

Portland State University

PDXScholar

University Honors Theses

University Honors College

3-2-2018

Terrace House Versus The Real World: a Cross-Cultural Comparison of Participants' Approaches to Conflict in Japanese and American Reality Television Programs

Graham A. Smith
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/honorstheses>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Smith, Graham A., "*Terrace House Versus The Real World: a Cross-Cultural Comparison of Participants' Approaches to Conflict in Japanese and American Reality Television Programs*" (2018). *University Honors Theses*. Paper 505.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/honors.510>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Terrace House Versus The Real World:

A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Participants'

Approaches to Conflict in Japanese and American Reality Television Programs

Graham A. Smith

Portland State University

Abstract

This paper engages in a cross-cultural discourse analysis of two reality television programs: the Japanese program *Terrace House* and the American program *The Real World*. The main goal of the analysis was to understand the conflict styles of the participants in each program, and explore the differences and/or similarities between them. Generally, the programs differed significantly in their portrayals of conflict with the Japanese program demonstrating that participants tended to attempt to maintain harmony among the group, and the American program demonstrating that participants focused more on individual concerns in conflict situations. *Terrace House* emphasized the resolution and management of conflict. *The Real World* emphasized the escalation of conflict and its management only when it became extreme. This work did identify a limited selection of similarities between the conflict management styles of both groups, however.

Keywords: cross-cultural discourse analysis, reality television, conflict management, face-threatening acts

Terrace House Versus The Real World: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Participants'
Approaches to Conflict in Japanese and American Reality Television Programs

1. Introduction

Reality television provides an interesting vision of the world. Nowhere else on television can one find programs that are so heavily dramatized, but also attempt to represent some aspect of the 'average' or 'ordinary' (Pardo, 2013). In order to be so dramatic, many of these shows dedicate a significant portion of their airtime to conflicts among their participants. This is at least true of American reality television, but what about examples of the genre from other cultures? Do they also dramatize conflict? If so, are there differences and/or similarities between how the programs depict participants engaging in that conflict? The current work seeks to engage in a cross-cultural discourse analysis of the Japanese reality television program *Terrace House* and the American program *The Real World*. Many see these cultures of having highly disparate conflict styles (Cai & Fink, 2002; Hasegawa & Gudykunst, 1998; Hirose, 2000). Does this hold true for the entertainment that depicts their respective cultures? This exploration will begin with a review of the conflict style differences between Japan and America. Then, it shall engage in an analysis of multiple conflict segments from both programs. Finally, the current work will seek to synthesize the findings from that analysis.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Conflict

Conflict in interaction is, as Jones (1990) points out, "any situation where two or more people [are] perceptibly not in accord with each other" (p. 41). This lack of accord may spring from the occurrence of incongruous values, opinions, "or even disagreements about the kind of conversation that is being developed" (p. 41). Moreover, this incongruity may be actual or

merely perceived (Ting-Toomey, 1994). The adversative episodes that result from conflict “[grow] out of an opposition to a request for action, an assertion, or an action” (Eisenberg & Garvey, 1981, p. 150 as quoted in Szatrowski, 2004, p. 2). Conflict interaction, or talk, follows a course from the initiation of the conflict to its eventual management and arrival at some sort of outcome (Honda, 2002; Jones, 1990). Strategies employed by interlocutors to negotiate conflicts vary across cultures (Cai & Fink, 2002). One regularly regards America as an individualist culture: one that tends to hold “the goals, needs, and rights of the individual over the goals, responsibilities, and obligations of the group” (p. 70). In turn, one often regards Japan as a collectivist culture: one that is just the opposite from the individualist in that it holds group concerns over individual concerns. In regards to American versus Japanese conflict styles, it is commonly held that Americans (as an individualist culture) are more confrontational than Japanese (as a collectivist culture), who tend to care more about the stability of the in-group. Indeed, communication styles and attitudes (both in general and specifically regarding conflict) do differ between Americans and Japanese (Hasegawa & Gudykunst, 1998; Hirose, 2000). However, the classic view of Americans as aggressive, confronting individuals and Japanese as passive collectivists has been challenged (Cai & Fink, 2002; Jones, 1990; Krauss, Rohlen, & Steinhoff, 1984). It is important to not reduce the differences between the two cultures as merely due to individualist versus collectivist, or passive versus aggressive communication styles. Instead, one should attempt to identify the conflict styles in each culture as the actors use them in interaction, and describe these disparate styles in the overarching context of how that culture communicates.

2.2 Situational and Contextual Factors

Situational factors such as who is talking to whom, and in-group/out-group position have

a bearing on interaction across cultures, including conflict interaction (Moriizumi & Takai, 2010). For instance, Moriizumi and Takai (2010) administered a survey to a few hundred Japanese females and found that they tended to change their conflict styles based on who they were talking to. However, situational factors likely have less of a bearing on American interaction (as an individualist culture) compared with Japan (as a collectivist culture; Oetzel et al., 2001). The increased focus on in-group versus out-group position in cultures such as Japan probably contributes to this (Gudykunst, Yoon, & Nishida, 1987; Moriizumi & Takai, 2010). In addition, contextual factors such as the structures of interactions (i.e., Honda, 2002) or the nature of the setting itself could also affect conflict interactions (Graham, 2007). For example, Honda (2002) found that the participant structure of Japanese talk shows (the structure that determines who talks and when) affects conflict management. She demonstrated that a rigid, turn-taking structure was correlated with a higher incidence of untargeted disagreement and the use of mitigation markers, whereas a looser structure where participants take the floor as they please was correlated with a more direct approach to conflict management. As another example, Graham (2007) studied politeness among participants in an email group and found that perceptions of what was or was not considered 'polite' was affected by the computer-mediated setting. Contextual and situational variables like these could be highly salient in determining many aspects of communication choice, especially choice when it comes to conflict interactions.

2.3 Facework

These situational factors also have a bearing on facework: another topic highly related to the negotiation of conflict (Oetzel et al., 2001; Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). 'Face' refers to one's sense of self-worth (as affected by acts that occur in social situations such as complimenting, accusing, teasing, etc.) and facework refers to the personal maintenance of that

face or, in other words, “[f]acework refers to a set of communicative behaviors that people use to regulate their social dignity and to support or challenge the other’s social dignity” (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998, p. 188). Of note is that compared to the situational factors presented above, self-construal, or one’s self-image, has more of an effect on facework overall (Oetzel et al., 2001). In addition, collectivist cultures tend to have more other-face concern (i.e., in potential or apparent conflict, they tend to have more concern for the image of the other party) whereas individualist cultures tend to have more dominating facework that focuses on self-face (i.e., the face concerns of the individual).

Brown and Levinson’s (1978, 1999) politeness theory holds that there are two aspects to face. There is negative face, which focuses on “[...] the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction – i.e., to freedom of action and freedom from imposition” (Brown & Levinson, 1999, p. 311). Essentially, negative face refers to the desire of one to not have others be an inconvenience to oneself. Then there is positive face, which in turn focuses on “consistent self-image or ‘personality’ (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants” (p. 311). Positive face is, in other words, one’s desire to be well-liked and to have one’s identity perpetuated and affirmed by others. One’s actions can threaten these two aspects of the face of an interlocutor: this is where Brown and Levinson’s (1978, 1999) concept of Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) comes in. As an actor makes an FTA, they may try to redress it via a variety of communicative strategies. Ting-Toomey (1988) developed face-negotiation theory which, as described by Oetzel and Ting-Toomey (2003), holds that members of all cultures do facework in every situation; the maintenance of the faces of interactants become rather challenging in embarrassing situations as well as situations involving conflict; “cultural variability, individual-level variables, and

situational variables influence cultural members' selection of one set of face concerns over others;" and those face concerns in turn affect what facework and conflict strategies the interactants choose (p. 600).

2.4 FTAs in Discourse

Due to the high level of importance face has across cultures, it is useful in any discussion of interpersonal conflict among cross-cultural discourse. A variety of previous research has analyzed FTAs in Japanese discourse, particularly in regards to politeness and perhaps, by extension, potential conflict (i.e., Noda, 1990, 2004; Oetzel & Ting-Toomey, 2003; Pizziconi, 2003; Tanaka, 2011; Watanabe, 2001); research analyzing FTAs in American discourse is also prevalent (see Dunleavy et al., 2008; Pearson, 1988). Moreover, semi-cross-cultural comparisons of politeness and conflict discourse using examinations of FTAs have been undergone: Kitao et al. (1987), in their study of how Americans versus Japanese non-native English speakers (in both Japan and the United States) interpreted different levels of politeness in English, found that Japanese non-native English-speakers perceived the level of politeness of request patterns in English slightly differently than native-speakers. Their findings illustrated numerous minute differences in the interpretation of politeness. For example, Japanese non-native English speakers tended to view imperfective, future-tense as more polite than their American counterparts, with a few exceptions. Moreover, a related study by Minami (1987) found that the relative social position of the speaker and hearer affects politeness strategies the most, whereas situational variables and the actual content of a request have the most effect on politeness in English.

The question comes to mind then, what are some, if any, patterns of linguistic expression in redressing FTAs? Moreover, how do these patterns differ across cultures? Wolfson (1981), in

her study on complimenting, used the term “semantic formula” to describe patterns like these (p. 121). She found that speakers of American English use exceedingly repetitive structures and word choice when uttering compliments. Moreover, drawing on her previous work with Manes (i.e., Manes & Wolfson, 1981) she holds that what counts as a speech act (i.e., a compliment) in English, may not hold true in languages like Japanese, and vice versa, due to cultural differences in how those speech acts present themselves. Moreover, Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989) provide numerous studies of speech acts, comparing them across languages.

2.5 Reality Television

Now, as to American reality television, scholars, at least when looking at discourse strategies within the programs, tend to focus on social concerns such as race or gender (Pardo, 2013; Sung, 2013). Reality television in America often focuses on interpersonal conflicts due to their inflammatory nature. Pardo (2013) argues, via a general analysis of the genre, that production processes utilized by producers of American reality television programs dramatize interpersonal conflict involving racism; she points out that producers often create casts that put together “urban people of color with white conservatives, many of whom have strong personalities and proclivities for confrontation [...]” (p. 70). Producers select “conflicts out of hundreds of hours of footage,” highlighting the issues “as central to the shows’ narrative trajectories” (p. 70). They purposely create controversial and dramatic material to “raise public interest and awareness” (Beck, Hellmueller, & Aeschbacher, 2012, p. 6). Gender as well might contribute to the inflammatory nature of conflict, and how participants engage in that conflict. Sung (2013) found that, in a reality show setting, women can change their conflict styles due to the large number of discourse options available to them. Specifically, Sung (2013) was able to show that women could construct their gender identities in conflict situations based on different

discourses of femininity: either through “dominant discourses” (such as frames that situate the self as ‘nice’ or capable of being harmonious with the entire group) or “more radical and subversive discourses” (i.e., frames that subvert the former sort of niceness); the author also noted that the conflict stances of participants tended to be more confrontational, as opposed to passive, thereby not aligning with traditional femininity (p. 228).

What is also interesting is that the structure of reality television programs seems to focus on the construction of “ordinariness” (Pardo, 2013, p. 67). Reality television is seen to represent the core of the social world; the genre “[...] locates genuineness in a specific type of emotional performance that are construed as indexical of authenticity, particularly breakdowns and personal disclosures” (p. 68). True to their name, shows like *The Real World* (1992-2013), try to represent an idealization of what is ‘real,’ and do this through the emotionality of their characters.

Conventions like testimonials (where a participant sits in front of a camera with a backdrop behind them and talks about what is going on in the program) often demonstrate this interiority (Pardo, 2013). Producers edit *The Real World*’s versions of this, participants speaking in the ‘confessional,’ into interactions, showing the live opinions and the authenticity of the participants as situations unfold.

Unfortunately, there is somewhat of a dearth of research that examines Japanese reality television. Honda (2002) did look at Japanese public affairs talk shows, but their structure is highly disparate when compared to that of reality television programming. One might consider Japanese game shows where hosts give participants challenges to complete, due to their unscripted nature, as a type of reality programming. However, many of these programs seem to lack the same kind of interpersonal conflict present in much of their American counterparts.

