

Politeness in Conversation between Native and Non-Native Japanese Speakers
in a First-Meeting Context

By

Rie Shirakawa

A Master's Thesis submitted to
The Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the degree of

Master of Arts

School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

September 2008

©Copyright 2008, Rie Shirakawa



Library and
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*
ISBN: 978-0-494-43493-2
Our file *Notre référence*
ISBN: 978-0-494-43493-2

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.


Canada

Abstract

In order to examine how advanced learners of Japanese realize the Japanese honorific system in an actual conversation, the present study focuses on their use of polite and non-polite forms. The study aims at exploring the actual effect of these usages by learners, but not limited to viewing them from a traditional perspective, which emphasizes the level of politeness at a sentence level, but by investigating characteristic discourse features in Japanese such as speech level. The study employs a case study methodology within a qualitative research framework. The participants, who are advanced learners of Japanese, conversed with a native Japanese speaker who is a stranger to them. Results from the study show deviations from the Japanese norm, but they also suggest that learners may have their own value system and employ it in conversation with Japanese. Some implications for cross-cultural communication and language teaching are drawn from these findings.

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my gratitude to all the people who helped me to complete the thesis. Without their sincere help, I could not have attempted the thesis.

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor, Professor David Wood, who always encouraged me for over a year. He provided me with creative ideas and thoughts whenever I needed. I thank him that he trusted me and waited for me when I was overwhelmed with many tasks that I had to handle when I just started teaching and writing this thesis at the same time. He is the educator that I would like to become.

Second, I thank all my participants who contributed their precious time to the data collection which is the core of this research. Without their participation, I could have faced difficulties in completing the thesis. For the participants who were advanced learners of Japanese, I thank them for their time and contribution to the interview process. They gave me valuable and insightful thoughts on the conversations that they had. In addition, I thank the Japanese native speaker who had conversations with ten learners of Japanese despite her tight schedule.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my family, especially my mother, Keiko and my best partner, Hirofumi. My mother, Keiko, always cared about me in Japan. For Hirofumi, I cannot express my gratitude in a few words. He has been always with me and encouraged me, but never pushed me. I am sure that I could not have completed the entire process of the master degree, including this thesis, without him. He is the best supporter and partner for me.

With this tremendous support from various persons, I produced this thesis. I appreciate all of them.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgement	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
List of Tables	vii
List of Appendices.....	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Background of the Study.....	6
<i>Definitions</i>	7
<i>Japanese Honorific System and Honorifics</i>	7
<i>Polite Form and Non-Polite Form</i>	8
<i>Discourse Politeness</i>	10
<i>Speech-Level Shift</i>	12
<i>Traditional Studies on Politeness and Japanese</i>	13
<i>Japanese Language and Society</i>	13
<i>Japanese Honorific System</i>	16
<i>Studies of Politeness in Japanese</i>	21
<i>Politeness Theory and Japanese</i>	23
<i>Universal Politeness Theory</i>	24
<i>Oppositions to Politeness Theory</i>	28
<i>Agreements with Politeness Theory</i>	32
<i>Pragmatic Politeness to Discourse Politeness</i>	38
<i>Politeness and Learners of Japanese</i>	42
<i>Cross-Cultural Miscommunication in Japanese</i>	42
<i>Learners and the Japanese Honorific System</i>	44
<i>Discourse Politeness and Learners</i>	47
<i>Research Questions</i>	50
Chapter 3: Methodology	54
<i>Design of the Study</i>	54
<i>Pilot Studies</i>	57
<i>Participants</i>	57
<i>Procedures</i>	57
<i>Analysis and Results</i>	59
<i>Participants</i>	61
<i>Non-Native Speakers (NNSs)</i>	61
<i>Japanese Native Speaker (JNS)</i>	63
<i>Data Collection</i>	64
<i>Conversational Data</i>	65
<i>Follow-up Interview</i>	66
<i>Data Analysis</i>	66
Chapter 4: Findings and Discussions.....	71
<i>Findings from Conversation: The Features and Change of Ways of Speaking</i>	72
<i>Overview of Conversation Data</i>	73
<i>Ben</i>	84
<i>Tom</i>	86

