

## *Original Paper*

# From Teachers' Minds to Speakers' Minds in the Applications to Psychology and Philosophy, Connected to Sociolinguistics in the Ways of Interactions for Better Relationships to Make Parts of Narratives

Eri Kondo<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A researcher in linguistics, Nagoya-city, Aichi, Japan

Received: February 5, 2022      Accepted: February 21, 2022      Online Published: March 23, 2022

doi:10.22158/fce.v3n1p1

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/fce.v3n1p1>

### ***Abstract***

*This paper is focused on discourse analyses that give us an insight that there is a cultural difference in showing empathy in dialogues from the issue of sociolinguistics. It would be based on further investigations and promotions to learn actual interactions as usages of languages, which is connected to a problem of bilingualism. The way to construct a conversation well shows a cultural view to give empathy in dialogues. This paper reveals the discourse frames in Japanese and American dialogues, related to frames of self of “we”, “you”, and “I”. It is significant for us to notice that these frames appear in expressions and discourse structures as speakers and hearers. It puts forward an investigation of ways with which people interact.*

### ***Keywords***

*psychology, philosophy, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis*

## **1. Introduction**

Many problems in education may have been left behind although things are gradually changing for the better. The issues on improving learning abilities and on advancing inferential thinking for obtaining an identity have been still controversial. Recently researchers have tended to find the relation between teaching methods and the effect on learning outcomes from an approach of classroom-based research projects. As a method, Johnson & Johnson (1994) propose that a cooperative learning against an individualism with a competitiveness is quite effective. Sugie Eds. (2016) suggest that learning through enough experiences would achieve a high ability of performances for all learners.

Surely teachers are mainly trained, based on their academic basis that is related to the way of learning in the psychological direction. However, there might be a distinction between how teachers think and how learners think in the same situations. Teachers want a focus from learners, and learners want a certain development. Novik & Gowin (1984, p. 7) draw an outline of ideas in teaching and learning by mentioning that “it is important to distinguish between the type of instructional strategy we employ and the kind of learning process in which the student is engaged”. A meaningful side is connected to “autonomous discovery learning (p. 7)”. If it is correct, it is indicative for learners to notice what is meant in a context as their discovery. Robinson (2002) roughs out a leadership of teachers, weighting up an idea that “school-wide, departmental, team and individual teacher goals should be informed by careful analysis of students’ learning needs (p. 76)”. The issue is sketched out as an ability of problem-solving. At this point, learning should be focused on the advanced function from a psychological aspect. Evans & Over (1996) bring out the best in an explanation through drawing that “reasoning and decision making are topics of central importance in the study of human intelligence and the starting point for any understanding of human rationality should be behavioural” (p. 1). Then, this paper suggests that teachers should recognize that it is more desirable for learners to acquire a skill in ordinary days in acquiring a second language; therefore, the analysis takes up a cultural difference in proceeding conversations, based on a Goffman (1981)’s proposal of a framework in operations of talks. It is related with the mixed tendency to sociolinguistics, sociologies, and philosophy. McKay & Rubdy (2011, p. 9) provide an illuminating explanation of how social and sociolinguistic contexts interact with language learning and teaching, in a state of that “in examining the social context of language learning, we focus on how language teaching contexts are affected by the larger social, political, and educational setting in which the teaching takes place”. It is certain that there is a limited proficiency in the research of Spanish-English bilinguals (Robinson & Altarriba, 2018) and Turkish-Germany bilinguals against monolinguals who criticize bilingualism. If so, it is excellent that teaching and learning are connected to sociolinguistics.

## 2. Literature Review

Sociolinguists who analyze conversations have attempted to specify the relationship between language and culture from the viewpoint of the structure of language (Austin, 1962; Goffman, 1967, 1981; Grice, 1975; Ide, 1992; Tannen, 1993; Young, 1994; Wardhaugh, 1998). Goffman (1981, p. 10) firmly establishes a connection between talks and functions, on behalf of that “a basic normative assumption about talk is that, whatever else, it should be correctly interpretable in the special sense of conveying to the intended recipients what the sender more or less wanted to get across”. In addition, it is noted that “we have a social encounter that ritually regularized the risks and opportunities face-to-face talk provides, enforcing the standards of modesty regarding self and considerateness for others generally enjoined in the community (p. 19)”. As it can be seen in the talks of (1) and (2), tolerable and adequate responses are relevant. Moreover, Goffman also adds that “when an individual is engaged in talk, some

of his utterances and nonlinguistic behavior will be taken to have a special temporal relevance, being directed to others present as something he wants assessed, appreciated, understood (p. 71)".

