

COLLECTIVE ACTION CHOICES IN JAPANESE WORKPLACE INTERACTION¹

Yuko SUGITA (University of Duisburg-Essen)

ABSTRACT

In classrooms of Japanese as Foreign Language (JFL) as well as in “inter-cultural training programmes” for business people going to Japan, students are advised not to directly say “no” or “impossible” when communicating with Japanese. The strategy is accounted for in terms of “culture” and, especially, in terms of the stereotypical notion of “indirectness”. Empirical analysis tells us, however, that cooperative actions in institutional settings are much more complex. This paper examines cooperative actions in more detail by analysing parts of an audio-recorded business meeting in a Japanese company. In this analysis, the process of negotiating business matters reveals a complex interplay of control mechanisms, institutional logics and knowledge on the part of the individuals involved. Applying the analytical framework of knowledge types of Ehlich and Rehbein (1977) and the discourse analytical method, it is shown that different linguistic means, talk organization, and shared knowledge are at work in the process of negotiating the sales goals.²

1. INTRODUCTION

For any given institution, the cooperative actions of its members are a prerequisite for its functioning (Brünner 2000: 8). In order to explain the

¹ This work was partly funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) within the framework of the SFB 538 Mehrsprachigkeit (Research Centre No. 538 Multilingualism) at the University of Hamburg.

² I am aware of the different backgrounds and agendas of various approaches in analysing interactional data, such as Ethnomethodological Conversation Analysis (CA), Discourse Analysis (DA) in general or Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (ten Have 2005). In this paper, the method of Functional Pragmatic Discourse Analysis (see, for example, Ehlich 1991) is employed, because the framework of knowledge structure was developed by researchers in this discipline. Nevertheless, studies in CA and Interactional Linguistics (Selting and Couper-Kuhlen 2000) are also taken into account.

cooperative actions of individuals, two distinctive paradigms have had an influence on institutional studies: the theory of cooperation as a rational choice of “benefit-oriented individuals” (for example, Orbell and Dawes 1991), and the model of “socially fully constrained actors” (for an overview of the paradigms and discussions see, Sato and Yamada 2004). The former acknowledges individuals as conscious decision-making actors, and the latter understands society as constraining the actions of individuals.³ In order to explain plausibly cooperative actions of institutional members in practice, however, we need to take both aspects into account, in other words, individuals acting on the basis of their knowledge about constraints in society. This paper assumes that an analysis of knowledge about possible actions in a given constellation offers explanatory potential for cooperative actions in everyday institutional interaction. Most of our knowledge of operating institutional actions is automatized and unconsciously applied. Other knowledge, however, implies deliberate decision-making. Knowledge is partly acquired through the socialization process and experiences, but it is also mediated through social networks or institutions. Therefore, institutional control mechanisms, rules and logics as well as interactional processes play an important role in forming and activating such knowledge about institutional actions. The empirical study presented in this paper shows the complex interplay of the factors mentioned above in negotiating institutional cooperation.

2. FRAMEWORK AND METHOD OF ANALYSIS

Assuming that we are knowledgeable agents in a society of alternatives from which we are able to choose in order to act in different social constellations, the analysis of concrete knowledge is essential for investigating individual and collective choice of action. In the framework of functional pragmatic discourse analysis (Ehlich 1991, Rehbein 2001), Ehlich and Rehbein (1977) propose the analytical and theoretical concept of “knowledge structures” and “types of knowledge structure”, analysing everyday interaction in German schools. These concepts are valuable in analysing institutional knowledge structures and their mechanisms. In what follows, the types of knowledge structures will be introduced.

³ In the recent discussions on the relationship between institution and culture, new models are being developed by institutional and cultural sociologists. See, for example, DiMaggio & Powell (1991), Swidler (1986), Sato and Yamada (2004). I am very much indebted to Jun Imai for his insightful comments on this issue.

Knowledge is categorized into seven types according to the degree of sedimentation, internalization or diffusion:

- (0) **Knowledge (resulting) from Idiosyncratic Experience** (*partikulares Erlebniswissen*)
 - (1) **Assessment** (*Einschätzung*)
 - (2) **Picture, Image** (*Bild, Image*)
 - (3) **Sentential Knowledge** (*Sentenz*)
 - (4) **Maxim** (*Maxime*)
 - (5) **Pattern Knowledge** (*Musterwissen*)
 - (6) **Knowledge of Routines** (*Routinewissen*)
- (Ehlich and Rehbein 1977: 44; for English equivalents, see Ehlich *et al.* 1996)

According to Ehlich and Rehbein (1977), this categorization is not exhaustive. Nevertheless, it offers potential for the further development of analysis of institutional knowledge.⁴

(0) Knowledge resulting from idiosyncratic experience is individual knowledge, of which a large part is forgotten. It is numbered zero because of its peripheral position in the knowledge structures. (1) Assessment is knowledge that is acquired by individual recurrent experiences as a kind of summary, such as “Y is often Z”, or “Some of Y is Z”. When this knowledge gains a firm status in the mind of X, it becomes (2) Picture. When the Picture, such as “Y is always Z”, or “All Y is Z”, gets shared with some other members of the social group, then it is called (2) Image. One such knowledge type is “stereotypes” (Redder 1995). (3) Sentential Knowledge is a collective mnemonic sentence, which all members of the social group share. In institutional settings such as schools, which are the focus of the analysis in Ehlich and Rehbein (1977), an example of Sentential Knowledge might be “A tree must be bent while it is young”. (4) Maxim is knowledge which is acquired from experiences and immediately elicits actions; such as “Pull a trick on the teachers whenever you can, but do not let them cop you.” It might remain individual, but can also be shared by members. (5) Pattern Knowledge is knowledge about the deep structure of action patterns for certain purposes, such as question and answer, or more complex ones like claim-making and its treatment in an institutional setting (Fiehler, Kindt and Schnieders 1999). (6) Knowledge of Routines refers to all possible knowledge types so internalized that one can act automatically without being conscious of them. According to the definitions above, (2) Image, (3) Sentential knowledge, (4) Maxim, (5)

⁴ Although more comparative studies are necessary, they also seem to be compatible with the social cognitive scientists’ view of “social knowledge”, as well as with the concept of “schema-knowledge structures” in the field of cognitive sociology (DiMaggio 1997, 2002; Zerubavel 1997).

Pattern knowledge and (6) Knowledge of Routines are “shared knowledge”, whereas (4) can be both individual and shared.

In this paper, I will mainly focus on (4) Maxim as knowledge immediately eliciting actions. According to Ehlich and Rehbein (1977: 61), a Maxim is employed when goal-oriented decisions between alternative actions must be made. A Maxim itself is usually not observed on the surface of the interaction, but, when it comes to rationalizing one’s own or others’ deed, its linguistic formulations become visible. If it ought to be shared with others, it is verbally transmitted in the interaction (Ehlich and Rehbein 1977: 60). The method of analysis taken here, detail analysis of action and knowledge in discourse, can only be of a qualitative character. Quantitative validity is therefore not claimed here. Rather, I am trying to demonstrate an instance of a method of analysing interaction by which the negotiation process of institutional cooperative actions can be elicited from the empirical data.

3. DATA

The corpora were collected in the framework of the project team Japanese and German Expert Discourse (JadEx) of the SFB 538 Research Centre of Multilingualism at the University of Hamburg (Hohenstein and Kameyama 2000). The data to be analysed here are taken from a digitally audio-recorded sales meeting that took place in the Kyoto office of a food-retailing company in 2000. No visual cues were available. The Regional Manager for Kyoto (hereafter RM) and the Area Managers for the region (hereafter AMs) attend a meeting which is held regularly. In the data under consideration, the topic is sales goals in the coming sales period. Both the Kyoto variety and Standard Japanese are used. The audio-recorded meeting data was transcribed using EXMARALDA software, which was developed by the Centre of Multilingualism mentioned above.⁵ In addition, some prosodic features are measured physically with the phonetic analysis software PRAAT.⁶

The data presented here are excerpts of a recorded meeting (see Appendix II). The numbers in square brackets indicate the score area number within the four excerpts. The numbers with the letter “s” for “segment” in the same line denote the utterance number within the complete tran-

⁵ For details and download see <http://www.exmaralda.org> (as of December 2007).