<i>Robert</i>	87
<i>Lena</i>	87
<i>Ken</i>	88
<i>Anna</i>	88
<i>Findings from Interview: Assessment, Decisions and Awareness of the Shift of Forms</i>	89
<i>Overall View of Interview Data</i>	90
<i>Ben</i>	100
<i>Tom</i>	101
<i>Robert</i>	102
<i>Lena</i>	104
<i>Ken</i>	106
<i>Anna</i>	108
<i>Discussion</i>	109
<i>Polite Speech and Decision of Linguistic Behaviors</i>	110
<i>Learners and Speech-Level Shift</i>	111
<i>Learner's Data Features from Discourse Politeness Perspective</i>	113
<i>Limitations of the Study</i>	115
Chapter 5: Conclusion and Implications.....	118
<i>Implications</i>	120
<i>Further Studies</i>	123
Appendix A.....	124
Appendix B.....	126
Appendix C.....	128
Appendix D.....	130
References.....	131

List of Tables

Table 1 Japanese Honorifics System and Honorifics	8
Table 2 Referent and Address Types of Polite Expressions	18
Table 3 Summary of the Participants' Backgrounds	62
Table 4 Sample of Transcription.....	68
Table 5 Total Number of Utterances and Those in C1 and C2.....	73
Table 6 Excerpt from Ben's C2	75
Table 7 Excerpt from Anna's C1	76
Table 8 The Ratio of Utterances of both JNS and the NNS Participants in C1.....	78
Table 9 The Ratio of Utterances of both JNS and the NNS Participants in C2.....	78
Table 10 The Ratio of Each Type of Utterance of JNS in C1 and C2.....	79
Table 11 The Ratio of Each Type of Utterance of the NNS Participants in C1	80
Table 12 The Ratio of Each Type of Utterance of the NNS Participants in C2	81
Table 13 The Number of Speech-Level Shifts by the NNS Participants.....	82
Table 14 The Ratio of Each Type of Utterance of Ben in C1 and C2	84
Table 15 Excerpt from Ben's C2.....	85
Table 16 The Ratio of Each Type of Utterance of Tom in C1 and C2	86
Table 17 Excerpt from Tom's C2	86
Table 18 The Ratio of Each Type of Utterance of Robert in C1 and C2.....	87
Table 19 The Ratio of Each Type of Utterance of Lena in C1 and C2.....	87
Table 20 The Ratio of Each Type of Utterance of Ken in C1 and C2.....	88
Table 21 The Ratio of Each Type of Utterance of Anna in C1 and C2.....	88
Table 22 Main Questions for the Follow-up Interview	90
Table 23 Summary of Interview Data.....	90
Table 24 Excerpt from Ken's C1	92
Table 25 Excerpt from Anna's C1	93
Table 26 Excerpt from Ben's C1	94
Table 27 Excerpt from Tom's C1	95
Table 28 Excerpt from Robert's C1.....	95
Table 29 Summary of Ben's Answers for Interview	101
Table 30 Summary of Tom's Answers for Interview	101
Table 31 Summary of Robert's Answers for Interview.....	102
Table 32 Summary of Lena's Answers for Interview.....	104
Table 33 Summary of Ken's Answers for Interview.....	106
Table 34 Summary of Anna's Answers for Interview.....	108
Table 35 Summary of Data.....	110

List of Appendices

Appendix A Basic Transcription System for Japanese (BTSJ)	124
Appendix B Sample Questions for Follow-Up Interview	126
Appendix C Background Information Sheet (Non-Native Speaker)	128
Appendix D Background Information Sheet (Native Speaker)	130

Chapter 1: Introduction

When people communicate with others, politeness is always a consideration. All cultures recognize this and it is reflected in the use of appropriate language. In English, for example, when one perceives a situation which requires politeness, ‘Could you ...?’ is often used in requests, while ‘Can you ...?’ may be used when one requests from someone who is at a relatively close social distance. Japanese language is not an exception in terms of such use of polite language.