(1) A: "The store was closed by the time you got out?"

B: "Darn it. I'm afraid it was."

etc...

A: "The store was closed by the time you got out?"

B: "It was open but they won't have any 'til next week".

etc...

(Goffman, 1981, p. 59)

(2) A: "The store was closed by the time you got out?"

B: [Striking head] "God. I'm sorry. I'm hopeless."

etc...

(Goffman, 1981, p. 59)

Today, as a theory known well, the Worfian hypothesis is introduced. Whorf (1941) finds that the structure of language controls the way in which the speakers view the world; therefore, it seems that the person who speaks a different language has another view of the world. The theory is based on that the recognition through linguistic forms is unconsciously developed, connected with the linguistic thoughts of the cultural group. This assumption is now widely accepted. Be that as it may, there may be a liability in discourse structures. Schiffrin (1994) carries out an explanatory study of something not previously researched. The observation is treated as a judgement from interactional sociolinguistics. On the basis of the opinion, discourse structures are belonging to two significances of structural and functional effects. Especially, as the functional moment, it is likely said that we include "structure of speech (act, event) as ways of speaking" and "elements and structures as ethnographically appropriate" in the approach (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 21). As an emphasis, Schiffrin also notes that "speaking for another is an act whose meaning is also interactionally situated", in the sense that "although space prevents us from a full examination of the interactive meanings of speaking for others, this act seems to be interpreted depending upon how the transfer of responsibility for speaking is achieved (p. 109)". Moreover, Goffman (1981) and Schiffrin (1994) refer to self talks and an implication of self as a social act. It is assured that there is an interpretation that metacognitive behaviors are related to the recognition of self which is connected to sociology and philosophy of mind from Descartes (2002). This paper investigates the cultural difference from discourse structures.

Watanabe (1993) explains a cultural aspect of framing by showing differences between American and Japanese speakers in their ways of framing of speech. The notion of framing in discourse is also defined by Tannen (1993). She said that "at the same time that expectations make it possible to perceive and interpret objects and events in the world, they shape those perceptions to the model of world provided by them (p. 21)". Therefore, it is noticeable that we find the frame through analyses of discourse. Then, of course, it relies on the discussion of structures of sentences teachers always teach as

grammatical forms. For example, at the meaning of sentence (3), it is assumed that the speaker often conveys each meaning through phrases and words as (4) and (5). In the word order, the explanation to medicine or drugs happens at the same time. Especially, at ordinary conversations, speakers usually do not use the complete syntax. In this respect, there may be a distinction between speaking and writing systems.

(3) Hi, Miyake, I go to the hospital once a month to get medicine for insomnia.

(4) Hi, Miyake,

I go to the hospital,

Well, once a month,

Uh, to get medicine

Because of insomnia, you know

(5) Miyake,

Ore byouin ni iku

Tsuki ichi

Kusuri nano

Fumin de

We should discover the habitual view of the world through the language, that is, the frame by analyzing the form of languages. It will contribute to building the communicative relationships between different cultures.

Firstly, Makino (1978) can explain a moderation between speakers and speakers' viewpoints by analyzing structures of language. His study is based on the Whorfian hypothesis as the proposed theory. He points out a different stance between Japanese and English (p. 49). In addition, he finds that an independent view of the speaker is clearly particular in Japanese conversations. Moreover, he mentions that these focuses suggest that empathy and an identity appear as a base in a conversation; therefore, it obviously means that there is a person who operates a conversation, having empathy (p. 51). His exploration insights that Japanese tend to show empathy more than English (p. 49).

Next, Suzuki (1975) also states that a speaker does not consider a hearer as a partner from the subjective side of himself, and it often focuses on a situation of the third person of *we* that identifies another self psychologically in Japanese (p. 49). In addition, he defines the feature in Japanese as "empathetic identification". Moreover, Lebra (1976) sets out Japanese culture in an "*omoiyari* ('empathy') culture (p. 38)". She defines it as that "*omoiyari* refers to the ability and willingness to feel what others are feeling, to vicariously experience the pleasure or pain that they are undergoing, and to help them satisfy their wishes (p. 38)". Further, as a feature of '*omoiyari* ('empathy')' in a conversation, she finds that "the speaker does not complete a sentence but leaves it open-ended (p. 38)".