⁶ For details and download see <http://www.fon.hum.uva.nl/praat> (as of September 2006).

scription. Institutional and personal names have been changed and bracketed with <> in the verbal transcription lines (for other abbreviation and transcript conventions, see Appendix I and Rehbein *et al.* 2002).

Concerning the organization and routines in the branch office of the company under consideration, our insights are mainly limited to the information available in the audio-recorded data of our corpora of three different meetings. Additional information was gathered from the collaborator who recorded the business meetings and from the internet sites of the company. This means that it is not possible to understand all the relevant business matters. As the data presented here are fragments, I will briefly present the content of the data for the sake of better understanding in the analysis that follows.

At the beginning of the final part of the meeting, the RM introduces the last topic for that day's meeting: *sūji awase* [adjusting figures]. In this institution, this apparently involves the sales goals reported by each AM being publicly compared with target figures defined by the management. Usually, higher targets than the reported figures are set out for the future. The RM reads out the sales goals for each area for the last week of May written in the distributed handouts, and the percentage compared to the same period of the year before. Three of the reported sales goals are lower (80–99 percent) than those of the preceding year. Only one of the AMs reports that he is planning to achieve 109 percent of the sales in the same period of the previous year. After the RM has read out all the reported figures, he directly states that he wants the goals to be raised to the level of the same period of the previous year, that is, 100 percent, because sales in the month of June cannot reach this level because of the unfavourable weather conditions in Japan at that time of year.⁷ He then reads the new figures for each area sales office. After that, the interaction presented in **Data 1** follows: The RM emphasizes that it is possible to achieve the new goals as defined by him. The manager then repeats “100 percent of the preceding year”, addressing Mr. Sato in utterances s124–s125. After a 3.5 second caesura, Mr. Sato just repeats “100 percent of the preceding year” with no special prosodic stress (s127). The RM emphasizes that it will definitely be impossible to achieve 96 percent of the previous year's outcomes in June (s129–s130).

After the interaction shown in **Data 1**, the RM refers to the actual sales goals, called *bazetto* [budget], and the percentage by which each area sales office has to raise its outcomes compared to those of the same period in the previous year. Giving the weather conditions (30 degrees, hot enough

⁷ Since June is the rainy season in almost all areas of Japan, the food products that the company retails are influenced by the weather conditions.

to have good conditions for selling their products) as one of the reasons for his confidence about the possibility of attaining last year's figures, the RM insists on his revised sales goals. He also shows sympathy to the AMs who, he thinks, want to postpone the tough task into June. Repeatedly arguing that the new goals must be achieved in May, he also emphasizes the difficult sales conditions in June.

In s262 in **Data 2**, the RM encourages the AMs to compensate for the predicted decrease of sales in June by boosting sales before that period. He then asks Mr. Kato for his opinion (s264). Instead of giving a direct answer, Kato, after a 3.5 second caesura, asks the RM whether he should achieve the last year's outcomes in all the distribution systems they have (s266). The RM does not immediately react to Kato's question, but aggressively argues that June would be a hard month in which to achieve higher sales outcomes. Hence, it would be better to overcome the difficulties in advance rather than postponing dealing with them (s269-s270).

Again in s276-s279 in **Data 3**, the RM says that the AMs should make efforts in good time in order to compensate for the sales losses in June. Mr. Mochizuki is then asked for his opinion in s281. After a 2.5 second caesura, he says he will try anyway. The manager reacts just with *na* [you see] (although this is unclear on the recording) and, after a caesura of 6.5 seconds, he points out that there is a good chance of Mr. Mochizuki achieving the goal, because his area office has only a moderate discrepancy between the self-reported sales goals and the management's decision (s286-s288).

After the interaction shown in **Data 3**, the RM asks Nakamura whose area office is likely to have far greater difficulties than Mochizuki's in making up the imbalance between the reported and the new sales goals. Nakamura mentions a sales strategy he would like to use: *hyaku-en hanbai* [100-Yen Sales]. The RM positively evaluates the sales campaign of selling products at reduced prices for a certain period of time (these data are not shown here).⁸

Data 4 begins with the RM's utterance emphasizing the necessity of a drastic strategy change, including sales campaigns (s429). Mr. Nakamura then suddenly asks the manager who is objecting to their plans to promote a campaign with reduced prices (s430). An explanation for his complaint is in order here. The interaction presented in **Data 4** shows that there is often a conflict among the managing, planning, and sales divi-

⁸ Here is the limitation of the data in question. Although this part is somewhat relevant to Data 4, without visual access and internal information about the institution, it is difficult to identify clearly the matters talked about and the persons talking.

sions in the company. The first two often hinder the price reduction campaigns preferred by the latter because of the (temporary) loss of profits for the former two, despite the (temporary) achievement of sales goals for the latter. Nakamura also claims that the AMs and their staff have great difficulty in achieving the given sales goals and that this is well known by the RM (s435). He also makes his doubts clear that he is not sure whether the president of the company knows about the difficulty of their situation (s443–s446). The RM confirms that he does (s447–s448).⁹ As Mr. Nakamura has assumed, the RM admits that the management and planning divisions do not usually agree with these campaigns (s439, s441) for the reason depicted above. Mr. Nakamura shows his understanding of the different interests of both the other divisions (s451 and s454–s459).

Towards the end of the meeting, which is not shown here, the RM repeats that the AMs should do their best to achieve 100 percent of the outcomes of the same period in the previous year. This statement closes the topic. The two AMs who have been rewarded for their good sales outcomes with a trip are wished a pleasant time by the RM. Then the chair of the meeting, who is not the RM, closes the meeting, thanking all participants. Let us now proceed to some analysis of the data presented above.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

First, the interplay of local control by the management which the RM represents here and the individual choices of action shown in **Data 1–3** will be examined. By the term local control, I mean the institutional control over individuals' work which is evident in everyday face-to-face interaction. This is distinguished from other control devices on the organizational level (Nakamura and Ishida 2005). The focus is, then, moved particularly on to Nakamura's choice of action in **Data 4**. At the centre of attention is the question of how an individual choice of action becomes collective or cooperative (Coulmas 2005: 11).

4.1 HOW AN INDIVIDUAL ACTION BECOMES COLLECTIVE

In our data, the local control of the RM is manifest in his verbal actions. He is actually using a range of talk-organizational means as well as linguistic ones in order to persuade the AMs to accept the decision of the

⁹ The RM's utterances, however, are not very clear-cut, so that we are not actually able to know whether he is really reporting the difficulty of the situation of the AMs to the president of the company.

management; only some of these will be mentioned here. For example, in the following three almost adjacent utterances (s115, s117 and s119) in **Data 1**, the RM's utterances gradually develop a threatening character:

- (7) (...) *kore saigo no shū* *ur-e-ru* *hazu desu* *kedo ne.*
 this in the last week sell-POT-ATT must VSUF.FRM CONS FP
 (expecting hearer's confirmation)
- 'You can sell this (amount) in the last week, I suppose?'*
- (8) *kore* *ur-e-ru* *hazu desu* *wa.*
 This sell-POT-ATT must VSUF.FRM FP (*emphasizing*)
'Oh, yes, you can sell this.'
- (9) *kore wa* *zettai* *ur-e-masu* *na.*
 This TOP definitely sell-POT-VSUF.FRM FP (*confirming*)
'You can definitely sell this, can't you.'

The tiny changes in the use of final particles which express different illocutions to the hearer, as well as the use of other modal expressions, such as the adverb *zettai* [definitely] or *hazu*, a noun which expresses strong expectation, gives the utterance chaining a threatening character.