Politeness study of Japanese language from a sociolinguistic perspective has intensified over a number of decades. Its central focus has been the Japanese honorific system (Kikuchi, 1997; Martin, 1964; Neustupny, 1972; Shibatani, 1990) since the system constitutes the polite part of Japanese language. Thus, politeness study of Japanese has typically involved the study of the Japanese honorific system. These traditional studies have largely succeeded in labeling the levels of politeness embedded in the honorific system. The honorific system, on one hand, is considered essential knowledge for a Japanese native speaker (NS henceforth), and without it, one may be considered ill-educated or unsophisticated (Hagino, 2005; Maynard, 1997; Neustupny, 1982). On the other hand, it is also considered one of the most difficult aspects of Japanese language (Carroll, 2005; Coulmas, 1992; Kindaichi, 2003; Niyekawa, 1991; Usami, 2001c; Ujihara, 1997; Wetzel, 2004).

There are two major types of honorifics in the honorific system: referent and addressee types. In particular, NSs struggle with the use of referent types when they learn them at school (Kikuchi, 1997; Sei, 2006). Niyekawa (1991) describes it as “much like a second language” for NSs (p. 147). Due to this difficulty, even NSs do not merely acquire

that type of honorific by exposure alone, but require focused instruction in the process of education and socialization. The acquisition of a certain type of honorific within the entire system is so complex for NSs that the Japanese publishing market for books and materials for instruction in proper use of the specific type of honorifics is a steady source of sales and profits (Carroll, 2005; Coulmas, 1992; Maynard, 1997; Wetzel, 2004). These publications are targeted to NSs, particularly those who are university graduates entering the work force, or workers who are uneasy about their use of the type of honorifics. In addition, training in the use of the type of honorifics is frequently offered on the job in many professions (Maynard, 1997; Shirado, Marumoto, Murata & Ishihara, 2006; Ujihara, 1997).

Since the proper use of a certain type of honorifics is complex and problematic for NSs, who have a considerable amount of social exposure, it stands to reason that non-native speakers (NNS henceforth) can easily be overwhelmed in the process of learning the Japanese honorific system including the specific type of honorifics. In particular, learners outside Japan are likely to struggle with it more than those who are in Japan, since they have significantly less social exposure to this critical but difficult aspect of the language. Meanwhile, cross-cultural communication between NSs and NNSs outside Japan has been a fact for decades. Although the Japanese language is an official language in only Japan and one province of Palau, and is basically used only as a major means of communication in Japan (Hatasa, 2008), it can be said that the number of users of Japanese outside Japan has been increasing. According to the Japan Foundation (2006), since 1979 there have been large increases in the number of learners of Japanese outside Japan, as well as the number of institutions where the Japanese language is taught, and

the number of Japanese teachers abroad. The number of learners stood at 2,979,820 in 2006, as compared to 127,167 in 1979, an increase of approximately twenty-three times. In addition, the number of Japanese who travel, study and work outside Japan has increased, according to The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan (2007). It is reported as 1,063,695 in 2006, up from 663,049 in 1990.

Clearly, the numbers of both learners of Japanese and NSs outside Japan are fairly large, and there is a high probability that a great deal of communication between these two groups occurs in Japanese. This has motivated me to consider learners of Japanese as an important group of communicators in the Japanese language, and to wonder how they can develop an ability to manipulate the language to be polite, especially considering that the honorific system and its complexities are challenging even to NSs.

In such cross-cultural communication, misunderstanding or miscommunication are probably unavoidable to some extent, due not only to grammatical aspects of Japanese, but also to pragmatic aspects. The miscommunication caused by pragmatic errors or inappropriateness sometimes can be more serious than that caused by lexical or grammatical errors. It is sometimes pointed out that an ordinary grammatical error made by a NNS may simply seem cute to a NS, but an error in the Japanese honorific system tends to provoke an instantaneous emotional reaction (Niyekawa, 1991, p. 15).

For instance, in face-to-face communication, politeness is expressed by a polite form which is attached to the end of an utterance. If one uses a non-polite form in such a situation, one may be considered impolite or too friendly. In addition, asymmetric use of polite (and non-polite) form is one of the features of Japanese discourse. That is, even in a situation such as that described above, one may change his/her form based on a certain

assessment of one's interlocutor, such as his/her age or social status, yet the other is not expected to change accordingly. This can also lead to miscommunication between a NS and a NNS.

