

論文の英文要旨

論文題目	A Japanese-Chinese contrastive study of politeness via degree of intimacy---from the perspective of Discourse Politeness Theory
氏名	Li Yuxia

This study empirically attests the effectiveness of Brown and Levinson's (1987) Politeness Theory and Usami's (1998, 2001, 2002 etc.) Discourse Politeness Theory by investigating and comparing the politeness of Japanese (a language with honorifics system) and Chinese (a language without syntactic honorifics). According to Brown and Levinson's (1987), if P (power) and Rx (rank of imposition) are constant, D (distance, indicator is degree of intimacy for speakers) is a variable. The research goal of this dissertation is to reveal what influence degree of intimacy plays upon the language activity in Japanese and Chinese. It contains 11 chapters, and each chapter is summarized as below.

Chapter 1 introduces the theoretical framework of this research. It also presents and explains the motivations of the three research focuses, namely, 1. Speech level in Japanese and honorific words in Chinese, 2. Methods of introducing conversation topics in Japanese and Chinese, 3. Responses in Japanese and Chinese conversations.

Chapter 2 explains data collection methods. Based on Usami's (2008b) empirical study method "comprehensive conversation analysis", this study elicits condition-controlled conversation data of Japanese and Chinese. It collects 12 pairs of Japanese Women conversation data (First-meeting-group and Friend-group are respectively 6 pairs), and 24 pairs of Chinese Women/Men conversation data (Women's and Men's First-meeting-group and Friend-group are respectively 6 pairs). Totally it records this 36 pairs' 720-minutes conversation data. Then all pairs answer a follow-up questionnaire. This study uses Usami ed. (2013)'s corpus data of Japanese Men conversation (First-meeting-group and Friend-group) to compare with Chinese Men data.

Chapter 3 to Chapter 6 analyzes speech level in Japanese conversation and honorific words in Chinese conversation. Chapter 3 explains speech level of words in Japanese conversation data, that is the indicator of characteristics of the speaker's language (Usami, 2001). Basic status words in sentences of Japanese First-meeting group are neutral word P (Women 91.30% and men 85.06%). Honorific words in sentences of Japanese friend-group conversation are lower than that of first-meeting group. The neutral P is used 75.24% in women conversation, and 56.55% in men conversation.

Chapter 4 analyzes the sentence-final speech level in Japanese conversation. It indicates the speaker's consideration to the hearer by an adjustment of psychological distance and treatment. Japanese first-meeting group's sentence end is basically "DESU/MASU" style (P). Whereas Japanese Friend-group's sentence end is basically normal style (N). Taking this result and conversation themes into consideration, Japanese women express intimacy by decreasing sentence-final courtesy. Japanese men express intimacy by selecting intimate topics such as their

girlfriends.

Chapter 5 studies speech level shift. Down shift in Japanese first-meeting women conversation is used mostly as “admiration, impression”, and used mostly as “suspended speech” by men. Up shift in Japanese conversation among friends is used mostly as “confirmation”, mainly using “DESHOU”.

Chapter 6 describes honorific words in Chinese conversation. Chinese in their first meeting conversation mostly use neutral word (P). Chinese men in first-meeting group seem to be more familiar with each other than their women counterparts. Chinese women pairing with friends also use basically neutral word (P). However, for Chinese men pairing with friends, who use rude words (N), which are not used in authentic situation. The abusive words occur in every 6 conversations. Based on Usami(1998, 2001, 2002 etc.) Discourse Politeness theory, these abusive words used by Chinese men among friends, can be interpreted as a shibboleth and positive politeness strategy.

Chapter 7 and 8 examine “How to keep the conversation going”, with a focus on conversation topics and topic introduction. Chapter 7 analyzes the typical pattern of topic change in Japanese and Chinese who first meet. Japanese’s typical conversation pattern is greeting, change of personal information (name, faculty, major, grade), reason of cooperation for this conversation recording, and other topics. Chinese’s typical pattern is change of personal information (faculty, grade, major, hometown), reason of cooperation for this conversation recording, and other topics. Chinese conversation does not have greeting and name.

Chapter 8 describes how to introduce topics. The dissertation hypothesizes that those who first meet would introduce new topics by questioning, and those who are friends would introduce new topics by declarative sentences. The results show that, Japanese conversation data support the above hypothesis, Chinese conversation, however, doesn’t. Chinese women friends use, instead, exclamatory sentences. Only Chinese men first-meeting group shows a little tendency.

Chapter 9 focuses on the listener, and studies the responses of the listener. First meeting group use more responsive expressions than friend group no matter it is Japanese or Chinese. Japanese conversation contains more responses than Chinese data. The most frequent response word in friend Japanese conversation is “UN” group, the second is “SOU” group, and the third is “AA” group. The most frequent response word in Chinese friends’ conversation is “en” group, the second is “dui” group, and the third is “a” group. Japanese and Chinese tend to use similar sound as response word.

Chapter 10 answers the research questions and summarizes the research findings after this Japanese-Chinese contrastive study of politeness, via degree of intimacy, from three aspects: the speech level in Japanese conversation and honorific words in Chinese conversation; the ways of introducing topics in Japanese and Chinese conversation; and the use of responses in conversation.

Chapter 11 explains the relevance of this study and Usami’s (1998, 2001, 2002 etc.) Discourse Politeness Theory and indicates research directions for future study.