Finally, it is helpful to describe the previous study in patterns of conversation in Japanese and English before moving on to the main research. It clarifies “*omoiyari* (‘empathy’)” proposed by Lebra (1976) from the view of a pattern. Mizutani (1993), first, demonstrates that the pattern of Japanese dialogue does not agree with that of English dialogue. She defines the pattern of Japanese dialogue as “co-construction”. Japanese interlocutors continue their talks cooperatively as a base on the common assumption (p. 9). She focuses on the fact that Japanese speakers do not finish one utterance completely, but speakers and hearers make one utterance cooperatively (p. 6). On the other hand, Mizutani mentions that English speakers finish their utterances perfectly, and hearers wait for them to finish and begin their utterances (p. 6). Next, Sunakawa (1999) reports that there is a difference in the models of Japanese and American conversations. She mentions that the pattern of Japanese is named as a “*Norishiro* (‘flap for pasting’)” Model, while that of English is a Jigsaw-Puzzle Model. The theory agrees with the explanation by Mizutani (1993) in respect to a classification whether there is an overlap or not. She put forward that “when we have two pieces of paper to be pasted together, we usually need some overlap in order to make them into one larger sheet (p. 18)”. Moreover, she adds that “when we play with a jigsaw puzzle, we try to keep finding appropriate pieces that should be embedded in the complete picture (p. 23)”. It shows that the overlap is not significant in English.

The ultimate aim of this paper is to investigate how people interact with each other in dialogues. It means how a person gives a care between interlocutors in their first language and how people communicate with each other in each frame of discourse. In this paper, the primary concern aims to observe how people show their empathy in dialogues. In addition, the analyses are focused on finding specific sociocultural differences in speakers.

This study focused on two aspects of interactions. One is a self, and another is empathy. A dialogue requires at least two speakers. When the two speakers begin a conversation, they have a consciousness of “you”, “I”, and “we” in dialogues. The cognition is psychological and philosophical. If a conversation is once begun, the speaker regularly builds up the three pieces of the recognitions of “you”, “I”, and “we”. They are aware of the issue that these three faces are independent. Empathy means that a speaker is associated with a hearer cooperatively. Or a speaker regards oneself as sharing the same characteristic in feeling with a hearer. Here, this paper suggests the following hypotheses:

- a) Empathy shows itself in dialogues.
- b) There is a difference between Japanese and English, in ways of showing empathy.
- c) The difference provides a distinction in ways of psychological side.

### 3. Methodology

This study uses video-recorded talk shows in Japanese and American English as its research materials. The channels of the programs used in this study are CNN, TV-Asahi and NHK.

- i) Larry King Live on CNN
- ii) Tetsuko no Heya on TV-Asahi  
Toppu Rannar on NHK

In these talk shows, the guests are invited to the hosts' programs and talk to the hosts about their business or private lives. Concerning the American talk show, the interviewer is Larry King, who is an aged disk jockey. The five guests are listed in the following chart:

**Table 1. List of Participants**

Program	Interviewers	Guests	Occupation	Age
A-A	AH1	AG1	Designer	50's
A-B	AH1	AG2	Actor	60's
A-C	AH1	AG3	Anchor	50's
A-D	AH1	AG4	Novelist	30's
A-E	AH1	AG5	Spiritual leader	60's

Next, concerning the two Japanese talk shows, in one program, the interviewer is Tetsuko Kuroyanagi, who is a 60's TV personality and in another program, the interviewer is Senri Ooe, who is a 30's musician. The five guests are listed in the following chart:

**Table 2. List of Participants**

Program	Interviewers	Guests	Occupation	Age
J-A	JH1	JG1	Actress	50's
J-B	JH1	JG2	Announcer	30's
J-C	JH2	JG3	Actor	40's
J-D	JH2	JG4	Ballet dancer	30's
J-E	JH2	JG5	Actress	40's

Ten talk dialogues from the three programs are video-recorded. Removing the first five minutes, the following thirty-minute conversation is convenient as data for this study. Next, these recordings are transcribed according to the Transcription Convention taken from Hashiuchi (1999, pp. 41-42).

#### 4. Analysis

The occurrences of showing empathy in dialogues give us a difference between Japanese and English. The analyses demonstrate how one interlocutor emphasizes with another one. Japanese hosts took a longer time than American ones to change a topic in talks.

In this section, this paper analyzes the data from the view of following-up by hosts to guests in English and Japanese talk shows. First, Japanese hosts talk frequently about their own experiences in the talk shows. It means that the hosts empathize with the guests and that the hosts follow up the guests by showing empathy in giving words.