In fact, as a NS of Japanese, I have had such experiences. While engaged in conversation with younger Japanese learners, I have heard them change their forms to match mine when I, the older participant in the conversation, changed my forms from polite to non-polite. From a Japanese normative view, their effort to match my choice of politeness forms is certainly not the expected behavior, and it is even more salient when one considers that they would be expected to at least understand this norm, since they were advanced learners. As Sakamoto (2006) points out, polite expressions are more important for advanced learners than for beginners, since NSs may consider that advanced learners *intentionally* choose non-polite forms based on their judgment of the relationship between them, which can offend NSs, since they may feel that they are being considered somehow socially inferior (p.167). In other words, if the learners are not fluent enough, NSs may not expect that learners can handle polite expressions. In addition to these miscommunications, from a learner's perspective a sort of dilemma in using honorifics has also been reported (Cohen, 1997; Haugh 2007; Ishihara, 2007; Mizutani, 1989; Seigal, 1996). These misunderstandings and dilemmas probably emerge from the evaluation of Japanese norms; when one expression is evaluated as 'mis'-use, a certain principle is applied which is the Japanese norm in this case. In addition, when one senses a dilemma, there seems to be an underlying thought that the Japanese norm should be considered.

Thus, it seems that the Japanese native norm is still considered as the only feasible framework when considering polite (or impolite) linguistic behaviors, regardless of the fact that Japanese society now is highly internationalized. In such a society, NNSs are as important interactants as NSs. The traditional framework of politeness in Japanese might seem outdated, and an alternative framework probably necessary. Before making such a sweeping judgment, it is necessary to first examine the use of polite (and non-polite) forms of Japanese language by learners. The present study is focused specifically on this - by revealing some phenomena in the use of Japanese polite language by learners, it may also be possible to present a possible framework to examine politeness by learners, as well as to draw some implications for both educators and learners of Japanese. The thesis consists of five chapters: Introduction, Backgrounds of the study, Methodology, Findings and Discussions, and Conclusion and Implications.

Chapter 2: Background of the Study

When one speaks, it is necessary to choose a certain expression among several expressions from very polite to vulgar, depending on certain aspects of the setting and the nature of the interlocutors. This is likely true in any language, and Japanese is certainly not an exception. In fact, it is likely the case that the pragmatic, syntactic, and semantic means of dealing with levels of politeness in Japanese are more systematically complex than in any other language. People around the world have a common, even caricatured perception that Japanese people are generally extremely polite, that the Japanese culture is highly sensitive to social hierarchies, and that this permeates Japanese behavior and language.

Some scholars deny these perceptions (Maynard; 1997, Wetzel; 2004). As Wetzel claims, it is plausible that the Japanese have been mistakenly understood as generally polite due to the language system, which is intertwined with culture and society. Wetzel (2004) writes that outsiders' perceptions of Japanese politeness are an oversimplification, of a sort:

The Japanese are much misunderstood as being simply polite. To find politeness woven into the structure of the language reinforces this stereotype. Keigo [the Japanese honorific system] is about much more than politeness or respect. It is a barometer of how people understand themselves and others; it serves to structure discourse and interaction; it abides change as much as any aspect of language ever could or will; and it is not going away. (p.3)

Thus, the common perception is not necessarily true. However, it cannot be denied that issues around politeness and the Japanese honorific system have been an intense focus of

interest among scholars of Japanese, as well as lay persons. In fact, some researchers note bizarre incidents such as murders in the work-place related to the use (or misuse) of the honorific system (Coulmas, 1992; Niyekawa, 1991; Sugito, 1976). For example, Niyekawa (1991) relates a story in which “an employee killed his slightly younger boss because he could no longer cope with being spoken down to” (p.22). She explains that in this instance, seniority and age were strongly involved in the use of polite/non-polite language, and resulted in the murder. This instance is a very extreme case indeed, but it does serve to show the deep and pervasive importance of one aspect of Japanese society with regard to politeness.

To begin a discussion of politeness in Japanese, what follows is a primer of the Japanese honorific system, with some elaboration of its interface with key aspects of Japanese society and culture which influence behavior. Before beginning to describe the system, however, there are some relevant terms that must be defined.