Concerning the turn organization, the RM, although not actually chairing the meeting, allocates a speaker's turn to the AMs, and the subsequent talk is strictly organized by him. The interactional pattern given in (10) can be derived from the data (**Data 1-3**):

- (10) Interactional pattern
- | | |
|----------------|--|
| RM | refers to the necessity of raising sales goals |
| RM ((Caesura)) | speaks to one AM (~ <i>san</i>), inquiring whether it is possible |
| RM | persists in his position |
| AM ((Caesura)) | reacts briefly |

As (10) shows, the contribution of each AM is restricted with regard to turn allocation and length. That is to say, the AMs cannot take turns themselves but must be invited by the RM. Although the RM asks the AMs for their comments, he does not directly respond to the utterances of the AMs, for instance, to Kato's question in **Data 2**. Rather, he persists in his arguments: he explains why the sales goals in the last sales week of May should be set higher. This argument is frequently repeated in the meeting. The aggressiveness of the RM's reaction is evident in his raised voice pitch and loudness as well as in the modal adverb *zettai* [definitely] and the final particle *zo* in s129–s130. With these speech characteristics, the final particle *zo* gives the utterances a strong insistent/threatening

illocution. It actually tells us that both the contributions of Sato and Kato (**Data 1–2**) at least are interpreted by the RM as indicating their unwillingness to accept the projected goals.¹⁰ In addition to the linguistic means described above, there is yet another way of local control: “talking with institutional logics”. In the RM’s utterances, it is generally taken for granted that the sales outcomes will achieve the level of the previous year. This is an institutional logic, by means of which the members should make sense of their actions. In concrete terms, if it is taken for granted that the whole year’s outcomes must be equivalent to or higher than the preceding year’s level, it makes sense to state that the predicted profit loss in June must be compensated for with higher sales outcomes sooner or later, as is the case in our data.

The RM is in a position where it is expected that he not only transmits the decision of the management to his staff (AMs), but also secures the achievement of the goals set by the management. As described above, the RM raises the goals to 100 percent of the previous year’s outcomes in the same sales period immediately after having read out the reported sales goals. However, the RM has to make sure that his staff will make the necessary efforts to attain such goals. Hence, he asks them for their comments. His solution is to control the actions of his staff locally by putting pressure on their choice of action not to opt for saying that this is impossible. By repeatedly employing the same interactional pattern as shown in (10), with the same argument in addition, the RM is enhancing the predictability of his possible aggressive reaction if one of the AMs chooses to react against his expectations.¹¹

Given a very restricted reaction slot, the AMs are nonetheless able to choose their verbal actions individually and deliberately. This can be observed in the verbal formulations the AMs are using (see below), as well as in the short caesurae before reacting. The caesura after being addressed has two functions here: to gain time to deliberately choose a verbal action from the alternatives they have; and to show their reluctance to agree to the RM’s higher sales goals.¹² As we can see in **Data 1–3**,

¹⁰ Mochizuki’s case in **Data 3** is excluded because of his relatively positive reaction from the RM’s viewpoint.

¹¹ The pattern is actually observed six times all together in the data in question. Due to space limitations, it is not possible to deal with all the cases here. The pressure is evident in the reaction of Mochizuki, the fifth person questioned by the RM in the meeting in **Data 3**, which is rather positively received by the RM.

¹² Conversation Analysts have demonstrated “pauses” as showing certain problems in the course of the interaction, for instance, as a sign of not having identified the caller on the phone (Schegloff 1968) or as a sign of hesitation about pursuing certain “dispreferred” acts such as rejecting a request (Jefferson 1980).

none of the AMs actually show themselves willing to accept the revised sales goals by saying either “yes” or “no” directly: Mr. Sato (**Data 1**) only repeats the RM’s utterance: *zennen hyaku* [100 percent of previous year’s]. Mr. Kato (**Data 2**) asks questions such as “do you mean we have to achieve 100 percent in all other distribution systems?” That the reactions of Sato and Kato are not desirable ones for the RM is evident in his aggressive reactions described above. Even Mr. Mochizuki (**Data 3**) says *yaru wa yarimasu yo*, [I’ll do what I can] which is not the same as *yarimasu* [I will].¹³

As demonstrated above, the local control of the RM obviously constrains the actions of the AMs. Nonetheless, individual choice must be taken into account in explaining the similarity of the AMs’ actions in **Data 1–3**. Thus, shared knowledge about the choice of action guiding a collective choice of action must be at work here. As stated in the previous section, the concept of Maxim is useful in understanding the deliberate choice of action in institutions. What can be derived from the AMs’ actions in terms of knowledge is to not agree wholeheartedly to the revised sales goals. Hence, this can be drawn out as the shared Maxim.¹⁴ “In negotiating the sales goals, never say ‘impossible’ to the higher goals, but show your reluctance to achieve them. Otherwise you will be regarded as fully accepting the given goals.” It is strategically important to keep the goals at a lower level which is easier for the sales staff to achieve, because the achievement rate of the “budget” is often the subject of evaluation in personal assessments (Nakamura and Ishida 2005: 43–47). According to Nakamura and Ishida (2005: 7), certain conflicts in sales meetings are predictable when negotiating concrete sales goals. The basic decision on sales goals is made by the management, but the responsibility for their achievement rests on the sales staff. The knowledge depicted above could have been developed as a consequence of this situation and have become acquired through individual everyday institutional experiences, or it might have been transmitted by senior colleagues as part of the “survival kit” in the institution.¹⁵

¹³ The syntagmatic expression “Verb *wa* Verb” such as *yaru wa yaru* or *yaru wa yarimasu* implies that the speaker will try to do something but considers him- or herself not responsible for any negative consequences.

¹⁴ Ehlich and Rehbein (1977: 64) distinguish shared Maxim (or “general Maxim”) from Maxim which an individual person develops.

¹⁵ Ehlich and Rehbein (1977: 65–66) also claim that students develop their Maxims making use of the school rules in order to avoid following them completely. See also Swidler (1995: 36) cited in Section 5.

4.2 HOW AN INDIVIDUAL “NON-COOPERATIVE” ACTION BECOMES COOPERATIVE

Let us now turn to an analysis of **Data 4**. In asking the RM an apparently undesirable question in an unexpected slot without waiting for a turn allocation in s430, Mr. Nakamura is the only person who does not act in the given framework depicted above. In contrast to his colleagues, Nakamura directly expresses their problems, referring to their “difficult/tough situation” (*kurushimi*) in s435. He presumes that the RM knows about this, but doubts whether the management has ever heard “our voice” (*naka no koe*) (s435, s443–s444). Nakamura’s choice of action at this point is challenging and jeopardizes what has been patterned in the interactional practice between the RM and the AMs so far. In this interactional process, we can observe that the RM’s way of speaking changes from strongly persuasive to being less warranting. His reduction of voice pitch and intensity, as well as other linguistic means such as the recurrent use of causal particle *kara* [as] in the utterance-final position, evidence a change in the way of speaking.¹⁶ Up to this point of the interaction in **Data 4** (up to s449), it seems as if Nakamura does not share the same knowledge of the action pattern, ignoring the Maxim that all the other AMs employ. What we witness after s452, however, somewhat compensates for his actions so far: Nakamura demonstrates himself and his staff to be “integrated” institutional members who are very aware of the institutional logic and values: while the RM is explaining why the marketing division disapproves of campaign sales with reduced prices, Mr. Nakamura shows his understanding of the different interests of the sales and marketing divisions (s452–s453). By giving an example of one of his staff (s461), he is showing the institutional logic as knowledge: every member of the sales staff is expected to know that “price reduction is not a good solution for achieving sales goals”, either as an Image (shared Picture, such as “Y is always Z”, or “All Y is Z”; see Section 1) or perhaps as institutional Sentential Knowledge (a collective mnemonic sentence such as a proverb or a slogan; see Section 1), even if it is the easiest way for the sales staff to clear stocks. As is apparent in Nakamura’s utterance about his staff who attended the training course, the company strategically implants such knowledge in the members of the sales division. Nakamura himself also adds that “it is certainly the most risky thing to discount 100 or 200 Yen per box” in s463. His final contribution *mā yō wakarū n desu kedo* [Well, I know the problem, however...] in s464 shows his understanding of the

¹⁶ The recurrent use of the causal particle *kara* in the utterance-final position gives utterances the nuance that the speaker wants the hearer to understand the circumstances. See the analysis of another dataset in Sugita (2004: 176).

institutional logic on one hand, and, on the other, the struggles of himself and his sales staff, with strategies often being constrained by the marketing or the management planning division. Finally, he withdraws.¹⁷ Nakamura's verbal action is his individual choice; however, his knowledge about the institutional logic leads him to refrain from giving his own interests absolute priority. His cooperation is also the result of the negotiation: this time, Nakamura is officially supported by the RM in carrying out a sales campaign which could help him to catch up with the raised sales goal.