Now, due to the seeming shortage of studies comparing conflict interactions in American

and Japanese reality television programs (and the additional dearth of research examining Japanese reality television), the current work could further the sociolinguistic study of conflict by exploring this genre of discourse. In addition, since scholars' focus on American reality television has been the dramatization of conflicts and emotionality, especially those in regards to race and gender (i.e., Pardo, 2013; Sung, 2013), it would likely be useful to explore conflict episodes in reality television programs from a cross-cultural perspective, analyzing the elements of speech acts, as opposed to just the content of them. The current work seeks to engage in a cross-cultural discourse analysis in order to fill these gaps in the literature, and attempts to answer the following research question: "How do young Americans versus young Japanese approach conflict in the setting of reality television programs?"

3. Methodology

3.1 *Terrace House* and *The Real World*

To explore the nature of conflict made evident in American and Japanese reality television shows, I selected one episode apiece from both the American show *The Real World* (1992-2013) and the Japanese show *Terrace House: Boys and Girls in the City* (*Terrace House*, 2012-2016). Both *The Real World* and *Terrace House* have similar structures which surround a singular premise: place at least six young adults (around 20 to 30 years of age) of opposite gender in a house together in some sort of urban area, and film them to see what happens. As can be expected, conflict ensues—especially that regarding romantic ventures. There are some notable differences between the shows, however. For one, *Terrace House* takes special care to ensure that all of its participants are single, whereas *The Real World* has a mixture of some members that already have significant others and some that do not. Moreover, *The Real World* has some diversity when it comes to race (Asian, Black, Hispanic, and White individuals are all

represented in season three), sexual orientation (one participant is a gay man), and religion. In contrast, *Terrace House* is fairly homogenous in race (entirely native-born Japanese except later in the season), and the participants are not identified as being diverse in other categories. Both programs are fairly heterogeneous in terms of occupation, though. All of the main participants in these two episodes are present from the beginning of their respective seasons (see Tables 1 and 2 for a breakdown of the housemates).

Table 1

Participants in Terrace House Season Three, Episode Six

<u>Name</u>	<u>Referred to As</u>	<u>Gender</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
Makoto Hasegawa	Makocchan	Male	22	College baseball player
Tatsuya Uchihara	Uchi	Male	23	Hair stylist
Yuki Adachi	Yuki	Male	27	Tap dancer
Minori Nakada	Minori	Female	21	College student and model
Mizuki Shida	Mizuki	Female	22	Office employee
Yuriko Hayata	Yuriko	Female	23	Medical student

Table 2

Participants in The Real World Season Three, Episode Ten

<u>Name</u>	<u>Referred to As</u>	<u>Gender</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
Mohammed Bilal	Mohammed	Male	24	Musician and retail associate
Rachel Campos	Rachel	Female	23	Soon-to-be graduate student
Pam Ling	Pam	Female	26	Medical student
Cory Murphy	Cory	Female	20	College student
David “Puck” Rainey	Puck	Male	25	Bicycle messenger
Judd Winick	Judd	Male	24	Cartoonist and animator
Pedro Zamora	Pedro	Male	22	Educator and AIDS activist

The Real World and *Terrace House* both have disparate features in addition to their filming of participants: ‘confessionals’ and ‘host sequences,’ respectively. *The Real World’s* confessionals are much like the ‘testimonials’ mentioned by Pardo (2013), where participants sit in front of a camera and discuss what is happening in the show. Confessionals in *The Real World*

tend to be interspersed throughout the program; producers will often cut them into the middle of a conversation (sometimes they only cut to the audio, leaving the current visuals of what is actually happening in the show on the screen). *Terrace House* has host sequences at the beginning of each of its episodes, as well as throughout (though not quite to the frequency of confessionals in *The Real World*, and producers never cut them into the middle of conversations). These sequences involve a panel of around six hosts discussing and interpreting what is happening in the show (often, the scene cuts to previous sequences in order to illustrate what the hosts are talking about).

3.2 Discourse Data

In choosing an episode from each program that would be comparable, I decided to select from the third season of *The Real World* (which aired in 1994) and the first season of *Terrace House* (as *Boys and Girls in the City* was a second series of *Terrace House*, actually representing the third season of production, airing in 2015). As such, episodes from these seasons would represent similar periods in the productions of the programs, thereby bolstering their validity of comparability. The producers of these shows would also have had more time to solidify concepts and production techniques by the third year of production. As for the episodes themselves, I chose episode 10 of *The Real World* and episode six of *Terrace House*. Not only do these episodes represent comparable points in the programs' timelines (each of *The Real World's* episodes are 20 minutes long, placing episode 10 at 200 minutes in, and each of *Terrace House's* episodes are 30 minutes long, placing episode six at 180 minutes in), they also each represent points in the shows that contain significant conflicts (neither of which are completed in just one episode). One should quickly note, however, that the producers of each program likely edited content to get it in its current form. For instance, they might have dismissed segments where one

can see participants collaborating in favor of content more replete with conflict. Thereby, the current work analyzes discourse that is somewhat of a skewed representation of reality, subject to the goals of producers.

3.3 Analytical Procedure

In order to understand the conflict management styles participants use in these programs, I qualitatively analyzed discourse segments. First, I transcribed the episodes in their entirety, with the sole exception being all but one of the ‘host sequences’ in the *Terrace House* episode. These segments only involved the hosts discussing the conflicts that had occurred in the show as opposed to the participants actually engaging in those conflicts; I transcribed one so as to determine whether or not they would be useful for the current work: despite their entertaining format, they were not useful. Then, I identified any conflict sequences with a basic understanding of the above definition of the term. In the end, I had identified seven specific conflict interactions among the reality show participants in *Terrace House* and 11 in *The Real World* (for the sake of brevity, I will present four segments from each program in the analysis below). Next, I attempted to identify how the participants were engaging in conflict talk (as well as facework) in each segment. Specially, I looked at how the participants were using linguistic devices to negotiate conflict.

4. Analysis

Both episodes provided insights into the conflict management styles and face negotiation strategies of Japanese versus American participants. I will analyze a limited selection of the conflict interactions from each show individually.

4.1 *Terrace House*

In episode six of *Terrace House* there are six housemates, all of which have been together

since episode one. Primarily, the conflict in this episode focuses around Uchi and Makocchan and their interaction with the women in the house. In the previous episode, Uchi had asked all three of them out on dates, which was surprising to the rest of the members of the house. Various incidents and disagreements spring from this behavior. Moreover, later in the episode, Makocchan breaches Uchi's trust by sharing with Yuriko that Uchi had felt awkward on their date, turning the house on Makocchan. Throughout this tumultuous narrative, the participants use clever linguistic devices when they commit FTAs, in order to mitigate any potential discord.

4.1.1 Uchi and Mizuki's date. In the beginning of the episode, Uchi and Mizuki attend a restaurant as part of their date. This particular segment revolves around how Uchi had asked all three of his female housemates out at once. His behavior has come into question by many of the participants as they see it as a breach of an implied social rule: that one should not ask out so many people at once as it devalues them and creates a situation similar to a "taste test" (see line four below). Uchi, perceiving this sentiment, uses this time at the restaurant to introduce the subject to Mizuki and ask her opinion on it. In this segment, the source of the conflict is a difference of opinion between Mizuki and Uchi regarding his rapid-fire invitation style. Below is a transcription¹ of their conversation in romanized Japanese, with an English translation²:

- (01) Uchi: /Nanka/ Yuriko-chan ni sa:...nanka iwareta nda yo ne.
 Yuriko told me something. [Literally: I was told
 something by Yuriko]
- (02) Mizuki: *Nani?*
 What?

¹ See Appendix A for an explanation of the transcription format and Appendix B for transcripts in Japanese kana.

² The translation was adapted in part from captions provided by Netflix (*Terrace House*, 2012-2016).

- (03) Uchi: *"p Nanka watashi..tachi..end p denbin ni kakerareteru?" Mitai na.*
[She] more or less said, "It seems like we're being compared or something."
- (04) Mizuki: *Un..misadamerareteru desho?*
Yes, like it's a taste test, you know?
- (05) Uchi: { *Sou iu wake ja nai yo. Sou iu wake ja nai yo.*
{ No, it's not like that at all. It's not like that.
- (06) Mizuki: { /???/
- (07) Mizuki: *De mo sorekoso makocchan ga... "sannin...to..hitori zutsu deeto suru no wa okashii" mitai na koto itte tarashii yo.* [Chuckles]
But, Makocchan said something like, "it was weird for you to [go on] dates with all three of us girls."
- (08) Uchi: *A..ssou?*
Really?
- (09) Mizuki: *Un.*
Yeah.
- (10) Uchi: *Nande?*
Why?
- (11) Mizuki: /???/ *Iya yakimochi ja nai? Tada.*
Maybe [he's] just jealous.
- (12) Uchi: *Maa de mo ne betsu ni Minori-chan to Makocchan tsukiatтеру wake de mo nai kara ne.*
Well, but it's not like Minori and Makocchan are together, right? }
- (13) Mizuki: { *Un.*
Yeah. }
- (14) Uchi: { *Ore ga*
I... }
- (15) Mizuki: { *Mada zenzen /ne/.*
No, not yet at all.
- (16) Uchi: *Minori-chan to ikura asobou ga ne, iwareru are wa nai kara.*
So, no matter how much Minori and I hang out together, it's none of his business.
- (17) Mizuki: */Tashi ka ni./*

For sure.

The entire conversation is in highly casual style marked by sentence fragments in lines (2) and (15) and the casual affirmative *un* (9; Jorden & Noda, 1988, 1990). This indicates a significant degree of social rapport among the participants. However, despite this context of relational closeness, the two interlocutors still engage in (mostly) indirect conflict, with Mizuki in particular committing a positive FTA against her date.

Uchi initiates the topic of discussion by introducing how Yuriko had criticized him (1). He introduces the topic by merely mentioning that Yuriko had said something to him, and Mizuki accepts this new topic via an affirmative in (2). This is in line with Jones' (2004) conception of topic initiation in casual conversation, where initiation occurs smoothly and without metacommunicative statements to indicate a topic change. After the topic is successfully initiated, Uchi relays the content of the criticism, and Mizuki, with *misadamerareteru* in (4), simultaneously agrees with his statement using an affirmative and threatens Uchi's positive face by arguing that he has been engaging in the activity of ascertaining something; she is implying that Uchi is just 'trying out' all of the women in the house. This is where the conflict begins. On the surface level, Mizuki agrees with Uchi, but really she is agreeing with Yuriko's assessment of his behavior. The implication of Mizuki's "taste-testing" statement is a degradation of his character, as taste-testing women is not a plausible action. "Taste-testing" itself is a metaphor that implies that Uchi sees women as food or objects that he can try at his leisure, without regard for their feelings. Essentially, Mizuki is implying that Uchi is being disrespectful towards women. She does redress this FTA slightly with the use of *desho* (a semi-formal version of *darou*, an agreement-seeking or tentative expression of the copula; Vance, Kawaura, Omura, & Riley, 1993).

Uchi picks up on this face threat, and in the next line (5) he denies the accusation. This

denial is his attempt to protect his positive face; he makes the accusation emphatic by way of repetition serving its conative function of intensification (Nakada, 1992; Rabab'Ah & Abuseileek, 2012). Mizuki, in response, continues to press her argument by introducing what Makocchan thinks about Uchi's behavior (7). This continues the threat on Uchi's face, but in a gentler way: instead of focusing on the issue of Uchi's respect towards women, the statement merely refers to the behavior as "odd" (*okashii*; Vance et al., 1993, p. 381). Moreover, by bringing in what Makocchan had said, Mizuki is removing some of the burden for the FTA from herself. In a way, she is not the one who is arguing that Uchi is acting weird, Makocchan is; Mizuki is redressing the FTA via quotation. The use of *mitai* ("to be like;" Vance et al., 1993, p. 326) further solidifies this. *Mitai* functions as a sort of hedge (i.e., "Makocchan said *something like*," 7). So, Mizuki is also hedging the FTA by situating her quotation as a paraphrase instead of a verbatim utterance.