Definitions

Japanese Honorific System and Honorifics

The Japanese honorific system has been closely related to the study of politeness in Japanese, and is known as *keigo* in Japanese. Kikuchi (1997) defines that, “*keigo* [italics added] is a specific way to show one’s deference by changing the ways to express the same fact” (p. 91). That is, the Japanese honorific system is defined as the politeness marking parts of various expressions chosen to express a given idea. There are two major types in the system: referent and addressee types. The referent type constitutes two forms (i.e., respectful and humble) while the addressee type contains one form (i.e., polite form). Thus, *keigo* contains various forms and it is sometimes used to indicate only the referent

type of honorifics. For instance, when considering *keigo* education for Japanese, it means only the referent type of honorifics. On the other hand, regarding polite expressions, both referent and addressee types are included. Thus, the categorization in relation to *keigo* can be complex. In addition, the Agency for Cultural Affairs under Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) (2007) recently proposes a new five-level categorization rather than three groups (i.e., respectful, humble and polite forms) by dividing both humble form and polite form into two specific groups (i.e. humble form 1/humble form2, and polite form/beautification form). In order to avoid confusion, in the present study, *keigo* which encompasses both referent and addressee types of honorifics, is defined as the honorific system, while the referent type is defined as honorifics. These definitions are illustrated below including the new idea by MEXT (2007):

Table 1

Japanese Honorifics System and Honorifics

<i>Respectful form</i>		<i>Referent type</i> = Honorifics	Japanese Honorific System
<i>Humble form1</i>	<i>Humble form</i>		
<i>Humble form2</i>			
<i>Polite form</i>	<i>Polite form</i>	<i>Addressee type</i>	
<i>Beautification</i>			

Polite Form and Non-Polite Form

The difference between the two types of honorifics (i.e., referent and addressee types) is in their functions: the former is used to express a polite attitude toward the referent in

the topic by conjugating verbs or using particular nouns; the latter denotes politeness toward an interlocutor by forming sentence-final components in a specific way. In other words, the addressee type is the only form used to show politeness toward an interlocutor in face-to-face conversation (Hagino, 2005). As such, it is generally called polite form or formal form, while an expression toward an interlocutor without this aspect is called plain form or informal form (Bunkacho, 1993). In the present study, the former is defined as polite form and the latter as non-polite form.

Examples can help in clarifying the polite/non-polite distinction. For instance, ‘I am a student’ can be expressed in two possible ways:

- (1) I am a student.
 - a. *Watashi wa seito da.*
 - b. *Watashi wa seito desu.*

As shown above, the difference between these two Japanese sentences can be found at the end. That is, *da* or *desu*. The former is non-polite and the latter is polite form. They are copular verbs and come at the end of the sentence, since the word order of Japanese is generally subject-object-verb, or S-O-V. In addition, there is a more polite form of this type, *degozaimasu*. As such, this is defined as super-polite form in the present study. This can be used as follows:

- c. *Watashi wa seito degozaimasu.*

Moreover, verb inflection is also considered an addressee type of honorific. It is expressed as follows:

- (2) A teacher comes.
 - a. *Sensei wa kuru.*

b. Sensei wa kimasu.

The expression in (2)-a, '*kuru*' (come), is a non-polite form, while the one in (2)-b, *kimasu*, is an inflection of *kuru* and is considered as polite form.

Moreover, when 'a teacher' in the sentence (2) is a referent in a conversation, there are two other alternative expressions.

c. Sensei wa irassyaru.

d. Sensei wa irassyaimasu.

These expressions contain the referent type of honorific of *kuru*, which is *irassyaru*. The difference between sentences (2)-c and (2)-d is whether or not it has '*masu*' which is an addressee type of honorific, polite form, located at the end. Since the addressee type of honorific can express a polite attitude toward an interlocutor, sentence (2)-d is considered a polite expression to the interlocutor in face-to-face conversation, though both of them contain polite expressions toward the referent. In this line, sentence (2)-c is an expression with a non-polite form, and sentence (2)-d is an expression with a polite form.