5. DISCUSSION

The institutional power relationship obviously constrains the actions of the members within the institution. However, it is necessary to look at the everyday practices of institutional interaction closely, in order to elucidate the negotiation process of cooperative actions. From the local analysis of the empirical data, it becomes evident that different linguistic means, talk organization, and shared knowledge are all at work in the process of achieving an institutional aim, such as getting consent for the sales goals. The management is speaking in terms of institutional logics, so that other members must act in the same institutional reality. Institutional logics are implanted as shared knowledge such as Image or Sentence in the training courses for the younger staff. Both have an influence on the member's choice of action. Nevertheless, the actions of the institutional members are individually chosen. In our case, the Maxim plays a role in allowing members to choose deliberately what they say in a meeting in which sales goals for the next sales period are projected. In Data 1–3, they are expressing their reluctance without directly confronting the RM. Yet, embedded in the talk strictly organized by the RM, their deliberately chosen comments on the raised sales goals, however implicit they might be, have little influence on the negotiation. Nakamura's sole choice of criticizing the company organization for its sales goals is a violation of the talk organization as it has been practised so far. In the negotiation process with the RM, Nakamura nevertheless acts as a com-

¹⁷ Showing his understanding of the attitude of the marketing division, Nakamura marks his utterance with an expression using the concessive particle *kedo* in the utterance-final position. Nakamura understands the situation, but it is implied that he cannot fully accept it. For more details about the utterance-final use of *kedo*, see Onodera (2004).

petent member of the company by showing that he has internalized the institutional logic.

As has become clear by now, individual members of an institution are neither fully constrained by the institutional power relationship nor fully conscious actors oriented to their own interests. Rather, members are constrained by their own knowledge, which elicits or guides actions. In this respect, remarks by Swidler (1995: 36) on institutional culture deserve our interest: "Institutions create obdurate structures that are both constraints and opportunities for individuals. For sociologists of culture, what is interesting about institutions is that individuals create culture around their rules. Individuals can then come to act in culturally uniform ways, not because their experiences are shared, but because they must negotiate the same institutional hurdles." Applying this view to our analysis, a Maxim is culture that members create around the institutional rules. The members' choice of action is, therefore, not identical with the institutional rules. Nevertheless, it is not free from them either, because being a member of this institution implies knowing that "they must negotiate the same institutional hurdles".

6. IMPLICATIONS FOR JFL RESEARCH

Although some sociological studies have revealed that the analysis of institutional interaction is necessary in order to understand fully the relationship between institution and individual action, we still lack empirical studies. I have tried to show in this paper that further study of mundane institutional practice could shed light on the organization of cooperative action in institutions. While this kind of analysis of interaction among Japanese institutional members must have some implications for the study of JFL, we need to investigate further contact situations in institutions empirically (see Fan and Neustupný in this volume for the study of contact situations in JFL). What the study of institutional members' knowledge could contribute to research in JFL is, for instance, to elucidate the mechanism of sedimentation processes of institutional knowledge in contact situations between L1 and L2 Japanese speakers. Language is a means to construct a mutual knowledge basis for institutional cooperation.¹⁸ Covering current research in cognitive science as well as cognitive sociology, the research could aim at practical analysis of the role of Japanese language in such sedimentation processes, asking

¹⁸ See Berger and Luckmann (1967: 34–46) on the role of language in constructing "a social stock of knowledge" (accumulation of socially shared knowledge).

how the knowledge is generated, mediated, shared and realized by L1 and L2 Japanese speakers in contact situations. When L2 Japanese speakers are observed to have difficulties in sharing and realizing the institutional knowledge as verbal actions, the reasons for and the consequences of these difficulties should be also examined. One possible practical training form could include contact situations embedded in the curriculum as it is already practised at Kanda University of International Studies, Japan (see Fan in this paper). Both L1 and L2 speakers should be instructed to make themselves aware of the strategic knowledge of actions they develop as well as the problems they encounter in the course of interaction in contact situations.

A change in perspective in JFL, including intercultural training courses, is required: students of JFL are no longer to be considered as people to whom only the stereotypical action rules should be taught, but as people who ought to acquire as well as create shared knowledge with their L1 counterpart. Such understanding also challenges the “taken-for-grantedness” in the institutional practice of L1 Japanese speakers which was the subject of this paper.

REFERENCES

- Berger, Peter and Thomas Luckmann (1967): *Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Brunner, Gisela (2000): *Wirtschaftskommunikation: Linguistische Analyse ihrer mündlichen Formen* [Business Communication: Linguistic Analysis of its Spoken Form]. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Coulmas, Florian (2005): *Sociolinguistics: The Study of Speakers' Choices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DiMaggio, Paul (1997): Culture and Cognition. In: *Annual Review of Sociology* 23, pp. 263–287.
- (2002): Why Cognitive (and Cultural) Sociology Needs Cognitive Psychology. In: Karen A. Cerulo (ed.): *Culture in Mind: Toward a Sociology of Culture and Cognition*. London: Routledge, pp. 274–281.
- DiMaggio, Paul and Walter W. Powell (1991): Introduction to the New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis. In: Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio (eds.): *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 1–38.
- Ehlich, Konrad (1991): Funktional-pragmatische Kommunikationsanalyse: Ziele und Verfahren [Functional-Pragmatic Communication Analysis: Aims and Methods]. In: Dieter Flader (ed.): *Verbale Interaktion: Studien zur Empirie und Methodologie der Pragmatik* [Verbal Interaction: Studies in Empirical and Methodological Pragmatics]. Tübingen: Narr, pp. 1–10.

- tion: Studies on the Practice and Methodology of Pragmatics]. Stuttgart: Metzler, pp. 127–143.
- Ehlich, Konrad and Jochen Rehbein (1977): Wissen, kommunikatives Handeln und die Schule [Knowledge, Communicative Action and the School]. In: Herma Goepfert-Frank (ed.): *Spracherhalten im Unterricht* [Linguistic Behaviour in Classrooms]. München: Fink, pp. 36–113.
- Ehlich, Konrad, Lachlan Mackenzie, Jochen Rehbein and Jan D. ten Thije (1996): *A German-English-Dutch Glossary for Work in Functional Pragmatics*. Chemnitz: Technische Universität Chemnitz.
- Fiehler, Reinhard, Walther Kindt and Guido Shnieders (1999): Kommunikationsprobleme in Reklamationsgesprächen [Communication Problems in Discourse of Claim-Making]. In: Gisela Brünner (ed.): *Angewandte Diskursforschung* [Applied Discourse Research]. Opladen/Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag, pp. 120–154.
- Hohenstein, Christiane and Shinichi Kameyama (1996): Exothesen [Exothesis]. In: *Verbmobil-Memo* [Verbmobil Project Report] 105.
- (2000): Zur kontrastiven Analyse von sprachlichen Ausdrucksmitteln in Expertendiskursen. Am Beispiel japanischer und deutscher Vortrags- und Planungsdiskurse [On Contrastive Analysis of Linguistic Means of Expression in Expert Discourse. Japanese and German Presentational and Planning Discourses]. In: Bernd Meyer and Notis Toufexis (eds.): *Text/Diskurs, Oralität/Literalität unter dem Aspekt mehrsprachiger Kommunikation. Beiträge zum Workshop "Methodologie und Datenanalyse". Arbeiten zur Mehrsprachigkeit (AZM)* [Text/Discourse, Orality/Literality in Multilingual Communication. Contributions to the Workshop "Methodology and Data Analysis"] 11, pp. 26–44.
- Jefferson, Gail (1980): On "Trouble-Premonitory" Response to Inquiry. In: *Sociological Inquiry* 50, pp. 153–185.
- Nakamura, Keisuke and Mitsuo Ishida (eds.) (2005): *Howaitokarā no shigoto to seika* [Work and Performance of White-Collar Workers]. Tokyo: Toyo Keizai Shinpo.
- Onodera, Noriko (2004): *Japanese Discourse Markers: Synchronic and Diachronic Discourse Analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Orbell, John and Robyn M. Dawes (1991): A "Cognitive Miser" Theory of Cooperator's Advantage. In: *American Political Science Review* 85, 2, pp. 515–528.
- Redder, Angelika (1995): "Stereotyp": Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Kritik ["Stereotype": A Linguistic Critique]. In: *Jahrbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache* [Yearbook of German as Foreign Language] 21, pp. 311–329.
- Rehbein, Jochen (2001): Das Konzept der Diskursanalyse [The Concept of Discourse Analysis]. In: Klaus Brinker, Gerd Antos, Wolfgang Heine-