(6)

01 JG: Bokuha sibu sibu yatte ta,

02 mitai na tokoro arimasu.

03 JH: Saishoha.

04 JG: Ee.

05 JH: Mata, are desuyo ne. Sono boku piano mo sou

06 dattan desu kedo, minna de yakuyu toka iku noni,

07 dansi dousi. Sore wo hitori nukete, mainichi

08 renshuu sinakya ikenai nde, nani yatte ru no,

09 [omae, mitai na.]

10 JG: [Aa, arimasu ne, ee]

11 JH: piano, onna ga yaru mono yatte [ru], mitaina.

12 JG: [Ee.]

(the English translation)

01-02 JG: I have done it unwillingly.

03 JH: At first.

04 JG: Yes.

05-09 JH: I also have had a similar feeling in piano. Everyone was playing baseball, but I got out of it and I had to practice piano everyday. They said, 'what are you doing?'

10 JG: Um-huh. So did I. Yes.

11 JH: They also said that you did the thing women did, that is, piano.

12 JG: Uh-huh.

This is an example from a Japanese talk show between JH (a man, a singer) and JG (a man, a ballet-dancer). JH and JG talk about lessons in their childhood. JG talks about the lesson in ballet, while JH talks about that in piano. At 01-02, JG gives JH information that he disliked the lesson in ballet. It is a first step to these talks. At 03, JH gives empathy to JG, which is a sign to understand the plot. At 05-09, JH begins to talk about his experience about the lesson in piano. JH shows that he had the same experience as JG had in the lesson of ballet. This suggests one feature of a way to show empathy in a Japanese dialogue. First, the Japanese host seeks out a topic that he can show empathy

from the guest's conversation. Next, the host introduces his experience. The host needs to select the topic with which the guest can emphasize. Then, the host begins to talk about his unwilling experience in the piano lesson.

(7)

01 JH: Demo jyampu dekiru you ni natta to iu koto

02 ha zuibun jyouzu de su yo ne.

03 JG: jya maa minna simasu keredo ne.

04 JH: jya a demo naka naka ne e.

05 Watashi keiba no kishu ni narou to omotte yatte ta

06 koto aru n desu kredo mo [ne].

07 JG: [Ee].

08 JH: demo maa yatte ta ra ba, haha ga anata jyampu

09 suru toki doumo ochi [sou] na ki ga suru [tte]

10 JG: [Ee,] [ee].

11 JH: itte [ne]. Yamete kure nai ka tte iu kara ne.

12 JG: [Hai hai].

13 JH: Sore de yame ta n desu keredo mo ne.

14 Dakara jyampu site ru kata miru to sugoi na a to

15 omou n desu keredo ne.

16 JG: Taimingu ga ne yappari aru n desu yone.

(the English translation)

01-02 JH: Are you an expert in horseback riding because you can jump, aren't you?

03 JG: No, I am not. Everyone can do it.

04 JH: No. It is not easy.

05-06 JG: I have wanted to be a jockey.

07 JH: Um-huh.

08-15 JG: However, my mother said that she felt that you seemed to fall

when you jumped and asked me to give it up. Therefore, I gave it up.

When I see the person jump, I think that he is an expert.

16 JG: There is a timing to jump.

This is another example from a Japanese talk show between JH (a woman, a host) and JG (a woman, an announcer). JH and JG talk about their experience in horseback riding. The main topic here is that JG has done the horseback riding in her school days. This is a dialogue that a host follows up a guest by which a host introduces her own experience to a guest. This host's experience represents empathy. The show of empathy is connected to a common experience and feelings. It is defined as a strategy in Japanese talks. In the American talk shows, this characteristic is not seen. American hosts never introduce their own experiences. This difference proves the hypothesis (b).



Moreover, this characteristic in Japanese dialogues clarifies the issue that there is an overlap in a topic, which is related with Mizutani (1993) and Sunakawa (1999). Japanese point out the topic which the interlocutors can emphasize with each other when they proceed with conversations cooperatively. To put it more concretely, interlocutors confirm empathy to the partner by rephrasing that “I am also doing so” or “I also have such an experience”. As result, they complete and maintain the consciousness that is “we have a similar experience and can have empathy mutually”. As for cognition, finally, the series of ways of empathy in Japanese means that the maintenance of spatial cognition of “we”. Makino (1978) gives an exploration of mixing a subjective side with an objective side to the loss of the perspective (p. 48). That is, Japanese tend to maintain the view of “we”. This agrees with “empathetic identification” defined by Suzuki (1975). These results seem to prove the hypothesis (a).