Regarding the level of politeness as a sentence, (2)-d is considered as the most polite one among the four since it contains both of the referent and addressee types of honorifics. Thus, from a pedagogical grammatical view point, the degree of these forms above, such as super-polite, polite and non-polite forms is explained in relation to politeness in Japanese. Within this standpoint, the use of non-polite form is not considered as the indication of politeness since it contains no politeness-marker. However, in the present study, politeness is defined from a different perspective which includes the use of non-polite form. The definition of politeness in the present study is provided below.

Discourse Politeness

The term *politeness* has been used not only by scholars and researchers, but also by many laypersons, with varying meanings. In general, politeness is understood as one's verbal and non-verbal behavior concerned with maintaining the harmony of a relationship with an interlocutor, or not damaging it in interactive communication. In relation to this, politeness study in Japanese has strongly focused on honorifics and the level of politeness of expressions with or without honorifics. For instance, *taberu* is the verb *to eat*, and *tabemasu* is the polite form of it. In addition, *meshiagarimasu* is another polite form which signifies the most polite meaning of the same concept, to eat. In this sense, politeness is likely to be taken as the level of politeness marker that a certain expression contains.

In western cultures, however, politeness study has centred more on the actual effect of one's utterances in relation to a human relationship, rather than in de-contextualized discussions. Particularly, Brown and Levinson (1978) focus on language use from a perspective of politeness and it may be viewed as pragmatic politeness. In line with Brown and Levinson, discourse politeness can be introduced as an augmentation to the concept of pragmatic politeness. That is, pragmatic politeness is only focused on sentence level phenomena of politeness, and overlooks language use at a discourse level, though it is plausible that pragmatic politeness could cover the discourse level in its fundamental concept. However, in order to reveal more specific strategic language use, particularly of the languages with honorific systems, such as Japanese, discourse politeness needs to be defined specifically.

Discourse politeness was introduced by Usami (1998) as a sub-category of pragmatic politeness. Usami (1999b) defines it as "the dynamic whole of functions of

various elements in both linguistic forms and discourse-level phenomena that play a part within the pragmatic politeness of a discourse” (p. 5). That is, discourse politeness can be also defined as a concept relevant to actual language use for the purpose of harmonious communication, rather than level of politeness, and, more specifically, it can be captured at the discourse level rather than the sentence level. According to Usami, employing discourse politeness enables a researcher to examine all languages, with or without honorifics, in the same way. Thus, the present study defines discourse politeness as a part of pragmatic politeness which views actual language use for smooth communication, but it can be achieved only at discourse level.

Speech-Level Shift

In face-to-face conversation in Japanese, there are two different sentence-final forms, according to the levels of politeness: polite and non-polite forms. It is necessary for a Japanese speaker to decide to use either polite form or non-polite form. This choice is necessary for any utterance in regard to the situation and some other factors. Once one determines the form, it is often maintained over stretches of discourse and creates the level of speech, which is called *speech level*. For instance, when one speaks to someone who is older, one may choose polite form and maintain it. The speech level, however, is changeable as well. For instance, when having a conversation a stranger, one may change forms from polite to non-polite as the conversation continues, with one’s assessment of some influential factors such as age or social status. This change in a conversation is defined as *speech-level shift*. This shift may occur as an overall change or in a particular utterance. That is, one may shift for a certain utterance, while maintaining a speech level. This shift is indeed observed in conversation (Ikuta, 1983). In particular, Usami (1999b)

defines the change from polite to non-polite forms as *downshift*, and non-polite to polite forms as *upshift*.

In the present study, speech level is operationalized as the overall use of each type of utterance in a certain length of time. Regarding speech-level shift, it specifies the level of shift between utterances as defined by Usami (1999b): upshift and downshift.

Traditional Studies on Politeness and Japanese

Politeness has been intensively studied by many scholars in Japan, and they have identified a number of significant roles of the Japanese honorific system in relation to politeness. That is, the use of polite form denotes a polite attitude, while non-polite form signifies impoliteness or intimacy. These functions are described within traditional studies on politeness in Japanese.

Japanese Language and Society

The study of the use of polite language has been discussed in relation to the structure of Japanese society, which is described as a hierarchal society (Matsumoto & Okamoto, 2003; Niyekawa, 1991, Maynard, 1997; Bohn, 2004). In addition, the concept of *uchi* (in-group, personal group) and *soto* (out-group, public group) is indicated as a defining characteristic of Japanese society (Martin, 1964; Ide, 1992; Maynard, 1997; Ono, 1999).