- mann and Sven F. Sager (eds.): *Text- und Gesprächslinguistik* [Linguistics of Text and Conversation] (Handbuch zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft [Handbook of Linguistics and Communication Science]). Vol. II. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 927–945.
- Rehbein, Jochen, Thomas Schmidt, Bernd Meyer, Franziska Watzke and Annette Herkenrath (2002): *Handbuch für das computergestützte Transkribieren nach HIAT* [Handbook for Computer-Aided Transcription According to HIAT] (Series B, Working Papers in Multilingualism 56). Hamburg: University of Hamburg, SFB 538 Multilingualism.
- Sato, Ikuya and Mamoru Yamada (2004): *Seido to bunka: soshiki o uogokasu mienai chikara* [Institution and Culture: The Invisible Forces that Make Structures Work]. Tokyo: Nihon Keizai Shinbunsha.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1968): Sequencing in Conversation Openings. In: *American Anthropologist* 70, pp. 1075–1095.
- Selting, Margret and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (2000): Argumente für die Entwicklung einer “Interaktionalen Linguistik” [Arguments for the Development of an “International Linguistics”]. In: *OZS/Gesprächsforschung* [OZS/Conversation Research] 1, pp. 76–95. <http://www.gespraechsforschung-ozs.de> (found February 2007).
- Sugita, Yuko (2004): *Gesprächserwartungen: Kontrastive Studie über die Gesprächsführung in deutschen und japanischen Telefonaten* [Conversational Expectations: Contrastive Studies on Conversation in German and Japanese Telephone Calls]. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Swidler, Ann (1986): Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies. In: *American Sociological Review* 51, April, pp. 273–286.
- (1995): Cultural Power and Social Movements. In: Hank Johnston and Bert Klandermans (eds.): *Social Movements and Cultures*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- ten Have, Paul (2005): Conversation Analysis Versus Other Approaches to Discourse: Review Essay of Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis: A Comparative and Critical Introduction (Robin Wooffitt). In: *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum. Qualitative Social Research* 7, 2, Art. 3. <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-06/06-2-3-e.htm> (found February 2007).
- Zerubavel, Eviatar (1997): *Social Mindscapes: An Invitation to Cognitive Sociology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

APPENDIX I

Symbols

• pause less than 0.3 second
•• pause approx. 0.5 second
••• pause between 0.5 and 0.9 second
((1 s)) 1 second pause
() not audible
: syllable lengthening
[v] verbal line
[mt] morphological transliteration
[en] translation in English
[su] supra-segmental features
/ repair

Transliteration	Morpheme category	Forms
ABL ablative	<i>kara</i>
ACC accusative	<i>o</i>
ADV adversative particle.....	<i>ga</i>
ATN nominal attribute particle	<i>na</i>
AUG augmentation.....	<i>ne, sa</i>
COM commutative particle.....	<i>to</i>
COND.PF perfective conditional.....	<i>-tara</i>
CONS concessive particle	<i>keredomo, kedo, keredo</i>
DAT dative particle	<i>ni</i>
DUB dubitative	<i>ō in deshō, darō</i>
DUR durative	<i>-te iru</i>
(DUR) durative with drop of vowel /i/	<i>-te ru, -te n (followed by NML "no")</i>
ESS essive.....	<i>de</i>
EXO exothesis*.....	<i>ano, e::to, etc.</i>
GEN genitive particle.....	<i>no</i>
FP final particle	<i>na, ne etc.</i>
HOR hortative	<i>-yō</i>
INT interrogative particle	<i>ka, (k)ke</i>
LOC locative.....	<i>de</i>
NEG negative	<i>V-na-i</i>
NML nominalizer particle.....	<i>no, n</i>
NOM nominative particle	<i>ga</i>
PAR participial	<i>Verb-te, Adjective-kute</i>
PF perfect	<i>Verb-ta, Adjective-katta</i>
POT potential.....	<i>Verb-(rar)eru</i>
QUT quotative particle	<i>to</i>
SUF.POL 'politeness' suffix.....	<i>-san [Mr., Mrs., etc.]</i>
SUS suspending form	<i>Verb stem with -i and -e, Adjective-ku</i>
1P-PL 1st person plural.....	<i>watashi-tachi, -ra</i>

Transliteration	Morpheme category	Forms
TOP topic particle	<i>wa</i>
VPRT particle verb	<i>da</i>
VPRT.FRM formal particle verb	<i>desu</i>
VSUF.FRM formal suffix verb	<i>masu</i>

* The instances of “exothesis” analysed here are so-called “fillers”. Because of their interactional function as an “externalisation of mental processes”, which should not be defined as “something which fills pauses” as “fillers”, they are called “exothesis” in Functional Pragmatic Discourse Analysis. See Hohenstein and Kameyama (1996) for a definition and empirical analysis.

APPENDIX II

Data 1

[1]	s115						
RM [v]	最悪	曜日	の	ま /	かわり	から	いろいろ
RM [v]	Saiaku	yōbi	no	ma /	kawari	kara	iroiro
RM [mt]	(even) in the worst case	day	GEN		change	ABL	differently
RM [en]	<i>If you think that far more weekdays during the period, even in</i>						

[2]							
RM [v]	考えたら、	去年並み		に	は	これ	
RM [v]	kangae-tara,	kyonennami		ni	wa	kore	
RM [mt]	think-COND.PF	level of the last year		DAT	TOP	this	
RM [en]	<i>the worst case,</i>	<i>it must be possible to sell this amount in the last</i>					

[3]	s116						
RM [v]	最後	の	週	売れる	はず	です	けど
RM [v]	saigo	no	shū	ur-eru	hazu	desu	kedo
RM [mt]	last	GEN	week	sell-POT	must	VPRT.FRM	CONS
RM [en]	<i>week.</i>						<i>In May of</i>

[4]							
RM [v]	年	の	五月	の	ね、	七万	九千
RM [v]	nen	no	gogatsu	no	ne,	nanaman	kyūsen
RM [mt]	year	GEN	May	GEN	AUG	79,332.	sanbyaku
RM [en]	<i>1999 (= last year), (we had the outcomes of) 79,332.</i>						

[5]	s117			s118		s119	
RM [v]	三十二。	これ	売れる	はず	です	わ。	((4s))
RM [v]	sanjū ni.	Kore	ur-eru	hazu	desu	[wa.]	((4s))
RM [mt]		this	sell-POT	must	VPRT.FRM	FP	this
RM [en]		<i>This (sales) must be possible to achieve.</i>				((4s))	<i>You can</i>

[Kansai Var]*

[6]		s120	s121
RM [v]	絶対 売れます	な。	((10,5s))
RM [v]	zettai ur-e-masu	[na.]	((10,5s))
RM [mt]	definitely sell-POT-VSUF.FRM	FP	
RM [en]	<i>definitely sell this, can't you.</i>		((10,5s))
NN [v]			(咳払い)
NN [en]			(clears throat)

[Kansai Var]