In reaction to this, Uchi asks for confirmation of Makocchan's statement (which Mizuki readily gives), and then he somewhat disagrees with Makocchan's sentiment in the next line (10). By asking "why," Uchi might be implying that there is shaky reasoning behind his housemate's notion of his strange behavior. However, Uchi is more likely implying that Makocchan has an ulterior motive for calling Uchi's behavior "odd." What is more interesting is Mizuki's reaction to the disagreement. Instead of continuing to press her argument as before, further criticizing Uchi's actions, she picks up on his argument regarding Makocchan's intentions, leading to a shift in the discussion (11). Mizuki suggests Makocchan is merely jealous of Uchi, resulting in him being critical of the "taste-testing." This avoids a direct confrontation of Uchi on Mizuki's part. She is also referencing a subtext that surrounds Makocchan for quite a few episodes (which additional segments will show more clearly below): many of the housemates share the notion

that Makocchan might be romantically interested in either Minori or Yuriko.

Uchi, sensing a shift, introduces an argument based on that subtext, stating that since Makocchan and Minori are not currently engaged in a romantic relationship, the amount of time Uchi spends with Minori should not be Makocchan's concern (12, 14, and 16). Mizuki, in various intervening lines (13 and 15) reacts to Uchi's argument with total agreement, and, on the last line, Mizuki uses *tashi ka* ("certain," Vance et al., 1993, p. 529) to demonstrate even further agreement.

It is evident that, although Uchi and Mizuki started out in disagreement with Mizuki committing a FTA against Uchi, they ended the conversation in agreement. However, it appears that what they were agreeing on was not what the original conflict was about. After Uchi challenges Makocchan's sentiment, Mizuki (in order to avoid a direct confrontation of Uchi) changes the subject slightly from Uchi's behavior in asking all three women out on dates to it not being Makocchan's business to judge said behavior due to their perception of Makocchan's jealousy. It appears that both parties are interested in maintaining that aforementioned rapport; they opt to avoid direct confrontation. Uchi and Mizuki only directly disagree with each other in lines (5) and (7). Mizuki consistently agrees with Uchi in a variety of lines, but in (4) she simultaneously agrees with Uchi and argues against him due to her agreement with Yuriko's assessment.

Jones (2004) discusses how interlocutors tend to drop topics only after they reach some sort of agreement, even if said agreement is superficial. The parties did not resolve the actual conflict surrounding Uchi's behavior. Instead, after reaching a point of evident dissonance between their two views, Uchi and Mizuki rapidly switch to another related topic with which they could be in concurrence. Only then do they drop the conversation.

4.1.2 Uchi and Mizuki's discussion of their date. Directly after Uchi and Mizuki's date as presented above, the program cuts to all of the members of the house sitting in a restaurant together. Yuriko asks how the pair's date turned out and Uchi holds that it went positively. He states that things opened up (relationally) between them. However, Mizuki seems like she is taken aback at that statement. She neither agrees nor outright disagrees with Uchi's claim, opting instead to change the topic slightly to the fact that she had an enjoyable time on the date. A segment of Uchi and Mizuki discussing their date in front of the group is below; Yuki and Yuriko play minor roles in the exchange:

(01) Uchi: *De mo ne uchitoketa kanji shita kyou wa.*

I think things opened up today.

(02) Yuki: *A:*

Oh.

(03) Mizuki: *Sou nan da.*

I see.

(04) Uchi: *Omottenai?*

Don't you think so?

(05) Mizuki: *E? Tanoshikatta yo.*

Hmm? I had fun.

(06) Uchi: *Tanoshikatta?*

You had fun? }

(07) Yuriko: { [Unsure of actual speaker] *un.*

Yeah. }

(08) Mizuki: { *Totemo.*

A lot.

(09) Uchi: *Totemo ne.*

A lot.

Uchi first shares his perception that things had opened up between him and Mizuki on their date in (1). He uses the phrase *uchitokeru*, a compound of *uchi* ("inside" Vance et al., 1993; p. 574) and *tokeru* (the verbal for loosening), resulting in a statement that means something like to "loosen one's insides" ('to open up'). Yuki makes a slight utterance in

response and to show his understanding and interest (2), which Mizuki immediately follows with *sou nan da* (3). Yuki's utterance is a small example of *aizuchi* (the Japanese term for minimal or listener responses interjected in conversation), and here it functions as an acknowledgement on Yuki's part as Uchi has already stated the primary content of his message (Tanaka, 2004). In (3), Mizuki also appears to utter an *aizuchi* phrase herself, something that acknowledges and agrees with Uchi's statement; speakers often use *sou desu ka* as *aizuchi* to express some form of agreement (Tanaka, 2004). However, it is not always the case that such phrases only express agreement, as this *sou nan da* is curious. It is flat in tone, and utilizes an extended predicate. This form, the extended predicate or the extension of a phrase via the noun phrase *no* (or, in the case of combination with the copula, *nda* or *ndesu*), serves two functions according to Noda (1990, 2004): re-framing and re-characterization. The re-framing function serves "to refer to a specific situation, and by doing so, to direct attention to that situation," whereas speakers use the re-characterization function to "[give] a unique label to that situation" (Noda, 2004, p. 101). These functions operate within situational context, imbuing meaning based upon background knowledge that the speaker assumes both parties have. Moreover, Maynard (1992) points out that the extended predicate can have an objectification function, where interlocutors can detach themselves from a situation and frame it from a different communicative level. In other words, the extended predicate nominalizes the sentence, separating the speaker, "provid[ing] an environment conducive to representing the perspective of a distant observer, rather than that of an involved participant" (p. 587). Mizuki, with (3), seems to neither fully agree with Uchi's phrase, otherwise she might have used an affirmative, nor outright disagree with it. Combined with the use of the

extended predicate, Mizuki is re-characterizing the situation, inferring that Uchi could be wrong in the assessment of their date. By distancing herself from the idea of relational closeness, through nominalization, she is implying that she is not participating in their becoming closer. As in, she does not share Uchi's feeling. This is an indirect positive FTA against Uchi. Mizuki could have outright disagreed directly with Uchi, thereby confronting him. However, in order to save his face (at least in part) she uses an indirect phrase re-characterized as a subtle disagreement. She is still threatening his positive face, though. The absence of agreement from the other person on the date makes his claim seem false. One should also note that Mizuki includes *da* in her utterance, as opposed to just saying *sou na no*. The sentence-final *no* appears alone more often in conversational discourse when compared with *nda* (Maynard, 1992). Her inclusion of *da* could make the phrase slightly more blatant and emphatic; it might have been more tactful to use just *no* on her part. Regardless, Mizuki's FTA is still indirect.

Uchi immediately responds by asking if Mizuki agrees with him in (4), but Mizuki redirects the question (5). Instead of saying explicitly whether or not she believes the two of them achieved a greater level of relational intimacy, she talks about how she had enjoyed the date. This is a related topic, but it is also a clear deviation from Uchi's original point.

He uses an echo question in (6) for his response. This question appears to serve a couple of different functions. First, it confirms the shift in topic. The phrase itself is a repetition of Mizuki's previous utterance, and thereby it likely serves a discourse structuring function, reorienting the flow of the exchange (Nakada, 1992). In addition, it implies a tacit ratification of the topic change on Uchi's part. He does not resist where she

wishes to take the conversation. Mizuki directly answers his echo question in (8), with an unknown speaker (likely Yuriko) in (7) interjecting with an affirmative as a form of *aizuchi*. In (8), Mizuki confirms her sentiment via *totemo* (“very [much];” Vance et al., p. 560). Then, Uchi, in the final line of the exchange, repeats this *totemo* with the addition of the sentence-ending particle *ne* (an agreement-seeking particle). Again this repetition probably serves a discourse structuring function, but this time it simultaneously demonstrates harmony between the two interlocutors and signals the end of the exchange.

With this segment, one can see a potential conflict, where Mizuki indirectly disagrees with Uchi’s assessment of their date, completely avoided with a shift in topic. Rather than disagreeing outright with Uchi’s argument, Mizuki opts instead to show her disagreement through the untargeted *sou nan da*. She shifts the subject when Uchi presses her on the matter, questioning whether or not she agreed with his original statement. After the topic shift, both parties agree on the new topic, and the conversation ends. This result is similar to the one above in their original date; they avoid conflict via agreement on a secondary issue. It is when they reach a point of discord that Mizuki introduces a topic shift and Uchi goes along with it. One should also note how the pair had a fairly sizable audience, likely making the need for perceived harmony between them more salient.

4.1.3 Discussion between Mizuki and Yuriko regarding Makocchan’s behavior. In the middle of the episode, Uchi has his date with Yuriko. Unfortunately, due to his poor planning, they did not arrive in time at the aquarium Uchi planned on, resulting in a fairly disappointing date. Yuriko and he agree to try again at a later date so Uchi can get his “revenge” (read: make up for his error). Uchi, after this incident of poor planning had occurred, talks with the other male participants in the house about how he felt towards Yuriko: that on his date with her he felt

awkward (regardless of the status of the aquarium), and he felt more comfortable with Mizuki. Makocchan then shared this information with Yuriko. Understandably, this upset her.

Towards the end of the episode, Yuriko comes into the room that all of the female housemates stay in, crying. Mizuki, being the only other person in the room, continues to press Yuriko as to what had happened, and Yuriko finally relates that Makocchan had told her that Uchi had felt uncomfortable on their date. His confiding in her was done off camera. The source of this conflict is the perceived breaking of the social rules by Makocchan: he was not supposed to tell Yuriko those things as they are both hurtful, and Uchi likely spoke them in confidence. Here, Mizuki and Yuriko discuss the conflict in a somewhat significant amount of depth, and eventually Mizuki shares her own opinion: that Makocchan might be romantically interested in Yuriko (a point that Yuriko counterargues against) and that she is “not really quite sure about him.” Hence, the outcome is an evident distrust of Makocchan. The issue of whether or not Uchi actually feels the way Makocchan had described was not discussed. Below is a transcription of this exchange between Mizuki and Yuriko:

- (01) Mizuki: *p Dou shita no? p Yuri.*
What's the matter, Yuri?
- (02) Yuriko: *Uun.*
Uh uh...
- (03) Mizuki: *Dou shita?*
What is it?
- (04) Mizuki: *Dou shita no?*
What happened?
- (05) Mizuki: *Tisshu tisshu.*
Tissue, tissue.
- (06) Yuriko: *Gomen.*
Sorry.
- (07) Mizuki: *Nani ga atta no?*
What happened?
- (08) Yuriko: *Nanka kongaragatte yoku...wakannai nda kedo.*

- I'm so confused and...not sure at all. }
- (09) Mizuki: { *Un.*
Yeah.
- (10) Yuriko: *Yuki...to no sa..dansu mi ni itta owari ni sa. Nanka ie kaette sa Makocchan..ga ribingu ni ite sa.*
After seeing Yuki's dance, I came home, and Makocchan was in the living room. }
- (11) Mizuki: { *A un.*
Oh, yeah.
- (12) Yuriko: *"Uchii ga..Mizuki to no deeto wa..nani mo ki tsukawazu ni futsuu ni tanoshimeta kedo..."*
He said that Uchi told him...that his date with you was carefree and fun.
- (13) Mizuki: *Un.*
Yeah.
- (14) Yuriko: *Watashi to no deeto no toki wa..kekkou ki tsukacchatta kara" mitai na.*
But it seemed he was quite tense on our date. Uchi told him something like that. }
- (15) Mizuki: { *Un.*
Yeah.
- (16) Yuriko: *"Sou iu sou ni itte ta yo" mitai na...no..o Makocchan kara kitte..sore de watashi ga mou hontou wake wakannaku natte..sakki...danshi heya ni ittan itte.."dou shiyo kka?" mitai na fuu ni..itta nda kedo...Makocchan ga "suizokukan ikitaku nasasou da ne" mitai na. "Ikitaku nai no?" mitai na fuu ni itte kita no mo. Nanka yoku wakannakute. Nanka Makochan kara..ki kiita hanashi de..."*
Uchi told him something like that. So, I heard that from Makocchan. And then I really didn't know what was going on anymore. And then I just went to the guy's room just to ask what we were going to do. But then...Makocchan kind of implied that I didn't seem eager to go to the aquarium. He asked if I wanted to go. I don't know what made him say that. So, like, I heard it from Makocchan- }
- (17) Mizuki: { *Shitteru desho tte koto desho?*

Like, it means he knows, too. }

- (18) Yuriko: { *Sou sou sou sou.*
Ucchii..kara mo..“e dou shitai no?” mitai na fuu ni
natte:. Nanka sono ato ni Makocchan kara..nanka LINE kite,
“daijoubu?” mitai na. “Ucchii ni hanashi nikui koto attari
shitara nanka itsu de mo soudan noru kara....heya to ka
iru kara itsu de mo yonde ii yo” mitai na. “Kanashinderu
/toko/ mitakunai” tteiu ka nante kaite atta ka wasureta
kedo. Da kara hontou ni wakannakute, nande aa iu LINE ga
kita no ka mo.
 Yes, that’s right. So they both asked me what I wanted.
 After that, Makocchan texted me, like, “Are you all right?”
 [“]Let me know if there’s something you find hard to
 discuss with Uchi. I’m in my room, so you can call me over
 anytime.” And then something like, “I don’t want to see
 you sad.” I kind of forgot. I’m really confused. Like, why
 did he text me that?
- (19) Mizuki: *Iya ne watashi ne koko hontou ni /nisanishi/ nanda kedo,*
Makocchan Yuriko no koto suki na no? tte isshun omotteta
no. De mo...
 You know, these past two or three days, I had a moment
 when I thought that Makocchan liked you. But...
- (20) Yuriko: *E..sonna*
 Is that...
- (21) Mizuki: *E..wakannai nanka kangaesugi ka na?*
 But, I don’t know. Maybe I’m thinking too much.
- (22) Yuriko: *De mo nanka motomoto minna ni sou ja nai? Makocchan.*
 But isn’t Makocchan like that with everyone?
- (23) Mizuki: *Un un...*
 Yeah, yeah...
- (24) Mizuki: *Makocchan chotto ne watashi saikin yoku wakannai kara sa.*
 Recently, I’ve been a little unsure of Makocchan.
- (25) Yuriko: *U:n.*
 Yeah.
- (26) Mizuki: *Saikin hontou ni wakannai ano hito.*
 I’m really not sure about him.