Regarding the hierarchal aspect, it is said that Japanese society emphasizes more hierarchy than equality, in contrast to American society which values more equality (Niyekawa, 1991; Maynard, 1997). It is also pointed out that the difference lies in the emphasis on informality between Japanese and American societies (Niyekawa, 1991; Takanashi, 2004). That is, the Japanese emphasize formality more than the Americans.

Accordingly, social differences between interlocutors are more important and expected to be acknowledged in Japanese society (Maynard, 1997; Takanashi, 2004). In such a society, one necessarily needs to spontaneously evaluate social differences with an interlocutor and to reflect it in communication.

With regard to the *uchi* (in-group, personal group) and *soto* (out-group, public group) concept, family members and close friends are in *uchi*, the in-group, while strangers and somebody who is older or at a socially higher status are usually grouped in *soto*, the out-group. These two worlds, in- and out-groups, are not absolute and stable, but rather, relative and changeable depending on one's perspectives, which Jordan and Noda (1994) explain as "shifting group affiliation" (p. 55). They explain, as an example, that "if an employee (Ms. Yamamoto) is asked a question about her boss by a fellow employee whose rank is comparable to her own, she will use polite language in reference to the boss (the out-group at the moment). But if the question is raised by an employee of another company, Ms. Yamamoto will now regard her boss as a member of her in-group" (p. 55). Given that, these in-/out-groups are not fixed to each person, but it rather changeable depending on one's perspective.

As shown above, hierarchy and in-/out-groups are characteristics of Japanese society, and they strongly relate to the use of language, particularly the honorific system. That is, one is expected to reflect these notions in one's linguistic behaviors in Japanese society. Martine (1964) names the necessary choice observed in the Japanese language system as an "obligatory category", and compares it with those in English, such as determining singular or plural, definite or indefinite (p. 407). In relation, Wetzel (2004) points out that, "it [Japanese honorific system] is a barometer of how people understand

themselves and others, and it serves to structure discourse and interaction” (p. 3). That is, assessment of social factors is necessary for communication in Japanese (Sakamoto, 2006). In other words, speakers of Japanese are expected to spontaneously evaluate social factors such as situational and inter-relational factors with an addressee.

Regarding social factors, previous researchers have pointed out a number of factors that influence one’s polite speech in Japanese (Kabaya, Kawaguchi & Sakamoto, 1998; Kikuchi, 1997; Kindaichi, 1957/1988; Lauwereyns, 2002; Martin, 1964; Maynard, 1997; Neustupny, 1972, 1982; Ogino, Misono & Fukushima, 1985; Okamoto, 1997; Okushi, 1998; Shitabani, 1990; Sugito, 1976, 1987). A number of factors are described with different terms, but they can be divided into three major categories: interpersonal relationship, situation and topic. Interpersonal relationship among interlocutors includes social status (high or low ranking within an organization), age, in-/out-group relationship, and intimacy. Whether or not a situation is formal influences one’s choice of forms. In addition, the nature of the topic of conversation is also considered one of the factors that affect one’s obligatory choice. These three major factors are described here one by one, but in an actual situation they are inevitably intertwined and do not simply individually influence one’s linguistic choice.

These factors are explained here in relation to Japanese polite/non-polite expressions, but any language recognizes social factors and reflects them in polite expressions (Niyekawa, 1991; Neustupny, 1978). For instance, “Could you ~?” in English can be categorized as a polite question. The French tu/vous system is often compared to the Japanese honorific system as well, since the nature of the system is determined by social factors such as hierarchy and intimacy. Japanese, however, works

differently from these languages in which politeness is limited to certain speech acts such as requests, or use of certain pronouns (Cook, 1997; Niyekawa, 1991; Neustupny, 1978). For example, the differences between the French tu/vous system and the Japanese honorific system can be discussed from three viewpoints. One is the range of its use - while the use of French tu/vous system is limited to the second-person pronoun, in any Japanese sentence whether or not it contains the second-person pronoun, the honorific system must be considered to determine form. Second, Japanese honorifics can also be used for the third person. Third, while the use of tu/vous system is reciprocal, the Japanese honorific system does not work in that way, but is asymmetric in that one participant in discourse may use a more polite form than the other.