[7]	s122		s123	s124
RM [v]	取り合えず 前年	百。	((3s))	<さとう>さん
RM [v]	Toriaezu zennen	hyaku.	((3s))	<Satō>-san
RM [mt]	for now previous year	100 (%)		Mr. Sato
RM [en]	<i>For now, (our goals is) 100% of the previous year's sales. ((3s)) Mr. Sato,</i>			

[8]		s125			
RM [su]			quietly		
RM [v]	前年	百。	これ	に	向かって
RM [v]	zennen	hyaku.	Kore	ni	mukatte
RM [mt]	previous year	100 (%)	this	DAT	toward
RM [en]	<i>100% of the previous year's [sales].</i>		<i>Please make efforts toward</i>		

[9]	s126	s127		
RM [v]	くたはい。			
RM [v]	[kudahai].			
RM [mt]	please			
RM [en]	<i>this goal.</i>			
SATO [v]	((3,5s))	前年	百。	
SATO [v]	((3,5s))	Zennen	hyaku.	
SATO [mt]		previous year	100 (%)	
SATO [en]	((3,5s))	<i>100% of the previous year's (sales).</i>		

[Kansai Var for "kudasai"]

[10]	s128	s129					
RM [su]		<i>higher & stressed</i>					
RM [v]	((5s))	これ どう 考えて	も	六月	は	です	な
RM [v]	((5s))	Kore dō kangaete-	mo	rokugatsu	wa	desu	[na]
RM [mt]		this how think-evenif	June	TOP		VPRT.FRM	AUG
RM [en]	((5s))	<i>In June, whatever we do, we cannot reach the goal of 96%</i>					

[Kansai Var]

[11]			higher & stressed			
RM [su]			<i>higher & stressed</i>			
RM [v]	もう一 九十六、	(もこりやも)	絶対	行けん	ぞ。	
RM [v]	mō: kyūjū roku,	(mo korya mo)	zettai	ik-en	zo.	
RM [mt]	really 96	(this really)	definitely	go-NEG	FP	
RM [en]	<i>(of the previous year.)</i>					

[12]	s130		
RM [v]	••	これ 絶対	無理。
RM [v]	••	Kore zettai	muri.
RM [mt]		this definitely	impossible
RM [en]	••	<i>It's definitely impossible.</i>	

*Kansai Var = so-called Kansai variety including Kyoto variety.

Data 2

[13]	s262					
RM [v]	だか、	レギュラー	の	落ち込み、	できる	だけ
RM [v]	[Da ka],	regyurā	no	ochikomi,	dekiru	dake
RM [mt]	therefore	regular	GEN	loss	as much as possible	
RM [en]	<i>Therefore, I would like you to make a bit more effort to compensate</i>					
	[= <i>da kara</i>]					

[14]								
RM [v]	です	なー	•	なんとか	•	もう	ひと	•
RM [v]	desu	na::	•	nantoka	•	mō	hito-	•
RM [mt]	VPRT.FRM	AUG		anyhow		a little bit		
RM [en]	<i>the loss in the regular distribution system</i>					•	<i>anyhow, to bring the</i>	

[15]					
RM [v]	ふんばり	がんばって	いただいて、	前年並み	まで
RM [v]	funbari	ganbatte-	itadai-te,	zennennami	made
RM [mt]	more	make effort-	give me.POL-PAR	previous year's level	to
RM [en]	<i>sales outcomes to the previous year's amount.</i>				

[16]	s263		s264	s265			
RM [v]	•••	行っとくと。	((8s))	<カトウ>さん、	どうです	か。	((3,5s))
RM [v]	•••	[ittoku] to.	((8s))	<Katō>-san, dō	desu	ka.	((3,5s))
RM [mt]		go QUT		Mr. Kato	how	VPRT.FRM INT	
RM [en]			((8s))	<i>What would you say, Mr. Kato?</i>			((3,5s))
	[= <i>itte oku</i>]						

[17]	s266	s267		s268
Kato [su]	<i>quietly</i>			
Kato [v]	()	や	なん	か
Kato [v]	()	ya	nan	ka
Kato [mt]		also	all	100 (%)
Kato [en]	<i>Do all the things such as () have to achieve 100%?</i>			
NN [v]				()

[18]	s269						
RM [v]	落とした	分	が	ね、	[来年 /	来年 /	来年]
RM [v]	Otoshita	bun	ga	ne,	[rainen/	rainen/	rainen]
RM [mt]	lost	portion	NOM	AUG	next year	next year	next year
RM [en]	<i>If you could make up for the loss next year/next year/next year,</i>						
	[It is understood that the RM wants to say raigetstu						

[19]				
RM [v]	取れる	ん	やったら	ねー、
RM [v]	tor-eru	n	[yat-tara]	ne:,
RM [mt]	take back-POT	NML	VPRT-COND.PF	AUG
RM [en]	you know			
	[next month' instead of 'next year'.]		[Kansai Var for "dattara"]	

[20]				
RM [v]	もう、胸	張って	落として	もろでも 結構 な
RM [v]	mō, mune	hatte	otoshite-	[morote]mo kekkō na
RM [mt]	really with confidence		let fall-	receive-even if O.K. ATN
RM [en]	it would be no problem; you could just reduce the sales goal			
	[Kansai Var for "moratte"]			

[21] s270				
RM [v]	ん	です	けど	ね。 ●● もう 来月 が や ね、
RM [v]	n	desu	kedo	ne. ●● Mō raigetsu ga [ya] ne,
RM [mt]	NML	VPRT.FRM	CONS FP	really next week NOM VPRT AUG
RM [en]	with confidence (this year).		●● At the end of the next month, we	
	[Kansai Var]			

[22]								
RM [v]	もう	最後	その	まま	もう	ぐっちゃぐちゃ	に	なって
RM [v]	mō	saigo	sono	mama	mō	gutchagucha	ni	nat-te
RM [mt]	really	at last	such	as	really	messy	DAT	become-PAR
RM [en]	will be in such a situation that things get really messy							

[23]								
RM [v]	です	な—、	((1s))	もう	何	を	失う	わからん
RM [v]	desu	na::,	((1s))	mō	nani	o	[ushinau]	wakar-an
RM [mt]	VPRT.FRM	AUG		really	what	ACC	lose	know-NEG
RM [en]	and,	you know,	((1s))	we do not know how much we will lose.				
					[= ushinau ka]			

[24] s271					
RM [v]	ちゅう	状況	です	から	ね。 ((7,5s))
RM [v]	[chū]	jōkyō	desu	kara	ne. ((7,5s))
RM [mt]	'as meant'	situation	VPRT.FRM	CAUS	FP
RM [en]					
	[=to iu]				

Data 3

[25] s275 s276						
RM [v]	((14s))	とり—あえず	同じ	しんどい	ん	だったら
RM [v]	((14s))	Tori:aezu	onaji	shindoi	n	dat-tara
RM [mt]		for now	same	severe	NML	VPRT-COND.PF
RM [en]	((14s))	If we will have a severe situation anyway,				

			s277		s278	
RM [v]	前	へ 前	へ 持って こう	と。	•••	で 前 へ 前
RM [v]	mae	e mae	e motte- k-ō	to.	•••	De mae e mae
RM [mt]	earlier	to earlier	to bring- go-VOL	QUT		then earlier to earlier
RM [en]	<i>we should try to make it come earlier.</i>				•••	<i>(We should) try to</i>

			s279			
RM [v]	へ	持って こう	と。	••	いう	だけ の こと で。
RM [v]	e	motte k-ō	to.	••	Iu	dake no koto dé.
RM [mt]	to	bring- go-VOL	QUT		'as meant'	just GEN thing ESS
RM [en]	<i>make it come as early as we can.</i>				••	<i>That's the only thing.</i>

	s280	s281			s282	s283
RM [v]	((6s))	<モチツキ>さん	どう	で	つか。	((2,5s)) 九万
RM [v]	((6s))	<Mochizuki>-san	dō	[de kka].	((2,5s))	Kyūman
RM [mt]		Mr. Mochizuki	how	ESS INT		91,000.
RM [en]	((6s))	<i>What about you, Mr. Mochizuki?</i>			((2,5s))	91,000.