In this exchange, one can see Mizuki and Yuriko attempting to reach an understanding

regarding Makocchan's behavior. First, Yuriko explains what Makocchan did. After a lengthy exchange of Mizuki gently urging Yuriko to account for her crying, and her giving only distressed noises in reply, Yuriko apologizes for the intrusion of her crying (2-6). Mizuki again asks as to what is the matter, and Yuriko begins her explanation with the use of *nanka* (colloquial of *nani-ka*, "something;" Vance et al., 1993, p. 350), and relates the story of Makocchan telling her what Uchi thought about the date while Mizuki interjects periodically with affirmatives to show that she is listening (7-15). *Nanka* functions throughout Yuriko's explanation like *mitai* in the first transcript I presented above, so it works as a hedge, softening the overall message that she is relaying. Mizuki, during the Yuriko's explanation, utters a significant amount of continuer *aizuchi* (Tanaka, 2004) such as in (9), (11), (13), and (15). Moreover, in (17), she echoes Yuriko to show her understanding and interest. Yuriko reacts to this in (18) with significant agreement via the use of *sou* four times in a row.

After Yuriko finishes explaining the situation in (18), Mizuki begins to describe how she has been unsure of Makocchan for a few days. This is where the conversation shifts to the two parties attempting to gain consensus on Makocchan. Mizuki posits that Makocchan may be interested romantically in Yuriko, something Yuriko reacts to, in (20), with affective *aizuchi* (expressing surprise). In (21), Mizuki backpedals, hedging with *nanka* and describing how she may be overthinking the issue. Yuriko then counterargues that Makocchan acts the same way around everyone else, so Mizuki, sensing a disagreement shifts to how she is unsure of Makocchan as opposed to suggesting that he is interested in Yuriko (24). She repeats this in the last line (26) to emphasize her point to Yuriko (in order to influence her).

The episode transitions directly from this exchange to a confrontation of Makocchan (see below). Mizuki, after hearing about Makocchan's behavior in this segment decides to take

matters into her own hands. In the above segment, though, she first operates as a comforter and a confidant for Yuriko, but after Yuriko explains the entire situation to her, Mizuki forms her own opinion based on her perception of Makocchan. Yuriko and Mizuki do not explicitly reach consensus regarding Makocchan in the above exchange (indeed, Mizuki shifts topics at one point to avoid discord with Yuriko), but the conversation does function to provide enough background for Mizuki to understand what has happened between Makocchan and Yuriko. Using this, Mizuki can operate to help resolve the conflict.

4.1.4 Mizuki's confrontation of Makocchan. In the previous segment, Yuriko revealed something to Mizuki that Makocchan shared Uchi's opinion of his date with Yuriko, who found it to be rather hurtful due to the confusion that it caused. Mizuki, in that discussion, agreed that it was a hurtful thing for Makocchan to do to Yuriko and potentially a breach of Uchi's trust. Thereby, Mizuki decides to confront Makocchan (committing a significant positive FTA). She sees Makocchan's telling as breaking a social rule due to the negative nature of the comment and the strain it may place on Uchi and Yuriko's relationship. The segment below demonstrates this confrontation, and it begins with her waking Makocchan up, who is alone in the bedroom that all of the male housemates share:

(01) Mizuki: *[Walks into guys' room and lightly hits Makocchan to wake him up] Chotto ii?*

You got a minute?

(02) Makocchan: *Dou shita? Bibitta.*

What's up? You startled me.

(03) Mizuki: *Yuriko ni sa...*

You said to Yuriko...

(04) Makocchan: *Un.*

Yeah.

(05) Mizuki: *"Ucchii...ga.../nanka/...ki tsukau tte itte ta yo"*

tte..itta desho? Are dou iu tsumori de itta?
 ...that Uchi expressed...how he was tense with her.
 What did you intend by that?

(06) Makocchan: *Yuriko ni?*
 To Yuriko?

(07) Mizuki: *Un.*
 Yeah.

(08) Mizuki: *Otokodoushi de shabe..tta..hanashi o..Yuriko ni kageguchi mitai ni icchatta..to shitara sore wa sore de dasai shi, moshi ne..Yuriko no koto ga..suki tte iu ka ki ni natte te...*
 If it was something that was just between you guys that you secretly told Yuriko, then, of course, that would be uncool. Or, if you like her or whatever and was concerned about her- }

(09) Makocchan: { *Ore ga?*
 Me?

(10) Mizuki: *Sou sou..moshi ne. De, itta nda to shite mo..yarikata chigau jan? Sore wa sore de. Sore ga purasu no koto dattara mada ii nda kedo, Yuriko ni taishite mainasu na..koto moshi ka shitara shokku ukechau ka mo shirenai..to ka ma Yuriko ni taishite sore o kangaenakatta no katte koto to..Ucchii ni taishite warui natte omowanakatta no ka na? tte iu no koto. Otagai ga gikushaku shichau jan.*
 Yes. Just, if so. And you told her because of that, well, it was still a wrong thing to do. If that was something positive, it's fine. But if it's something negative for Yuriko, it could mess her up. I wonder if you thought of how it could affect her and how it would negatively affect Uchi. Like, they're going to be unsure of each other now.

(11) Makocchan: *Un.*
 Yeah.

(12) Mizuki: *Yuriko sonna no ki ni shichatte sa..deeto dokoro ja nai jan. "Mata omowareten no ka na? Ki*

tsukatten no ka na?" tte omottara kawai sou ja nai? Mochiron Uchii mo kawai sou da kedo, Makochan no koto shinyou shite sa tabun itteru darou shi.

Yuriko is so concerned about it, she can't think of the date. Don't you feel bad that she's concerned about how he thinks of her? I mean, I feel sorry for Uchi, too. I'm sure he told you because he trusts you.

(13) Makocchan: *"Kinou nan hanashita no?" mitai na no hanashichatta kara sa.*

Well, I just said whatever I heard yesterday. }

(14) Mizuki: { *U:n.*

Yeah. }

(15) Makocchan: { *Iwarechatte.*

It just came out.

(16) Mizuki: *Nigosanakya.*

[You] have to make things vague.

(17) Makocchan: *De mo nigoshitara sore ni tsuite mo Yuriko mo kiite kuru kara sa. Shihajimechatta no wa warui nda kedo sa.*

Well, she can still ask about it if I make things vague. I feel bad for what I started.

(18) Mizuki: *Un..docchi ni shiro..nanka chotto chigau natte omotta kara.*

Whatever the case, I figured something wasn't right.

(19) Makocchan: *Sokka.*

I see.

(20) Mizuki: *[Stands up] Hatsugen ni wa sekinin o motsu you ni.*

Just be careful with what you say.

(21) Makocchan: *Hai.*

Okay.

(22) Mizuki: *Oyasumi [Leaves the room].*

Good night.

(23) Makocchan: *Nan da yo.*

What was that?

Mizuki begins the conversation in (1) by lightly hitting Makocchan and inquiring as to his availability. Waking him up is a negative FTA on Mizuki's part. Makocchan points this out by expressing his surprise at being awakened (2). In the same sentence, he also questions Mizuki about why she woke him up. Mizuki, in (3), immediately begins the confrontation (thereby ignoring Makocchan's issue with her negative FTA), accompanied at first by an affirmative from Makocchan, consenting to the topic and also functioning as a continuer *aizuchi* (4). She explains what Yuriko had said to her, and then asks what Makocchan intended by saying those things to Yuriko (3, 5). In response, he first asks an echo question, *Yuriko ni* (6), to which Mizuki uses an affirmative, confirming what she had said beforehand (7). However, Mizuki does not wait for Makocchan's answer, but instead she, with (8), continues to press and expand upon her argument, first introducing the idea of a breach of trust as committed by Makocchan against Uchi, and then presenting the possibility of Makocchan's romantic interest in Yuriko. Makocchan interrupts her on the next line (9) with *ore ga* to express an affective *aizuchi* (surprise at Mizuki's claim that he might be interested in Yuriko), but he does not yield the floor. Mizuki continues her strain of thought in (10), first responding to his surprise with *sou sou moshi ne* ("Yes, yes if that's the case;" she does not assert that Makocchan is for sure interested in Yuriko romantically, she merely presents it as a possibility), and then she continues her argument as to why it was a wrong thing for him to do (it could sow discord between Uchi and Yuriko). Makocchan again interjects with a continuer *aizuchi* (11), and then Mizuki continues yet again in the next line (12), finishing her argument as to the detrimental effects of Makocchan's action.

The entirety of Mizuki's statements thus far in the exchange are a combination of two different positive FTAs. First, her argument is a degradation of Makocchan's character. She is holding that he has broken a social rule, breaching Uchi's trust and causing negative feelings to

arise in Yuriko. Then, Mizuki's argument, in part, is an accusation that Makocchan is interested romantically in Yuriko. She connects this with his behavior, implying that he is acting immaturely as a result of his interest. After line (12), Makocchan attempts to protect his face from the first threat by presenting a counter-argument: that he said whatever he had heard, implying that he was not aware of Uchi's saying those words in confidence (13). Mizuki issues a continuer *aizuchi* via an affirmative in (14), and Makocchan then completes his argument in (15) with the passive form of the verbal *iu* ("to say;" Vance et al., 1993, p. 179). The passive forms of Japanese verbals tend to function differently from English passives (Jorden & Noda, 1990). They arise as either³ involuntary passives (as in, the referent is affected by the action of something else) or adversative passives (i.e., the referent is adversely affected by the action of something else). Makocchan is probably attempting to distance himself from blame for any negative effects of his speech by situating himself as a victim of those very utterances.

In response, with (16), Mizuki essentially ignores his counterargument and commits a negative FTA: she orders him, with an exceedingly direct request, to be vaguer. She is trying to get him to limit how many personal things he says, potentially limiting the amount of harm he could do. She uses *nigosu* ("to speak ambiguously;" "Nigosu," n.d., para. 1) in a form that requires necessity (Jorden & Noda, 1988). The phrase itself is a shorter version of the full form *nigosanakute wa ikenai* ("you must be vague"). This is a rather strong request, especially in its shortened form. Makocchan responds to this by simultaneously counterarguing against having to be vague and acquiescing to Mizuki's argument by apologizing (17). The two sentences in his utterance seemingly oppose each other. However, his apology is somewhat lackluster, with him

³ Japanese speakers also use passives for honorific speech. However, it is highly unlikely that Makocchan is using a passive here as an honorific (Jorden & Noda, 1990).

merely stating that he feels bad about what happened. Another note about his apology is that it utilizes an extended predicate. So perhaps this is not an apology, but a hedge for his preceding counterargument. Essentially, Makocchan may be attempting to re-frame his counterargument in terms of his feeling bad about the negative results of his actions.