Next, there is a characteristic that a host proposes a guest a following word when a guest hesitates about continuing utterances or pauses. It expresses that a host shows empathy to a guest and goes through a conversation by the proposal. This feature agrees with the idea of Sunakawa (1999).

(8)

01 AH: A terrific lady worked for you. You haven't spoken much about it,

02 but it's been some time now, and I'd like you to ask about her

03 because we met her. Carolyn Bessette Kennedy, who died with her husband

04 in that plane crash, worked for you in what capacity.

05 AG: I really haven't talked .. and you know. I mean

06 I've not talked about this to anyone and had no idea that you would even ask me.

07 Carolyn was someone I found in Boston, actually, in one Boston store,

08 and offered her a job in New York to work with people that needed some special

09 attention because ...

10 AH: VIPs

11 AG: Yes, it may be because we were doing clothes for a film or for a personal

12 appearance or certain, you know, it was really a personal thing.

This is an example from an American English talk show between AH (a man, a disk jockey) and AG (a man, a designer). AH and AG talk about Carolyn Kennedy. At 01-04, AH refers to the relationship between AG and her, and asks AG about her by saying clearly, “I'd like you to ask about her”. It is the first step to this talk. At 05-09, AG answers AH's question. At 10, AH offers a new appropriate utterance from “because”. It is certain that the host's proposal makes the guest extend the following story of the guest. This is a strategy.

(9)

01 AG: So the combination of yoga ...

02 AH: and Buddhism, right?

03 AG: Yes, as you will see, it is really worthwhile,

04 yoga practice as well as the sort of positive mental training.

This is another example from an American English talk show between AH (a man, a disk jockey) and AG (a man, a spiritual leader). AG hesitates, then AH offers a new appropriate utterance to follow up AG.

## 5. Discussion

The occurrences of empathy have been examined. Japanese and English data have represented different results in the way they overlap in a topic. In Japanese, the interlocutor shows empathy by introducing own experiences to another one. Japanese in dialogues always select a topic which can have empathy with each other. According to the analysis of data, the Japanese have the consciousness to agree with the statements strongly more than to show an argument which is personal in it. It clarifies that Japanese tend to maintain the cognition of 'we' by the display of empathy. In English, one interlocutor shows empathy by proposing the following word. The important point to note is a respect of sequence in dialogues. In English, a host and a guest have clear roles as a recognition. An interlocutor gives a view of "you". Suzuki (1975, p. 53) defines self-recognition as "the absolute self regulation". Next, the results reveal a difference in discourse frames such as a prototypical frame in Japanese dialogues of "we talk" and American ones of "you and I talk" respectively.

As a philosophical discussion, it is possible to serve two analyses on these sociolinguistic findings in interactions. First, Descartes (2002, p. 10) mentions that "so after considering everything very thoroughly, I must finally conclude that this proposition, I am, I exist, is necessarily true whenever it is put forward by me or conceived in my mind" and adds that "but I do not yet have a sufficient understanding of what this 'I' is, that now necessarily exists". At this stance, it is inevitable for speakers to know the way of interactions to show the self. Next, Williamson (2005, p. 95) insists that "forms of context-relativity" are related to judge propositional values of truth or false. From this logic, it is natural that speakers should give statements to interpret utterances.

As a psychological application to this argument to explain them exactly, a conversation continues, having developed abilities for inferences and analogies that do not show a stupidity in interpretations. Then, it is better to gain just a theory for the condition in interactions of conversations. Holyosak & Morrison (2005) suggest that we should recognize cognitive abilities of reasoning and conceptualizing in thinking. This paper concludes that it is a benefit to learn the structure of discourse against the shutdown of minds to connect to self-talks.

As the sociological point, it would open another view to an identical self. Goffman (1963, p. 2) commands that "society establishes the means of categorizing persons and the complement of attributes felt to be ordinary and natural for members of each of these categories" and adds that "social settings establish the categories of persons likely to be encountered there". For example, we sing a song at a music class, then we must learn the parts and tempos. At the same time, it is adequate that we should establish the social identity for business persons.

To this end, these arguments may fundamentally prove the hypothesis (c): the difference provides a distinction in ways of psychological side. Therefore, we need further academic investigations that relate to psychology, philosophy, and sociolinguistics.