[Kansai Var for "desu ka"]

	s284	s285			s286	s287
RM [v]		一千。			(?s.)	((6,5s))
RM [v]		issen.			(Na.)	((6,5s))
RM [mt]					you see	
RM [en]					(You see.)	((6,5s))
Moch [v]	((2,5s))	やる	は	やります		よ。
Moch [v]	((2,5s))	Yaru	wa	yari-masu		yo.
Moch [mt]			do	TOP do-VSUF.FRM		FP
Moch [en]	((2,5s))	<i>I'll do what I can.</i>				

	s288						
RM [v]	ま	<コウナン>	は、	申告数字	より	あと	五百
RM [v]	Ma	<kōnan>	wa,	shikoku-sūji	yor	ato	gohyaku
RM [mt]	well	Kōnan-branch	TOP	reported-figures	than	still	500
RM [en]	<i>Well, Kōnan-branch has just about 500 more than the reported</i>						

	s289				
RM [v]	や	から。	((1,5s))		
RM [v]	[ya]	kara.	((1,5s))		
RM [mt]	VPRT	CAUS			
RM [en]	goal.	((1,5s))			

[Kansai Var for "da"]

Data 4

	s429						
RM [v]	もう	もう	思い切った	こと	やらな	どう	にも
RM [v]	mō	mō	omoikitta	koto	[yar-ana]	dō	ni mo
RM [mt]	now	now	daring	thing	do-NEG.COND	(not)	at all
RM [en]	<i>You must be daring, otherwise it will not work at all.</i>						

[Kansai Var for yaranakereba]

[Kansai Var]

[33]		s430	
RM [v]	へん で と。		
RM [v]	hen de to.		
RM [mt]	NEG FP QUT		
Naka [v]		● ● 支社長	そんな ん どこ で ストップ
Naka [v]		● ● Shishachō	sonna n doko de sutoppu
Naka [mt]		RM	such NML where LOC is brought
Naka [en]		● ●	Regional Manager, but who gets in our way?

[34]		s431		s432	
RM [v]				何 が。	
RM [v]				Nani ga.	
RM [mt]				what NOM	
RM [en]				What?	
Naka [v]	が かかる ん です か。			そう いう 話—、	
Naka [v]	ga kakaru n desu ka.			Soo iu hanashi:,	
Naka [mt]	to stop NML VPRT.FRM INT			such story	
Naka [en]				I think everyone of us	

[35]	
Naka [v]	営業部 の 思い は 一緒 や 思う ん
Naka [v]	eigyōbu no omoi wa issho [ya] omou n
Naka [mt]	sales division GEN thought TOP together VPRT think NML
Naka [en]	from the sales division thinks in the same way as you mentioned.

[Kansai Var for "da to"]

[36]		s433		s434	
Naka [v]	です けど ね。 ((1s))	あと	どこ	で	うち ストップ
Naka [v]	desu kedo ne. ((1s))	Ato	doko	de	uchi sutoppu
Naka [mt]	VPRT.FRM CONS FP	yet	where	LOC	in our company
Naka [en]		((1s))	I do not really understand who else		

[37]	
Naka [v]	が かかる か よう わからん の です ね。
Naka [v]	ga kakaru ka [yō] wakar-an no desu ne.
Naka [mt]	is brought to stop INT well know-NEG NML VPRT.FRM FP
Naka [en]	hinders (our plans), you know.

[Kansai Var for "yoku"]

[38]		s435	
Naka [v]	こう やって、 支社長ら		と 話
Naka [v]	Kō yat-te, shishachō[-ra]		to hanashi
Naka [mt]	like this do-PAR RM and like		COM talk
Naka [en]	When we talk with you like this, Regional Manager, you know most of		

[plural suffix used more often in Kansai Var]

[39]		
Naka [v]	させで もろうたら 私たち	の
Naka [v]	s-ase-te- [morō-tara] watashi[-ra]	no
Naka [mt]	do-CAU-PAR- receive-COND.PF 1P-PL	GEN
Naka [en]	our problems.	

[Kansai Var for "morattara"] *[plural suffix used more often in Kansai]*

[40]						s436
Naka [v]	苦しみ	も	大概	知って	はります	や ん。で
Naka [v]	kurushimi	mo	taigai	shitte-	[hari-masu	[ya n]. De
Naka [mt]	troubles	also	almost	know-	DUR.FRM-VSUF.FRM	you know then
Naka [en]						And

Var]

[Formal Kansai Var "imasu"] [Kansai Var]

[41]					
Naka [v]	それを	支社長会議	で	まあ	経営
Naka [v]	sore o::,	shishachō-kaigi	de::,	mā	keiei-
Naka [mt]	it	ACC	RM's meeting	LOC	well management
Naka [en]	then, you tell about it in meetings of regional managers or managers'				

[42]						
Naka [v]	会議	か	どっか	で	ゆうて もらいます	や
Naka [v]	kaigi	ka	dokka	de	[yūte]- morai-masu	[ya
Naka [mt]	meeting	or	somewhere	LOC	say- receive-VSUF.FRM	you
Naka [en]	meetings or so, right?					

[Kansai Var for "itte"]

[Kansai

[43]						s437	
Naka [v]	ん。	••	あと	ストップ	かかる	ん は、	やっぱり
Naka [v]	n].	••	Ato	sutoppu	kakaru	[n] wa,	yappari
Naka [mt]	know		yet	is brought to	stop	NML TOP	as expected
Naka [en]		••	Then, is it the planning division that hinders our plan?				

Var]

[Kansai Var for "no"]

[44]						s438	
Naka [v]	企画	の	方	から	です	か。••	せぜこの
Naka [v]	kikaku	no	hō	kara	desu	ka. ••	[Zezeke] no
Naka [mt]	planning (division)	GEN	direction	ABL	VPRT.FRM	INT	money GEN
Naka [en]						••	Does it

[euphemistic use; old-fashioned motherese for money]

[45]						s439	
RM [v]				そう	や	ね、	やっぱ
RM [v]				Sō	[ya]	ne,	[yappa]
RM [mt]				so	VPRT	FP	as expected
RM [en]				Yeah; that's the marketing division.			
Naka [v]	関係	です	か。				
Naka [v]	kankei	desu	ka.				
Naka [mt]	relation	VPRT.FRM	INT				
Naka [en]	have to do with money?						

[Kansai Var] [= yappari]

[46]				
RM [v]	マーケ	の	方	から。
RM [v]	māke	no	hō	kara.
RM [mt]	marketing (division)	GEN	direction	ABL
Naka [s]				s440
Naka [v]	マーケ	の	方	
Naka [v]	Māke	no	hō	
Naka [mt]	marketing	GEN	direction	
Naka [en]	<i>It is the marketing</i>			

[47]		s441	s442	s443
RM [v]		マーケ	や	ね。
RM [v]		Māke	[ya]	ne.
RM [mt]		marketing	VPRT	FP
RM [en]		<i>Yes, marketing.</i>		
Naka [v]	です	か。		((2,5s)) 中 の 声 が
Naka [v]	desu	ka.		((2,5s)) Naka no koe ga
Naka [mt]	VPRT.FRM	INT		inside GEN voice NOM
Naka [en]	<i>division.</i>			((2,5s)) <i>I really don't know</i>
<i>[Kansai Var]</i>				

[48]				
Naka [v]	トップ	まで	ね、	聞こえて
Naka [v]	toppu	made	ne,	kikoete-
Naka [mt]	top	to	AUG hear-(DUR)	NML INT hear-(DUR)-NEG NML INT
Naka [en]	<i>whether our voices are heard by the executives or not.</i>			

[49]		s444		s445	
RM [v]					()
Naka [v]	よく	わからん	の	です	ね。(ほんま に。)
Naka [v]	yoku	wakar-an	no	desu	ne. ([Honma ni.]
Naka [mt]	well	know-NEG	NML	VPRT.FRM	FP really
Naka [en]					<i>(Really.)</i>
<i>[Kansai Var for hontō ni]</i>					