Mizuki begins to attempt to end the conversation in (18), and also explains why she decided to confront Makocchan. She then stands up and gives him yet another order, urging him to take more responsibility for what he says (20). This request is somewhat gentler than the first, opting to not use the first, and rather direct request style. What is interesting here is that Mizuki uses *you ni* (“way of [doing],” Jorden & Noda, 1988, p. 275) in a sentence final position. Superiors (especially teachers) utilize this form in order to “[indicate] obligation” (Kaiser, 2001, p. 603; Nihongo Kijutsu Bunpou Kenkyukai, 2003). Essentially, she is ordering Makocchan to act in a way that involves his being more responsible, and her phrasing sounds like a teacher or a supervisor handing down instructions to a student or subordinate. What is even more interesting is Makocchan’s response to this order. Instead of again arguing against it, he further acquiesces to Mizuki’s argument, responding with the formal affirmative *hai*, instead of the casual equivalent *un*. The switch from the casual to the formal affirmative by Makocchan, combined with Mizuki’s language in (20), indicates that he is going along with Mizuki’s choice of an imaginative relationship where she is the older sister, teacher, or supervisor and Makocchan is the subordinate receiving her instruction. It is only after Mizuki leaves that Makocchan appears to express his own opinion in dissent, reflecting on the negative nature of the situation to himself (23).

Another aspect of this exchange to note is the fact that both parties use the masculine particle *sa*. Typically used in casual conversation, “[*s*]a is an assertive particle [...] that often

marks obvious, accepted information” (Jorden & Noda, 1990, p. 204, emphasis added). It is less strong than the exclamatory “[...] sentence-final particle” *yo* (Jorden & Noda, 1990; Vance et al., 1993, p. 604). Mizuki uses this to emphasize shared information in the above segment in (3), when she begins the confrontation. Makocchan uses the particle after the use of *kara* (particle meaning “because;” Vance et al., 1993, p. 222) or *kedo* (colloquial of *keredomo* meaning “but;” p. 239) at the end of major sentences to assert his main points. For example, he uses *sa* with the hedge in (17) to emphasize said hedge and attempt to situate his position as obvious. Moreover, what is also interesting is Mizuki’s use of *jan*, which is a colloquial contraction of the agreement-seeking *ja nai* (meaning “isn’t it?” “Janai,” n.d., para. 1). This makes it slightly more evident that Mizuki is attempting to gain compliance, mutual understanding, and agreement from Makocchan. She uses *jan* in (10) and (12) during two of the longest stretches of her argument.

This confrontation stands out from the other Japanese conflict segments presented above, especially when compared with the exchanges between Mizuki and Uchi. The interlocutors do not redirect and agree about something else that the conversation was not about in the first place. Instead, the conversation has a clear flow from Mizuki’s introduction of the topic to Makocchan, her argument as to why he is in the wrong, and a singular rebuttal by Makocchan followed by his eventual submission to Mizuki’s point of view. Mizuki continues to press her argument, and when Makocchan protests, she does not shift the topic as she did before; she continues her argument and even directs Makocchan to engage in certain behaviors. Makocchan does come around to Mizuki’s point of view and, on the surface, he does agree to be more careful about what he says. However, the outcome of the exchange, while presenting as agreement, is more likely a sort of social distance between Makocchan and Mizuki. One benefit of her confrontation of Makocchan, though, is the fact that he is now aware of his mistake. Mizuki brought it to his

attention, despite the evident risks associated with challenging him: decreased harmony and increased discord.

4.2 *The Real World*

Now, episode ten of *The Real World* is also rife with conflict. This episode in particular is a continuation of a conflict that occurs across multiple episodes surrounding the participant named Puck and his relationship with the rest of his housemates. Severe discord surrounding his behavior and refusal to be conscientious of the other people in the house has strained many of the housemates' interactions with Puck. Eventually, this conflict results in Puck's eviction.

4.2.1 Rachel and Puck's argument over cleaning. Close to the beginning of the episode, the program cuts to Rachel and Puck cleaning a house bathroom. Here, the discord between them surfaces as disagreement over proper cleaning technique. There is a problematic history of relational strife between Puck and Rachel which is especially evident in this episode. The source of this relational strife is the fact that the pair, on several occasions, had kissed, but Rachel had made it clear that she was not interested in pursuing romantic intimacy with Puck. While he does not explicitly say so, this fact seems to have greatly disappointed Puck, who likely wanted such a relationship. Throughout a series of exchanges, Puck and Rachel's accord swiftly degrades. The segment below is one example of this. The source of the conflict is likely the irritability of both parties, as well as an incapability of values. Neither party puts much effort into redressing requests or comments on another's cleaning abilities. Below is a transcription⁴ of this exchange:

⁴ 'Confessionals' (represented by the 'C' in parenthesis next to a name) are included in the transcription as they occur spliced in among montages and dialog throughout the episode, unlike host sequences in *Terrace House* which only occur in their own set-apart sections within that program.

- (01) Rachel: You better get over here and clean it up.
- (02) Puck: Hey I cleaned it up it was black..in the bottom of it.
- (03) Rachel: /???/
- (04) Rachel: You can../unplug/ that and let }
- (05) Puck: { I think you should
shut up, 'cause I'm
doing it my way and then you can finish up the job you
know?
- (06) Rachel: [Adds more cleaning product to the bathtub]
- (07) Puck: Oh..oh..oh..come on..it's all going..it's all going in
the ocean Rachel stop....don't do that...that's..way too
much.
- (08) Rachel: /Look/ I'll clean it my way
{ you clean it your way and I'm cleaning it my way.
- (09) Puck: { Put it on this....put it on this....put it on this
and use a little elbow grease and then maybe you could
o:pen a jar now and then.
- (10) Rachel: You're such a little [bleep].
- (11) Puck: Yeah well you're such a little [cuts off]
- (12) Rachel (C): I need to try and meet other guys.....and hang out
with people and I think it could only be..better for
our friendship.

Throughout this interaction, the main focus is a disagreement over how one should clean the bathroom. Rachel's and Puck's techniques are opposed to each other. This begins with an admonishment by Rachel for Puck to clean something in the bathroom (1). This is a negative FTA, bald and on-record. Puck, with (2), claims that he already cleaned it, describing how it is in a much better state now than it was before he did so. Rachel gives some face-threatening advice to Puck, implying that the way he was cleaning it before was wrong, and Puck interrupts by reaffirming his way of cleaning and telling Rachel to "shut up" (4-5). In this portion of the conversation, Rachel gives Puck advice and he rejects it. Then, the roles switch: Rachel becomes the cleaner and Puck becomes the admonisher. When she adds more cleaning product to the bathtub, Puck wholeheartedly disagrees with her decision due to environmental concerns (6-7).

Rachel, in response, reaffirms her position that she has her own way of doing things and so does Puck (8). Essentially, she argues that Puck should not tell her what to do. Puck then commits a negative FTA by interrupting her again and telling her what to do, ignoring Rachel's previous statement (9). At the end of the scene, Rachel and Puck exchange insults to show their displeasure with each other (10-11).

It is evident in this segment neither party is attempting to avoid or even manage the conflict. Both Puck and Rachel attempt to save their positive and negative face through attempting to override each other's opinion. Puck's phrase "I think you should shut up" in (5) is an example of this. Not only does he cut off Rachel's admonishment, but he also completely ignores her advice, asserting his own cleaning technique. Rachel does the same thing when Puck admonishes her: she asserts her idea of them each having their own way of cleaning bathtubs. The outcome of this conflict talk is an escalation and a continuation of the issue. Rachel admonishes Puck; Puck does not take kindly to this admonishment and then gives his own advice to Rachel in return who also does not take kindly to admonishment. Nothing is resolved as a result of this discussion, and instead Puck and Rachel seem even more at odds with each other by the end of it.

4.2.2 Cory's argument with Puck. Later in the episode, the participants explain through confessionals that Cory had lent her car to some friends of Mohammed and Rachel and they had returned it in exceedingly poor condition. She vents her frustrations about this to Puck, and he, perturbed by it, makes the argument that Cory has no right to be upset, an assertion that Cory disagrees with. This is the source of their conflict: Puck's insistence on his belief that Cory should not complain, and Cory's insistence that she should be able to vent about it and that Puck should stop telling her what to feel about the situation. Below is a transcription of two connected

exchanges that occurred between Puck and Cory surrounding the issue:

- (01) Pam (C): Cory...lent her car...to Mohammed and Rachel's friends...to go to Berkley...and..when she drove it..for the first time..herself..she found out that the clutch is to:tally...shot.
- (02) Cory (C): I was taught that if you borrow something [rising pitch from "some" to "thing"]..you return it in the exact same condition it was borrowed...or else you...replace it.
- (03) Puck: *p* The facts are..you cannot complain about what these people have done. *p* You conveniently loa:ned...you did it. You said..borrow my car...here,
- (04) Cory: /Oh um/..this is going around in circles
{ I'm totally sick of talking about this Puck.
- (05) Puck: { And you /???/
- (06) Puck: No I'm listening to you now..pre-bitching..you're saying it's okay for you to bitch..and I'm saying it's not.
- (07) Cory: Puck...my car is fu[bleep] broken..I can't drive it up the hill. }
- (08) Puck: { You:: }
- (09) Cory: { I have a right to be a little bit angry..and I don't care what you { say.
- (10) Puck: { No..it's fine.
- (11) Puck (C): /She's/ whining...she just whi::nes..man..I don't..I don't know..whatever.
- (12) Puck: It's on you..Cory..it's not them.
- (13) Pam (C): Puck is a te:rrible listener..telling Cory how she should feel about the situation [chuckles through the word "situation"]..just..did not help very much.
- (14) Cory: [Talking to Pam] *p dec* completely gone *end dec*..like my car will not.. { barely run.
- (15) Puck: { [From background] /???/ /Bogart/..help me do it. Cory? What are you doing?...right now?
- (16) Cory: Puck..please don't lecture me..I'm being }
- (17) Puck: { Well

- you're doing exactly /???/ }
- (18) Cory: { *f* I'm talking to Pam
about how I feel.
- (19) Puck: I'm telling you how to feel..it's on you [points at
Cory].
- (20) Cory: *ff* Why are you telling me how to feel?
- (21) Puck: 'Cause you're whining about { /???/
- (22) Cory: { *dec* Do:n't start.
- (23) Pam (C): It pissed me off that Puck wouldn't even let me
listen..to Cory..because he had already told her how
she should feel /and the/ case should be closed.
- (24) Pedro (C): I really..find it impossible to deal with Puck. I think
he's extremely..self-centered,

After showing some confessionals that provide background, the scene cuts to Puck and Cory talking in the house's kitchen. It begins in the middle of the conversation, and so context on this specific exchange is not fully available. Puck begins with his primary claim: that Cory should not complain about people ruining her car as she was the one who agreed to loan it to them in the first place (3). Cory attempts to end the discussion of the issue altogether by arguing that they need to stop talking about it (4). She complains that she is "sick" of discussing the issue. However, Puck refuses to drop the topic, and instead he continues his argument. He accompanies this statement with a positive FTA directed at Cory, using an expletive in (6). Cory picks up on this expletive, and in (7) utters one of her own and emphatically accounts for why she should be able to complain. Puck interrupts to strike back with the argument that either the car is functioning fine, or with a commiseration statement (i.e., it is okay for you to be upset); the former is more likely what he was intending with the phrase "No..it's fine" (10). After a confessional, Puck again asserts his point that Cory is at fault for the problems with her vehicle (12).

From here, the scene cuts to the living room where Cory is talking to Pam about her car

troubles and Puck overhears. He, after being on the phone, interrupts Cory in the middle of her sentence to challenge her (14-15). Cory protests and asks Puck to leave her alone (16). Puck does not comply and interrupts again, repeating the challenge (17). After hearing Cory assert, with heavy emphasis, that she is telling Pam how she feels about the situation, Puck picks up on the keyword “feel” and tells Cory that he is telling her how to feel (18-19). In response, Cory yells at Puck, claiming that he should not tell her how to feel (20). Puck begins his argument again, but Cory interrupts and cuts off the conversation (21-22).

Puck has his own opinion on how Cory should deal with the unfortunate situation surrounding her vehicle, but she does not accept this opinion. Cory does this first by attempting to end the conflict talk with Puck, but he continues to press his opinion. As such, she begins to counterargue against him at various points throughout the discussion. This continuing pressure by Puck and the rebuttals from Cory intensify the conflict, and the result is an unresolved outcome: both parties are at odds with each other, and by the end of the segment they are at worse odds with each other.