## 6. Conclusion

This study has represented the findings which analyze the cultural difference in cognition and the way of showing empathy in Japanese and English dialogues. The main findings are based on that Japanese proceed with the dialogues with the frame “we talk” and that English do with the frame “you and I”. Japanese tend to have a conscious of “we” in a conversation. On the other hand, English has a tendency of having a frame of “you and I talk”. These results of data have clarified the differences in overlaps of a topic as well as two frames. This study contributes to the interpretations of the different matter of showing empathy, in a state of speakers to change a new topic that related to social and cultural differences. I hope that this study helps us to be aware of how people in dialogues interact with each other. In addition, I believe that the understanding of it reveals a new realization for successful relationships in cases of job seeking and meeting. Further study on cultural framing in dialogues are demanded, based on miscommunicated situations.

Eri Kondo has a master degree in linguistics at the graduate school of JWU in Tokyo. This paper is based on the thesis of bachelor approved by Sachiko Ide.

## References

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Chafe, W. (1980). *The pear stories: Cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production*. New Jersey: ALEX Publishing Corporation.
- Descartes, R. (2002). Mediations on first philosophy. In J. C. David (Ed.), *Philosophy of mind* (pp. 10-20). NY: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, J., & David, E. O. (1996). *Rationality and reasoning*. Sussex: Psychology Press.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. NY: A touchstone book.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual*. NY: Pantheon.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Grice, H. (1975). Logic and conversation. In Cole & Morgan (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3, speech acts., pp. 41-58). NY: Academic Press. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368811\\_003](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368811_003)
- Hashiuchi, T. (1999). *Disukoosu [Discourse]*. Tokyo: Kurocio Shuppan.
- Hayashi, R. (1996). *Cognition, empathy, and interaction: Floor management of English and Japanese conversation*. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

- Holyoak, K., & Robert, G. M. (2005). Thinking and reasoning: A reader's guide. In J. H. Keith, & G. M. Robert (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of thinking and reasoning* (pp. 1-12). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ide, S. (1992). On the notion of wakimae: Toward an integrated framework of linguistic politeness. In T. Michiko (Ed.), *kotoba no mozaiku* (pp. 298-305). Tokyo: MLS.
- Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (1994). *The new circle of learning*. Virginia: ASCD.
- Lebra, T. (1976). *Japanese patterns of behavior*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9780824846404>
- Makino, S. (1978). *Kotoba to kuukan*. Tokyo: Tokai Daigaku Shuppankai.
- McKay, S., & Rani, R. (2011). The social and sociolinguistic contexts of language learning and teaching. In L. Michael, & D. Catherine (Eds.), *The handbook of language teaching* (pp. 9-25). Oxford: Wiley-blackwell.
- Mizutani, N. (1993). Kyoowa kara taiwa he. *Nihongogaku*, 12(4), 4-10.
- Novak, J., & Bob, G. (1984). *Learning how to learn*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139173469>
- Robinson, C., & Jeanette, A. (2018). The psycholinguistics of bilingualism. In A. Jeanette, & H. Roberto (Eds.), *An introduction to bilingualism: Principles and processes* (pp. 69-92). NY: Routledge.
- Robinson, V. (2002). Excellence in educational leadership: Practices, capabilities and virtues that foster improved student outcomes. In B. Tony (Ed.), *Principles of educational leadership and management* (pp. 73-92). Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sugie, S. (Ed.). (2016). *Active learning in cooperative learning*. Tokyo: Meiji.
- Sunakawa, C. (1999). *Norishiro vs. jigsaw-puzzle: A comparative study of co-construction in advising discourse* (Unpublished M.A. thesis). Japan Women's University.
- Suzuki, T. (1975). *Kotoba to shakai*. Tokyo: Chuukou Gyousha.
- Tannen, D. (1993). *Framing in discourse*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Wardhaugh, R. (1998). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Watanabe, S. (1993). Cultural differences in framing: American and Japanese group discussions. In *Deborah Tannen* (pp. 176-209).
- Whorf, B. L. (1941). The relation of habitual thought and behavior to language. In L. Sapier (Ed.), *Language, culture, and personality* (pp. 9-49). Wisconsin: Sapier Memorial Publication Fund.
- Williamson, T. (2005). Knowledge, context, and the agent's point of view. In P. Gerhard, & P. Georg (Eds.), *Contextualism in philosophy: Knowledge, meaning, and truth* (pp. 91-114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Young, L. (1994). *Crosstalk and culture in sino-American communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511519901>