[50]		s446	s447	
RM [v]			社長一	出て
RM [v]			Shachō:	dete-
RM [mt]			company director	attend-
RM [en]			<i>The company director</i>	
Naka [v]	社長	出られて	ます。	
Naka [v]	Shachō	der-arete-	masu.	
Naka [mt]	company director	attend-PASS.POL-	(DUR-)VSUF.FRM	
Naka [en]	<i>Does the executive director also attend (the meetings)?</i>			

[51]							
RM [v]	はる	からー,	その 場	で の	会議	や	からー。 ●●
RM [v]	[haru]	kara:,	sono ba	de no	kaigi	[ya]	kara:. ●●
RM [mt]	DUR.FRM	CAUS	its place	LOC GEN	meeting	VPRT	CAUS
RM [en]	<i>attends the meetings, it is the meeting in his presence, therefore...</i>						
	[Kansai Var]			[Kansai Var]			

[52]	s448					s449	
RM [v]	えっ,	私らー	で	見てる	こと	を	みな sh' (...)
RM [v]	E',	watashi-ra:	de	mite-ru	koto	o	mina sh' (...)
RM [mt]	EXO	1P-PL	ESS	see-(DUR)	thing	ACC	all
RM [en]	<i>Ah, what we observe (here) is all (told to him)</i>						(...)
Naka [v]							あー、全部、
Naka [v]							A:, zenbu,
Naka [mt]							EXO everything
Naka [en]							<i>Oh, he knows</i>

[53]					s450	s451	
RM [v]					●●●	ただ	
RM [v]					●●●	Tada	
RM [mt]						nonetheless	
RM [en]					●●●	However,	
Naka [v]	知って	(はん)		です		か。	
Naka [v]	shitte-	[(han)]		desu		ka.	
Naka [mt]	know-	DUR.FRM	NML	VPRT.FRM		INT	
Naka [en]	<i>about everything?</i>						
	[= haru n, formal Kansai Var for "iru n"]						

[54]						s452	
RM [v]	そろばん	はj/	はじいてる		から	ね。	
RM [v]	[soroban	haj/hajiite-ru]			kara	ne.	
RM [mt]	use-(DUR)	an abacus			CAUS	FP	
RM [en]	<i>they are calculating the cost and the profit, you know.</i>						
Naka [v]							わかり
Naka [v]							Wakari-
Naka [mt]							understand-
Naka [en]							<i>I understand.</i>
	<i>[idiomatic expression for 'to calculate the cost and profit']</i>						

[55]		s453				s454	
RM [v]						あの一、	経営企画
RM [v]					Ano:,	keiei-kikaku	
RM [mt]					EXO	management planning	
RM [en]					<i>Uh, in the management planning</i>		
Naka [v]	ます。		わかります。				
Naka [v]	masu.		Wakari-masu.				
Naka [mt]	VSUF.FRM		understand-VSUF.FRM				
Naka [en]	<i>I understand.</i>						

[56]	s455					
RM [v]	の	方	で	そろばん	はじいてる	から一。 要 は こん
RM [v]	no	hō	de	soroban	hajiite-ru	kara.: Yō wa kon
RM [mt]	GEN	direction	LOC	use-(DUR)	an abacus	CAUS in short this
RM [en]	<i>division, they are profit-oriented.</i>					<i>I mean they</i>

[57]						
RM [v]	だけ	う / 売り上げ	を	落として	でも、	こん だけ の 利益
RM [v]	dake	u/uriage	o	otoshite-	de mo, kon	dake no rieki
RM [mt]	amount	sales outcome	ACC	lose-	even if this	amount GEN profit
RM [en]	<i>are doing, you know, it's like (they are thinking about) what is needed for</i>					

[58]						
RM [v]	を	確保する	ため	には	どう	いう あれ や つちゅう
RM [v]	o	kakuho-suru	tame ni	wa dō	iu	are [ya] [tchū]
RM [mt]	ACC	keep	in order to	how	'as meant'	that VPRT 'as meant'
RM [en]	<i>keeping such and such profits even if the sales outputs go down.</i>					
	<i>[Kansai Var] [=to iu]</i>					

[59]	s456					
RM [v]	の	あれ	を	やってる	から。	• 既 に これ からは 営業部
RM [v]	no	are	o	yatte-ru	kara.	• Sude ni kore kara wa eigyōbu
RM [mt]	NML	that	ACC	do-(DUR)	CAUS	already this from TOP sales division
RM [en]	• <i>We are already in such a situation in</i>					

[60]						
RM [v]	も	マーケ	も、	経営企画		と、 共生し
RM [v]	mo	māke	mo,	keieikikaku		to, kyōsei-shi-
RM [mt]	also	marketing	also	management planning	COM	cooperation-do-
RM [en]	<i>which both sales and marketing divisions must cooperate with the</i>					

[61]						
RM [v]	ながら、	施策	を	進めて	いかん	と や
RM [v]	nagara,	shisaku	o	susumete	ik-an	to [ya]
RM [mt]	during			take steps-	have to go	VPRT
RM [en]	<i>management planning division to plan the strategies.</i>					
	<i>[Kansai Var]</i>					

[62]	s457	s458	s459			
RM [v]	ね。	•• ね?	((1,5s))	その	絡み	が ある から ね。
RM [v]	ne.	•• Ne?	((1,5s))	Sono	karami	ga aru kara ne.
RM [mt]	AUG	you know		its	involvement	NOM exist CAUS FP
RM [en]		•• <i>You know.</i>	((1,5s))	<i>It's because of this reason.</i>		

[63]	s460	s461				
Naka [v]	((2s))	ま、	こないだ	勉強し	に	行った やつ で
Naka [v]	((2s))	Ma,	konaيدا	benkyō-shi	ni	it-ta yatsu de
Naka [mt]		well	the other day	study-do	to	go-PF guy ESS
Naka [en]	((2s))	<i>Well, our guy who had a training course the last time knows</i>				

[64]

Naka [v]	も やっぱり、	ケース単価	を	落とす	の	が
Naka [v]	mo yappari,	kēsutanka	o	otosu	no	ga
Naka [mt]	also	as one can expect	unit price of case	ACC	reduce	NML NOM
Naka [en]	<i>well already that the lost of profits is mostly caused by cutting</i>					

[65]

Naka [v]	一ばーん、	利益	の	損失	に	当たる	とかいうー	の	が
Naka [v]	ichiba:n,	rieki	no	sonshitsu	ni	ataru	to ka iu:	no	ga
Naka [mt]	most	profit	GEN	loss	DAT	correspond	or so	NML	NOM
Naka [en]	<i>the unit price of cases or so.</i>								

[66]

						s462	s463
Naka [v]	いろいろ	わかってます	から	ね。	((1,5s))	ま	
Naka [v]	iroiro	wakatte-masu	kara	ne.	((1,5s))	Ma	
Naka [mt]	various things	know-(DUR)-VSUF.FRM	CAUS	FP		well	
Naka [en]							((1,5s)) Well,

[67]

Naka [v]	百円	二百円	値引き	する	の	が	一番	怖い
Naka [v]	hyaku en	nihyaku en	nebiki-	suru	no	ga	ichiban	kowai
Naka [mt]	100 Yen	200 Yen	price reduction-	do	NML	NOM	most	risky
Naka [en]	<i>it is certainly the most risky thing to discount 100 or 200 Yen each,</i>							

[68]

							s464	
Naka [v]	話	です	けど	ね。	まあ	よう	わかる	ん
Naka [v]	hanashi	desu	kedo	ne.	Mā	[yō]	wakaru	n
Naka [mt]	story	VPRT.FRM	CONS	FP	well	well	understand	NML
Naka [en]	<i>however....</i>						<i>Well, I understand the problem very</i> <i>[Kansai Var for "yoku"]</i>	

[69]

Naka [v]	です	けど。
Naka [v]	desu	kedo.
Naka [mt]	VPRT.FRM	CONS
Naka [en]	<i>well, however...</i>	