4.2.3 The group’s confrontation of Puck. The episode then, in an effort to demonstrate even more strife between Puck and his housemates, presents a house meeting where many of the participants confront Puck on his phone habits. Apparently, he had not been taking down messages when people have been calling for his housemates; he would merely ask the callers to phone back at another time. Puck’s housemates see this as discourteous, and as breaking an implicit rule in the house since everyone else writes down messages for Puck but he does not reciprocate. One can assume that all of the members of the house are involved in this confrontation, but only Pedro, Puck, Cory, Rachel, and Judd (in addition to one unknown voice) participate in this specific exchange:

(01) Pedro: [Addressing group] I know that I have lost...three

- phone calls...in the past week. Ahem. So }
- (02) Puck: { Okay..let's say
I click over..and the person says...message
or....Pedro..or message for...anybody. And I'm not
getting up..I'm on the other line..so why don't you
just call back in..two hours..see you later..[makes
clicking noise like hanging up a phone].
- (03) Cory: { People should be respectful. It doesn't matter what
{ the /???/
- (04) Unknown: { /???/ [Talking overlaid over Cory's previous line in
the background and later in the foreground] }
- (05) Puck: { No:...no
no..I think..I think people are expecting to be
/respectful/..but they don't have to do anything that
they don't want to.
- (06) Pedro: The difference is that when people call for
Puck..Pedro gets up...and goes all around the house
if he has to..to find a pen }
- (07) Puck: { Your fault.
- (08) Pedro: { And get...you
know..the number down. }
- (09) Puck: { Your fault
though. }
- (10) Pedro: { /???/ }
- (11) Judd: { That's..that's
courtesy. }
- (12) Pedro: { It's..it's it's just,
- (13) Puck: *p* Whatever man..I'm losing loads of money /and/ you
don't hear me whining about it I just don't care.
- (14) Pedro: Well that's you..Puck..I do care. It is established
that Puck does not care about anybody's messages...but
his.
- (15) Pedro (C): We tried to have a discussion about it..and he's just
getting up and...and leaving...but..he's still part
of the problem.
- (16) Rachel: I'm sick and tired of him..leaving..every time we have
a discussion.

(17) Puck (C): All I can say is I don't care about the phone..I don't care.

Pedro begins the conversation with an implied accusation of Puck, threatening his face, and arguing that the reason that he has lost calls in the past week has been due to Puck (1). Puck responds to this by describing what he sees as a reasonable procedure for dealing with phone calls: asking people to call back later (2). Cory adds on to the face threat targeted towards Puck by arguing that Puck is being disrespectful. She does this through a slightly indirect statement regarding the fact that people need to be respectful in general (3). Cory redresses her FTA by stating it as an overarching rule that people should be respectful. Puck rebuts that, while some expect others to be respectful, he does not have to do so if he does not want to (5). Here, he is trying to both avoid blame for not writing down messages for people and he is attempting to discredit the argument that he should start doing so.

Then, Pedro joins the fray and brings up the main impetus of his argument in (6), which is that he goes through a lot to write down messages for Puck, but Puck does not write down messages for him. This continues on the same line as Cory's argument regarding respect. What is interesting here is that Pedro switches to third-person when describing the effort he puts in. This is likely to demonstrate a perceived difference between Pedro and Puck: Pedro is attempting to show the contrast between what he does and what Puck does. However, Puck interrupts him to push forward his own line of argument: that the effort Pedro puts in is his own fault, implying that Puck should not have to do something just because others do it for him (7-10). Puck uses repetition to intensify his point.

Judd then enters the conversation by interrupting, arguing that it is courtesy to take messages, hoping to invalidate Puck's previous argument (11). Unfortunately, in response, Puck then redirects and disregards their arguments by stating that he is losing a lot of money by being

on the show (and not working as much), thereby implying that their problem is minimal compared to his (13). Here he is attempting to minimize their hardship; he is trying to avoid blame for not taking messages again. Pedro argues that Puck just does not care, and challenges him on it via the use of a passive phrase, “It is established that Puck does not care about anybody’s messages...but his” (14). Yet again, Pedro uses the third person to relate back to his previous phrasing. Rachel expresses her displeasure with Puck while he is out of the room (16).

Throughout this conversation, Puck is attempting to avoid blame for people having lost messages, and he is attempting to save his negative face (as he does not want to start writing down messages). The rest of the group is committing a series of positive and negative FTAs directed at Puck, but they are mostly redressed via generalizing the rules (i.e., “that’s courtesy” as opposed to ‘you need to be more courteous’) and via narrative examples (i.e., Pedro explaining that he goes through the house looking for a pen). Pedro intensifies his argument by further contrasting himself and Puck through the use of third-person in describing their differences. Puck uses repetition as a device to emphasize his claims. The group is basing their argument on social proof (see Cialdini, 1984): since everyone else is doing it, Puck should do it as well. In contrast, Puck is attempting to undermine this logic by denying the responsibility of being courteous. Despite the peer pressure that the rest of the housemates are putting on Puck, the outcome is more frustration on the group’s end and the avoidance of having to do anything different on Puck’s end. The discussion does not end with a resolution of any kind.

4.2.4 The group’s discussion of Puck’s behavior (without Puck). Late in the episode, at a birthday dinner for Mohammed located at a restaurant, all of the housemates barring Puck discuss his behavior and their various conflicts with them. Throughout this exchange, the participants are attempting to negotiate what they should do about the evident problems that have

arisen with Puck:

- (01) Pedro (C): We sat there..at Mo:'s birthday..and talked about Puck..an and Mo was the one who brought it up.
- (02) Mohammed: I don't want /it/..to be: in the house and feel like I have t...t...to be protective of people [rising intonation on "people"]...you know what I mean when he did that }
- (03) Rachel: { It didn't hurt me..but /it what/ Mo's saying it's the actual action of it [gestures with her hand in a forceful motion].
- (04) Mohammed: Well you know and then I asked Rachel later I was like }
- (05) Pam: { Well how did you feel about it [directed at Rachel]?
- (06) Rachel: I was just more..hurt by the just the verbal stuff. I'm just getting..to the point where I can't..deal with it anymore.
- (07) Mohammed: Puck is like so far out there dude that it just...he's like disgusting to me.
/???
- (08) Pam: I don't uh..I don't he's certainly not like a man open to change. }
- (09) Cory: { And even though he says he doesn't really do these things..then he always backs down and really does want to be a part of..the...the seven of us..and really does..really does care in a really weird way.
- (10) Rachel: I like him. }
- (11) Cory: { I do too. }
- (12) Rachel: { I just can't stand..the way..right now..he's declared war on the house.
- (13) Pedro: She likes him, I don't. I..I have no need for Puck in my life.
- (14) Mohammed: Thing is..we're living in the same situation right? We have to determine now..what form of communication we: need to use to get it across. The message has to get

across or the problem gets worse.

- (15) Rachel: I feel bad sitting here talking..about Puck..too. Just like Cory does. But..unlike Cory..I'm not afraid of confrontation. And I'm not /af/..and I've reached the point where..I can't do it alone and..if everybody else is pissed off then let's do something that's how I feel.
- (16) Pam: Is the..overall feeling though that we don't want Puck to move out? [slightly low intonation]
- (17) Pedro: Yes.
- (18) Rachel: { Yea::h..I don't want him to move out.
- (19) Cory: { /???/
- (20) Pedro: You know..I don't want him out of the house,
- (21) Mohammed: If that's....the only thing that we have to use I think that's what we should use.
- (22) Pedro: { Okay so
- (23) Pam: { He is going to:...see it as..you guys are a:ll..conspiring against me..you wanna throw me out now...{ fine..stray dog's out of the house..you know.
- (24) Judd: { /???/
- (25) Mohammed: He's not going to leave...
{ I bet you a million bucks he won't leave.
- (26) Rachel: { /???/ /He's/ I tell you..I know the /???/..Mo knows him.. { and I know him.
- (27) Mohammed: { I bet you a million..I think me and Rachel /???/
- (28) Pam: { You guys know him better...yeah.
- (29) Mohammed: { know him better than anybody in the house and I can tell you that Puck will not leave.
- (30) Rachel: He's not going out like that. }
- (31) Mohammed: { I bet you a
{ million bucks.
- (32) Rachel: { [unsure of actual speaker] /quote unquote./
- (33) Judd: If nobody minds..I'd like to..kind of speak to Puck on my own...before we do anything.

Throughout this segment, the housemates are attempting to reach consensus as to what to do about Puck. The scene cuts out the beginning of the exchange, so specific context is not

available; viewers see what looks to be a point close to the beginning of the discussion with Mohammed describing the negative aspects of something Puck did (2). Rachel then talks about how Puck has acted towards her (how the force of it is detrimental), but then she hedges it slightly by talking about how he has not been too hurtful (3). The group continues focus on Rachel and her conflict with Puck (as it has been fairly intense), and Rachel ends up saying that his verbal attacks on her have caused the situation to reach a bleak point (4-6). Mohammed and Pam then comment on Puck's belligerency and strange behavior (7-8).

Cory, in response and not wanting to be too negative, provides some qualities in favor of Puck, arguing that he wants to be a part of the group, and both Rachel and she state that they like Puck (9-11). However, Rachel, after Cory expresses her tolerance of Puck, almost immediately brings the conversation back to Puck's conflict with the house (12). Pedro jumps in and intensifies the negative sentiment towards Puck by stating that he does not like him (13).

From here, Mohammed introduces the issue of what they should do about Puck, and Rachel, while committing a minor positive FTA towards Cory (implying that she is afraid of confrontation), argues that the housemates should all confront Puck (14-15). Pam then asks a question attempting to gain consensus: do they all agree that they should not evict Puck (16)? Generally, this question creates consensus among the group. However, Mohammed says that they should use eviction as a threat to get Puck to come to their point of view (21). Pam argues that Puck would react to such a threat rather poorly, saying that he will just leave, something that many members of the house do not want to happen (23). In rebuttal, Rachel and Mohammed assure the rest of the group that Puck will not move out of the house when threatened like that (25-32). The way they do this assurance is of note. They keep repeating that they will bet a large sum of money that Puck would not move out when threatened. This is to show their certainty.

The significant number of repetitions is interesting, though. They are likely using the persuasive function of repetition here to influence their housemates (Rabab'Ah & Abuseileek, 2012).

Regardless, the exchange ends with Judd asking if it is all right with the rest of the group if he talks to Puck alone before they confront their housemate as a group (33). Unfortunately, the group's answer is not included in the scene.

Essentially, this negotiation over what to do flows from general discussion of the issue, to the identification of the specific problems arising from the conflict with Puck, the group's decision to confront Puck, and then a discussion about how to do so. It is unclear whether or not the group will actually threaten to evict Puck, but overall this exchange had a positive outcome (at least when compared with the above conflict segments between Puck and the rest of the housemates). The group members actually reached a decision. However, they did not reach total consensus when it came to whether they should threaten eviction.

5. Discussion

5.1 Conflict Management in a Japanese Reality Television Program

The four examples of Japanese conflict presented above represent the general points of conflict present in the current episode of *Terrace House*. Primarily, there are four participants involved in these exchanges: Mizuki, Uchi, Yuriko, and Makocchan. Mizuki is one interlocutor that is present in every one of the segments. It is clear through her style of conflict management that she values the harmony of the group over her own individual expression of opinion. On numerous occasions, when she reaches a point of evident discord with another interlocutor, to maintain harmony she will shift the topic slightly to another related concept, and then reach agreement with her counterpart on that new concept. This happened when Uchi kept arguing against her agreement with Yuriko's assessment of his behavior, and when Yuriko disagreed

with her point that Makocchan may be interested romantically in Yuriko. Moreover, Mizuki will commit FTAs against other interlocutors, but in indirect ways. One can see this with her use of *sou nan da* and *misadamerareteru* with Uchi, threatening his positive face both times, but only as implied threats. This falls in line with the collectivist value of group harmony that appears to be highly salient in Japanese society (Jones, 1990; Watanabe, 2004). However, as Mizuki demonstrates, there are expressed opposing views in Japanese conversations (Noda, 2004); it is just that, in order to avoid discord, interlocutors may shift topics to something all parties are capable of agreeing on, or they may express FTAs in indirect ways so as to redress the threatening aspect of the utterance.

