Rebuttal	7(4)*	13
Opinion Giving	6(3)	15
Attention Request	1	5
Personal Experience	1	21

*Figures in parentheses are number of utterances out of the total which included repetition of the other participants utterance.

Although women did use sa in rebuttal and opinion giving contexts, half of the total number of utterances where they used sa in these contexts included repetitions. In contrast, utterances where men used sa in rebuttal and opinion giving contexts did not involve repetition. Tannen (1987) claims that one of the functions of repetition in conversation is accomplishing social goals through a persuasive effect or linking one speaker's ideas to another's. The use of repetition in rebuttal and opinion giving contexts lessens the impact of presenting the rebut or the opinion as speaker exclusive information by establishing common ground (Tannen 1987: 581) from which to rebut the other conversational participant or to express one's opinions.

The use of repetition with rebuttal and opinion giving can also be seen with women's use of ne in Table 5.

TABLE 5

Differences in the Usage of Contextual Variants of Utterance-Internal Ne by Men and Women

<u>Context</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Men</u>
Clarification	25	14
Rebuttal	16	4
Opinion Giving	42(25)	23
Attention Request	6	9
Personal Experience	12	19

Women's use of ne together with repetition in opinion giving utterances makes their persuasive power stronger than men's who tend to use the particle ne alone, i.e. without repetition. As I demonstrated above the use of the particle sa with opinions makes the opinion appear lighter in tone than opinions given with ne since ne elicits agreement from the other participant. In addition, the use of repetition with the particle ne gives the added effect of giving opinions from the position of given information. Thus, women tend to be more persuasive than men in giving opinions.

7. Concluding remarks

I have shown with data from actual conversations that first, there is an important connection between the claim a speaker makes about the information contained in his or her utterances and the particles used in these utterances. When a speaker chooses a particle he or she is saying "this is my information" (sa), "this is our information" (ne), or "this is information" (no particle). Second, the traditional characterization of sa as being assertive and imposing are not sufficient for an accurate representation of the way sa is used in conversation. As I demonstrated through the data, sa, when used to express the speaker's opinions, makes the utterance appear lighter in tone. Contrary to previous analyses the use of ne in speaker exclusive information contexts makes the utterance, the speaker's opinion, appear stronger by urging the hearer to agree with the speaker.

My conclusions here based upon Japanese data may be carried over in to other languages as well. A more thorough investigation into the use of so called "tag questions" in English, which are often given as the equivalent of ne, could produce the same conclusions as in my analysis here. Furthermore, investigation of suprasegmentals such as intonation in English and other languages not having particles such as sa and ne may be called for.

References

- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. (1987) *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Roger and Albert Gilman (1960) The pronouns of power and solidarity. In Thomas E. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 253-77.
- Cook, Haruko M. (1990) The sentence-final particle ne as a tool for cooperation in Japanese conversation. In H. Hoji (ed.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*. Stanford: The Stanford Linguistic Association, 24-44.
- Doi, Takeo (1971) *The anatomy of dependence*. Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Hashimoto, Shinkichi (1969) *Joshi, jodoshi no kenkyuu* [Particle and auxiliary verb research]. Tokyo: Iwanami.

Hengeveld, Elizabeth C. (1984) The lexicographic representation of power vocabulary in Japanese. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Cornell University, Ithaca.

Ishida, Akiyoshi (1992) Kaiwa ni okeru "nanka" no yakuwari ni tuite. [The role of "nanka" in conversation]. Tsukuba University thesis. Unpublished manuscript.

Ishikawa, Minako (1988) The cognitive and interactional functions of the Japanese particle *ne* in discourse. *Southern Review* 3: 24-35.

Ishikawa, Minako (1992) A synthesis of three approaches to discourse: an analysis of the Japanese particle *ne*. Unpublished paper presented at the *Linguistics Society of America Annual Meeting*.

Kamio, Akio (1979) On the notion of speaker's territory of information. In G. Bedell, E. Kobayashi and M. Muraki (eds.), *Explorations in linguistics: Papers in honor of Kazuko Inoue*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 213-231.

Kamio, Akio (1991) The theory of territory of information. Unpublished manuscript.

Konoshima, Masatoshi (1966) *Kokugo joshi no kenkyuu* [Japanese particle research]. Tokyo: Ofusha.

Lakoff, Robin (1975) *Language and a woman's place*. New York: Harper and Row.

McGloin, Naomi H. (1990) Sex differences and sentence-final particles. In Sachiko Ide and Naomi H. McGloin (eds.), *Aspects of Japanese women's language*. Tokyo: Kuroshio, 23-41.

Maltz, Daniel W. and Ruth Borker (1982) A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. In J. J. Gumperz (ed.), *Language and social identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 196-216.

Martin, Samuel (1975) *A reference grammar of Japanese*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Matsumura, Akira (1975) *Kotengo gendaigo joshi jodoshi shosetsu* [Particles and auxiliary verbs in classical and modern Japanese]. Tokyo: Gakutosha.

Minami, Fujio (1970) On the meaning of sentences in modern Japanese. In R. Jakobson and S. Kawamoto (eds.), *Studies in general and oriental linguistics*, 467-483.

Minami, Fujio (1974) *Gendai nihongo no koozoo*. [Modern Japanese syntax]. Tokyo: Taishshukan.

Moriyama, Takuroo (1989) Ninshiki no muudo to sono shuuhun (Epistemic mood and its environment). In Y. Nitta and T. Masuoka (eds.), *Nihongo no modariti* [Japanese modality]. Tokyo: Kuroshio, 57-120.

O'Barr, William M. and Bowman K. Atkins (1980) "Women's language" or "powerless" language? In S. McConnell-Ginet, R. Borker, and N. Furman (eds.), *Women and language in literature and society*. New York: Praeger, 93-110.

Sugiyama Lebra, Takie (1976) *Japanese patterns of behavior*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Suzuki, Ryoko (1990) The role of particles in Japanese gossip. Unpublished manuscript.

Tannen, Deborah (1984) *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends*. Norwood: Ablex.

Tannen, Deborah (1987) Repetition in conversation. *Language* 63(3): 574-605.

Teramura, Hideo (1984) *Nihongo no shintakusu to imi* [Japanese syntax and meaning], vol. 2. Tokyo: Kuroshio.

Wetzel, Patricia (1990) Are "powerless" communication strategies the Japanese norm? In Sachiko Ide and Naomi H. McGloin (eds.), *Aspects of Japanese women's language*. Tokyo: Kuroshio, 5-22.