Moreover, hedging via the use of *mitai* and *nanka* are common in the segments above. This likely relates to the prerogative among the participants, as mentioned above, of maintaining harmony. When the housemates approach or discuss a difficult topic, these help to soften any potential FTAs or negative feelings about the issues at hand. Yuriko is quite prolific in her use of *nanka* when describing Makocchan's behavior. Also, quotation as both a hedge and as a means of presenting evidence is universal among these segments. Quotation could also help the participants to distance themselves from the claims they are making.

One should also note the dimension of relative social position and its effect on Japanese conflict discourse and facework. As compared to other cultures, such as American culture, Japanese place a high emphasis on social position and ranking, and can change their politeness styles based upon that (Noda, 2004). However, despite age differences among the participants in this episode of *Terrace House*, none of them appear to significantly change any of their style choices based upon who they are talking to. All of them use highly casual speech when they talk to each other. In addition, the participants, at least in the episode analyzed, never once uttered the

word *senpai* (a term referring to “one’s senior;” Vance et al., 1993, p. 447) to refer to one of their housemates. Social position is likely not a significant factor in the participants’ conflict management styles.

Finally, the use of extended predicate falls in line with Noda’s (1990, 2004) re-framing and re-characterization functions of the grammar device. Mizuki uses it in her indirect expression of disagreement with Uchi. Makocchan uses it to hedge and frame his slight apology. Overall, Japanese conflict management styles as represented in *Terrace House* tend to revolve around the maintenance of harmony and protection of others’ faces via indirectness, hedges, and other grammatical devices. This Japanese reality television program demonstrates the reduction and management of conflict. In this episode, Mizuki is the primary agent in this management, but all of the housemates seem to do this. She is just the most prevalent. The show emphasizes that the participants wish to avoid conflict, and when conflict occurs, the participants in *Terrace House* intervene to manage it.

5.2 Conflict Management in an American Reality Television Program

Then, the four examples of American conflict above, though limited, demonstrate a fairly cohesive vision of how *The Real World* presents the flow and management of conflict in its episodes. As seen with the overarching conflict between Puck and the rest of his housemates, this program represents conflict as fairly intense. When conflict talk begins, at least in the first three examples, it only ever seems to escalate in severity. There tends to be no clear outcome except that participants are in more discord with each other than before. This is likely due to the presence of Puck. As a participant, his goal appears to only be to push forward his own agenda, whether that is resisting Rachel’s cleaning advice (and pressing his own technique upon her), attempting to keep Cory from engaging in what he sees as unnecessary complaining, or avoiding

having to write down phone messages for people. The last example is the only one that shows some negotiation in a potential conflict. Admittedly, there is not much disagreement among the housemates in the last example regarding whether or not they have to do something about Puck, but there is some discord surrounding how they should deal with the situation.

Puck, Rachel, and Mohammed use a fair amount of repetition in order to either persuade or emphasize something. This fits in with the functions Rabab'Ah and Abuseileek (2012) found that repetition had in television discourse. Rachel and Mohammed were rather prolific in their use of it in the last example, and it is clear that they were using repetition to influence their peers.

Moreover, narrative examples and generalized rules as a means to redress FTAs were another dimension to the conflict in this episode. When the group is confronting Puck, they present their positive and negative FTAs as generalized rules by using implying that "people should be respectful" (line (3) in 4.2.3). Pedro also uses third person nominals in the narrative example he uses to convince Puck to start taking messages. Statements like these make general rules that apply to everyone, but the implicit meaning behind them is that Puck needs to become more respectful. However, this appears to intensify as opposed to mitigate the conflict.

The Real World represents conflict as primarily individualist (especially in the segments where Puck speaks). The parties involved only attempt to push forward their points of view, and most of the time they have little regard for the others' faces. This tends to result in conflicts that are unresolved. However, in the next episode (where the housemates evict Puck), the conflict is resolved by the intervention of all of the housemates; the last example presented here is the preview of that cooperation between them. It seems that the main problem in the entire episode, and the main roadblock to the resolution of conflict, is Puck. His style is the most aggressive and individualistic of all of them as he often ignores the various counterarguments that his

housemates make.

5.3 Comparing Conflict Styles in *Terrace House* and *The Real World*

Generally, it appears that the main difference between how *Terrace House* versus *The Real World* present conflict is what they emphasize in conflict situations. The Japanese program emphasizes the maintenance of harmony and the avoidance of discord. When Mizuki senses a disagreement with Uchi, she shifts the topic, leaving the disagreement unresolved, but resulting in agreement on something else. In addition, when she heard of a problem due to Makocchan that was having a negative effect on Yuriko, she confronted Makocchan in private in an attempt to resolve the issue. The American program, on the other hand, focuses on escalating discord between the participants (specifically, between Puck and the rest of the housemates), and the eventual direct confrontation of Puck due to that discord. When Puck and Rachel argue over cleaning, the situation only seems to get worse as they mirror each other's statements about their respecting each other's cleaning techniques (while they both ignore their own advice). Then, when Puck argues with Cory about her complaining, Cory attempts to cut off the conflict and then Puck forces her into continuing the argument due to his insistence on his own point of view. When the program does represent the negotiation of a conflict towards a suitable end, it is when the group is discussing how to deal with Puck. The two programs are opposed in their representation of how conflict occurs and resolves.

However, these representations fall in line with both cultural conceptions of how conflict occurs in each country. In Japan, there is the 'myth of harmony' where one might say that conflict does not occur in the island nation; many scholars have disproven this, though, hence the term 'myth' (Jones, 1990; Szatrowski, 2004). Then, in America, one might see conflict as rampant and undergone by assertive individualists (Cai & Fink, 2002). In many ways, both

shows represent conflict styles in line with their country of origin's respective cultural values. If Japan emphasizes loyalty to the group over the individual (Cai & Fink, 2002; Watanabe, 2004), then a show that emphasizes the maintenance of harmony among the group is consistent with that value. Then, if America focuses on the individual over loyalty to the group (Cai & Fink, 2002), then a show that emphasizes more individual conflict styles and a refusal among individuals to give up their own positions is consistent with American values as well.

That is not to say that there are no similarities between each program's representations of conflict styles. Repetition appears to be a key consistency in conflict discourse in both programs. It appears to function both as a persuasive tool as well as something that can emphasize a phrase across both languages (Nakada, 2004; Rabab'Ah & Abuseileek, 2012). Moreover, there is disagreement in both programs expressed as FTAs, although these acts do differ in terms of how direct they tend to be. Participants in *Terrace House* and *The Real World* commit FTAs, but *Terrace House* participants tend to commit them in more indirect ways. In the end, it appears that the answer to the current work's research question is that the shows demonstrate more differences than similarities between young Japanese versus young Americans.

5.4 Reality Television

The question does then come to mind: are these reality television programs at all representative of how conflict functions in actual discourse? First, each show demonstrates discourse that appears to be similar to other examples of conversational discourse. Second and more importantly, as reality television can represent the core of the social world (Pardo, 2013), *Terrace House* and *The Real World* represent, at least in part, a reflection of how the two cultures see themselves, no matter how dramatized that reflection appears to be. An editor did construct the viewers' perceptions of the conflict in the two episodes explored here, but it is

useful to investigate this constructed view of reality.

5.5 Limitations

There are significant limitations to the current work, though. First, there was little inter-coder reliability. An academic advisor (who is a native speaker of Japanese) provided insight at certain points, but a single investigator transcribed the discourse and underwent most of the analysis. Next, the order in which the investigator undertook the methods explained above varied significantly as the analysis progressed, meaning that the investigator applied the method somewhat unevenly. Finally, investigator bias almost certainly presented itself due to both the near-absence of inter-coder reliability and the investigator's primary experience with only one of the languages represented (English); only limited experience with Japanese was in the investigator's skill set. Some grounding in established pragmatic, sociolinguistic, and communication theory did help to offset this bias, however.

5.6 Implications

The primary implication of this work is that it provides new insights on Japanese versus American conflict management styles due to its exploration of a previously unexplored area: reality television programs. The dearth of research comparing these types of shows cross-culturally is probably due to their relative youth compared to other media (talk shows appear to have established themselves much more, especially in Japan). The findings presented here are preliminary, but point to some potential avenues for future research. For one, a further cross-cultural exploration of reality television conflict discourse that involves a larger corpus would likely provide further insights that the small sample here could not provide. Two, one could expand the comparison of Japanese reality television programs to American reality television programs to include a greater variety of shows; the results from the current work are limited to

only the two programs analyzed.

6. Conclusion

Essentially, there are more differences than similarities between conflict styles in a Japanese reality show versus those in an American program. It seems that *Terrace House* focuses on the collectivist ideal of maintaining harmony among the group, whereas *The Real World* focuses on the individualist aspects of engaging in conflict. Japanese interlocutors softened their FTAs in order to avoid discord, and American interlocutors pushed their own arguments, which resulted in more direct FTAs. As such, the cross-cultural difference between the two groups of participants in terms of their conflict styles is that the Japanese strive to maintain harmony, and the Americans focus on more individualistic goals. The current work provides not only an intriguing exploration of heavily dramatized content, but also helps further explicate cross-cultural differences in conflict management styles.

References

- Beck, D., Hellmueller, L. C., & Aeschbacher, N. (2012). Factual entertainment and reality TV. *Communication Research Trends*, 31(2), 4-27.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomenon. In E. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 56 –310). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1999). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. In. A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (pp. 311-323). London: Routledge.
- Cai, D. A. & Fink, E. L. (2002). Conflict style differences between individualists and collectivists. *Communication Monographs*, 69(1), 67-87.
- Cialdini, R. (1984). Weapons of influence. In R. Cialdini, *Influence: The psychology of persuasion* (pp. 1-16). New York, NY: Morrow.
- Dunleavy, K. N., Martin, M. M., Brann, M. Booth-Butterfield, M., Myers, S. A., & Weber, K. (2008). Student nagging behavior in the college classroom. *Communication Education*, 57(1), 1-19. doi:10.1080/03634520701678679
- Eisenberg, A. R. & Garvey, C. (1981). Children's use of verbal strategies in resolving conflicts. *Discourse processes*, 4(2), 149-170. doi:10.1080/01638538109544512
- Graham, S. L. (2006). Disagreeing to agree: Conflict, (im)politeness and identity in a computer-mediated community. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(4), 742-759. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2006.11.017
- Gudykunst, W. B., Yoon, Y. C., & Nishida, T. (1987). The influence of individualism-

- collectivism on perceptions of communication in in-group and out-group relationships. *Communication Monographs*, 54(3), 295-306. doi:10.1080/03637758709390234
- Hasegawa, T. & Gudykunst, W. B. (1998). Silence in Japan and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29(5), 668-684. doi:10.1177/0022022198295005
- Hirose, Y. (2000). Public and private self as two aspects of the speaker: A contrastive study of Japanese and English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(11), 1623-1656. doi:10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00111-3
- Honda, A. (2002). Conflict management in Japanese public affairs talk shows. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(5), 573-608. doi:10.1016/S0378-2166(01)00053-4
- Janai. (n.d.). In *Jisho*. Retrieved from <https://jisho.org/search/%E3%81%98%E3%82%83%E3%81%AA%E3%81%84>
- Jones, K. (1990). *Conflict in Japanese conversation* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Order No. 9116210)
- Jones, K. (2004). Managing topics of conversation in Japanese. In P. Szatrowski (Ed.), *Hidden and open conflict in Japanese conversational interaction* (pp. 29-64). Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.
- Jorden, E. H. & Noda, M. (1988). *Japanese: The spoken language part 2*. New Haven, CT: Yale University.
- Jorden, E. H. & Noda, M. (1990). *Japanese: The spoken language part 3*. New Haven, CT: Yale University.
- Kaiser, S. K. (2001). *Japanese: A comprehensive grammar*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kitao, K., Munsell, P., Kitao, S. K., Yoshida, S., & Yoshida, H. (1987). *An exploratory study of differences between politeness strategies used in requests by Americans and Japanese*

- (Report No. ED284426). (n.p.): Institute of Education Sciences and U.S. Department of Education.
- Krauss, E. S., Rohlen, T. P., & Steinhoff, P. G. (Eds.). (1984). *Conflict in Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Manes, J. & Wolfson, N. (1981). The compliment formula. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Conversational routine: Explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech* (pp. 115-132). The Hague, NL: Mouton.
- Maynard, S. K. (1992). Cognitive and pragmatic messages of a syntactic choice: The case of the Japanese commentary predicate n(o) da. *Text - Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 12(4), 563-614. doi:10.1515/text.1.1992.12.4.563
- Minami, F. (1987). *Keigo*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Misadameru. (n.d.). In *Jisho*. Retrieved from <https://jisho.org/search/%E8%A6%8B%E5%AE%9A%E3%82%81%E3%82%8B>
- Moriizumi, S. & Takai, J. (2010). The relationships between Japanese interpersonal conflict styles and their language expressions. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 150(5), 520-539. doi:10.1080/00224540903365349
- Nakada, T. (1992). Kaiwa no housaku toshiteno kuikaeshi (On repetition within conversational strategy). *Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuu Houkoku (National Institute for Japanese Language)* (Ed.), *Kenkyuu Houkokushuu (Research Reports)*, 13, 267-302.
- Nigosu. (n.d.). In *Jisho*. Retrieved from <https://jisho.org/search/%E3%81%AB%E3%81%94%E3%81%99>
- Nihongo Kijutsu Bunpou Kenkyuukai (2003). *Gendai Nihongo bunpou*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.

- Noda, M. (1990). *The extended predicate and confrontational discourse in Japanese* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Order No. 9106275)
- Noda, M. (2004). Hidden disagreement. In P. Szatrowski (Ed.), *Hidden and open conflict in Japanese conversational interaction* (pp. 95-123). Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.
- Oetzel, J. G., & Ting-Toomey, S. (2003). Face concerns in interpersonal conflict: A cross-cultural empirical test of the Face Negotiation Theory. *Communication Research*, 30(6), 599–624. doi:10.1177/0093650203257841
- Oetzel, J. G., Ting-Toomey, S., Masumoto, T., Yokochi, Y., Pan, X., & Takai, J. (2001). Face and facework in conflict: A cross-cultural comparison of China, Germany, Japan, and the United States. *Communication Monographs*, 68(3), 235–258.
doi:10.1080/03637750128061
- Pardo, R. (2013). Reality television and the metapragmatics of racism. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 23(1), 65-81. doi:10.1111/jola.12007
- Pearson, B. (1988). Power and politeness in conversation: Encoding of face-threatening acts at church business meetings. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 30(1), 68-93.
- Pizziconi, B. (2003). Re-examining politeness, face and the Japanese language. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(10-11), 1471-1506. doi:10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00200-X
- Rabab’Ah, G. & Abuseileek, A. (2012). The pragmatic functions of repetition in TV discourse. *Research in Language*, 10(4), 445-460. doi:10.2478/v10015-012-0004-x
- The Real World* [Television franchise]. (1992-2013). United States: Viacom Media Networks.
- Sung, C. C. M. (2013). Doing gender in conflict talk: An analysis of gendered discourses in a U.S. reality TV show. *Journal of English Studies*, 11, 520-539. doi:10.18172/jes.2625
- Szatrowski, P. (2004). *Hidden and open conflict in Japanese conversational interaction*. Tokyo:

Kurosio Publishers.

Tanaka, H. (2011). Politeness in a Japanese intra-organisational meeting. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 21(1), 60-76. doi:10.1075/japc.21.1.04tan

Tanaka, L. (2004). *Gender, language and culture: A study of Japanese television interview discourse*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Tannen, D. (1984). *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Terrace House [Television franchise]. (2012-2016). Tokyo: Fuji Television. Los Gatos, CA: Netflix.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). Intercultural conflict styles: A face-negotiation theory. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication* (pp. 213-235). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1994). Managing intercultural conflicts effectively. In L. Samovar & R. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (7th ed., pp. 360-372). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Ting-Toomey, S. & Kurogi, A. (1998). Facework competence in intercultural conflict: An updated face-negotiation theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 22(2). 187-225. doi:10.1016/S0147-1767(98)00004-2

Vance, T. J., Kawaura, N., Omura, J., & Riley, B. (Eds.). (1993). *Kodansha's romanized Japanese-English dictionary*. Tokyo: Kodansha International.

Watanabe, S. (2004). Conflict management strategies in Japanese group discussions. In P. Szatrowski (Ed.), *Hidden and open conflict in Japanese conversational interaction* (pp. 65-93). Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.

- Watanabe, Y. C. (2001). *Stuttering in discourse: Interactional management of stuttering moments and identity* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Order No. 3009650)
- Wolfson, N. (1981). Compliments in cross-cultural perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15(2), 117-124. doi:10.2307/3586403

Appendix A

Transcription Key (partially adapted from Tannen, 1984, p. xix):

Note: The current work utilizes a monospace font for spacing purposes.

.. noticeable pause or break in rhythm (less than 0.5 second)

... half second pause, as measured by stop watch, an extra dot added for each half second of pause, hence,

.... full second pause

..... second and a half pause, and so on

underline marks emphatic stress

. marks sentence-final falling intonation

? marks yes/no question rising intonation

: indicates lengthened vowel sound (extra colons indicate greater lengthening)

, marks phrase-final intonation (more to come)

musical notation is used for amplitude and appears under the line:

p piano (spoken softly)

pp pianissimo (spoken very softly)

f forte (spoken loudly)

ff fortissimo (spoken very loudly)

acc spoken quickly

dec spoken slowly

The above notations continue until punctuation, unless otherwise noted

/???/ indicates transcription impossible

/words/ within slashes indicate uncertain transcription

[brackets] are used for comments on quality of speech, context, and translation notes

{ Parallel curly brackets on two successive lines indicate overlapping speech

{ Two people talking at the same time

Offset curly brackets on two lines indicate }

{ second utterance latched
onto first, without
perceptible pause

Appendix B

Japanese Transcriptions

ウッチとみずきのデート (Uchi and Mizuki's Date)

- (01) ウッチ: /何か/悠里子ちゃんにさ:…何か言われたんだよね。
- (02) みずき: 何?
- (03) ウッチ: 「*p* 何か私..たち..*end p* でんびんにかけられてる?」みたいな。
- (04) みずき: うん..見定められてるでしょ?
- (05) ウッチ: { そういうわけじゃないよ。そういうわけじゃないよ。
- (06) みずき: { /???/
- (07) みずき: でもそれこそまこっちゃんが...「三人...と..一人ずつデートするのはおかしい」みたいなこと言ってたらしいよ。[Chuckles]
- (08) ウッチ: あっ..そう?
- (09) みずき: うん。
- (10) ウッチ: 何で?
- (11) みずき: /???/ いやヤキモチじゃない? ただ。
- (12) ウッチ: まあでもね別にみのりちゃんとまこっちゃん付き合ってるわけでもないからね。}
- (13) みずき: { うん。}
- (14) ウッチ: { 俺が }
- (15) みずき: { まだぜんぜん/ね/。}
- (16) ウッチ: { みのりちゃんといくら遊ぼうがね、言われるあれはないから。
- (17) みずき: /確かに/。

ウッチとみずきのデートについて話 (Uchi and Mizuki's Discussion of Their Date)

- (01) ウッチ: でもね打ち解けた感じした今日は。
- (02) ゆき: あ:
- (03) みずき: そうなんだ。
- (04) ウッチ: 思っていない?
- (05) みずき: えっ? 楽しかったよ。
- (06) ウッチ: 楽しかった? }
- (07) ゆりこ?: { うん。 }
- (08) みずき: { とても。
- (09) ウッチ: とてもね。

みずきとゆりこのまこっちゃんの振る舞いについて話 (Discussion between Mizuki and Yuriko regarding Makocchan's behavior)

- (01) みずき: *p* どうしたの? *p* 悠里。
- (02) ゆりこ: うーん。
- (03) みずき: どうした?
- (04) みずき: どうしたの?
- (05) みずき: ティッシュティッシュ 。
- (06) ゆりこ: ごめん。
- (07) みずき: 何があったの?
- (08) ゆりこ: 何かこんがらがってよく...2 分かんないんだけど。 }
- (09) みずき: { うん。
- (10) ゆりこ: 雄基...とのさ..ダンス見に行った終わりにさ。何か家帰ってさまこっちゃん..がリビングにいてさ。 }

- (11) みずき: { あうん。
- (12) ゆりこ: 「ウッチーが..美月とのデートは..何も気使わずに普通に楽しめたけど...
- (13) みずき: うん。
- (14) ゆりこ: 私とのデートの時は..結構気使っちゃったから」みたいな。 }
- (15) みずき: { うん。
- (16) ゆりこ: 「そういうふうに言ってたよ」みたいな...の..をまこっちゃんから聞いて..それで私がもう本当訳分かんなくなって..さっき...男子部屋に行ったん行って..「どうしよっか?」みたいなふうに..いったんだけど...まこっちゃんが「水族館行きたくなさそうだね」みたいな。「行きたくないの?」みたいなふうに言ってきたのも。何かよく分かんなくて。なんかまこっちゃんから..聞聞いた話しで... }
- (17) みずき: { 知ってるでしょってことでしょ? }
- (18) ゆりこ: { そうそうそうそう。ウッチー..からも..「えっどうしたいの?」みたいなふうになって:。何かそのあとにまこっちゃんから..何か LINE 来て、「大丈夫?」みたいな。「ウッチーに話しにくい..ことあったりしたら何かいつでも相談乗るから....部屋とかいるからいつでも呼んでいいよ」みたいな。「悲しんでる/とこ/見たくない」っていうか何て書いてあったか忘れたけど。だから本当に分かんなくて、何でああいう LINE が来たのかも。
- (19) みずき: いやね私ねここ本当に2~3日なんだけど、まこっちゃん悠里子のこと好きなの?って一瞬思ってたの。でも...
- (20) ゆりこ: え..そんな
- (21) みずき: え..分かんない何か考えすぎかな?
- (22) ゆりこ: でも何かもともとみんなにそうじゃない?まこっちゃん。
- (23) みずき: うんうん...
- (24) みずき: まこっちゃんちょっとね私最近よく分かんないからさ。

(25) ゆりこ： う：ん。

(26) みずき： 最近本当に分かんないあの人。

みずきがまこっちゃんに相對した時 (Mizuki's Confrontation of Makocchan)

(01) みずき： ちょっといい？

(02) まこっちゃん： どうした？ビビった。

(03) みずき： 悠里子にさ...

(04) まこっちゃん： うん。

(05) みずき： 「ウッチー....が.../なんか/...氣使うって言ってたよ」 って..言ったでしょ？
あれどういうつもりで言った？

(06) まこっちゃん： 悠里子に？

(07) みずき： うん。

(08) みずき： 男同士でしゃべ..った..話しを..悠里子に陰口みたいに言っちゃった..としたらそれはそれでダサいし、もしね..悠里子のことが..好きっていうか氣になって... }

(09) まこっちゃん： { 俺が？

(10) みずき： そうそう..もしね。で、言ったんだとしても..やり方違うじゃん？それはそれで。それがプラスのことだったらまだいいんだけど、悠里子に対してマイナスな..こともしかしたらショック受けちゃうかもしれない..とかま悠里子に対してそれを考えなかったのかってことと..ウッチーに対して悪いなって思わなかったのかな？っていうのと。お互いがギクシャクしちゃうじゃん。

(11) まこっちゃん： うん。

(12) みずき： 悠里子そんなの氣にしちゃってさ..デートどころじゃないじゃん。「また思われてんのかな？氣使ってんのかな？」って思ったらかわいそうじゃない？もちろんウッチーもかわいそうだけど、まこっちゃんのこと信用してさ多分言ってるだろう

し。

(13) まこっちゃん：「昨日何話したの？」みたいな話しちゃったからさ。 }

(14) みずき： { う：

ん。 }

(15) まこっちゃん： { 言われちゃって。

(16) みずき： にごさなきゃ。

(17) まこっちゃん： でもにごしたらそれについても悠里子も聞いてくるからさ。し始めちゃったのは
悪いんだけどさ。

(18) みずき： うん..どっちにしろ..何かちょっと違くなって思ったから。

(19) まこっちゃん： そっか。

(20) みずき： [Stands up] 発言には責任を持つように。

(21) まこっちゃん： はい。

(22) みずき： お休み。 [Leaves the room]

(23) まこっちゃん： 何だよ。