The choice of a certain form according to social factors is essential for virtually every utterance in Japanese (Enomoto & Marriott, 1994; Ishida, 2001; Maynard, 1997; Sugito, 1987). Sugito (1987) specifically notes that Japanese cannot express anything without considering an appropriate form depending on the factors described above. Thus, social factors are embedded in the entirety of linguistic behavior in Japanese, and appropriate selections are often exquisitely sensitive and important. Maynard (1997) explains that the proper use of honorifics is necessary for an adult and the lack of this knowledge can be considered not well-educated, childish, rude, and unsophisticated, and, misuses of those expressions may offend others since one's view of social status is embedded in one's verbal expression.

Japanese Honorific System

In previous sections, how polite forms are expected in Japanese society is explained, as well as the factors which affect the use of polite forms. In this section, a detailed account of the grammatical features of Japanese honorific system is provided.

The Japanese honorific system can be divided into two major groups in terms of its basic functions: referent type and addressee type. In the study of Japanese, the referent type is often categorized into two (i.e., respectful and humble). Thus, the Japanese honorific system is generally considered as a three-category system (Jorden & Noda, 1994; Kabaya et al., 1998; Kikuchi, 1997; Kindaichi, 2003; Martin, 1964; Neustupny, 1972, 1978; Tsujimura, 1996; Watanabe, 1971). According to Maynard (1997):

“Respectful forms are used when addressing or talking about someone whose social status is relatively higher than the speaker’s. In the same situation, humble verb forms may be used in reference to the speaker’s own actions and state of mind”. (p. 60)

Thus, the respectful and humble types are used to show politeness for the referent in the conversation. Accordingly, both of them are called referent type.

In contrast, Jorden and Noda (1994) explain the addressee type, saying that it “indicates politeness toward the person(s) spoken to, regardless of the item to which they refer....This type of politeness, ... involves only the speaker and the addressee” (p. 56). Thus, this type is generally called the addressee type. The addressee type is expressed by a copular verb *desu*, or *masu*, which is a modal inflection of verbs, as politeness-marking. Since Japanese word order is Subject-Object-Verb, S-O-V (Jorden & Noda, 1994; Maynard, 1997), these copular verb or verb-inflections come at the end of the sentence. Given that, in face-to-face communication, the addressee type is a key to one’s polite

attitude. However, in order to capture a full picture of the Japanese honorific system, the referent type of honorific cannot be detached from the addressee type. The functions of referent and addressee types are shown in table 2 below, based on Kikuchi (1997). A sample sentence in English is ‘one attends’ (‘one’ can be either a teacher or a friend, X).

Table 2

Referent and Address Types of Polite Expressions

Referent Type		With it Ex. Addressee= an older person	Addressee Type
With it Ex. Topic = a teacher (sensei)	Without it Ex. Topic= a friend (X)		
1. Sensei ga shusseki nasai-masu.	3. X ga shusseki-shimasu.		
2. Sensei ga shusseki nasaru.	4. X ga shusseki-suru.	Without it Ex. Addressee= a younger person	

Note. ‘To attend’ is translated as *shusseki suru*.

(Kikuchi, 1997, p.105, translated by the author)

Table 2 contains four groups (i.e., 1. with both referent and addressee, 2. with only referent type, 3. with only addressee type and 4. without both types).

1. Sensei ga shusseki nasai-masu.
2. Sensei ga shusseki nasaru.
3. X ga shusseki shimasu.
4. X ga shusseki suru.

The topic in sentence 1 and 2 is ‘a teacher’, while that in 3 and 4 is ‘a friend’ (indicated as X). It makes a difference in the choice of verb (i.e., *nasaru* vs. *suru*) in the chart.

Nasaru is a respectful form of *suru* (to do). The respectful type is chosen because the

referent is someone who is at a socially higher status. In addition, there is another distinction among these four sentences, which is whether or not the sentence has *masu*, verb-inflection, at the end of the sentence. The sentences 1 and 3 contain it while sentences 2 and 4 do not. According to the table above, the difference between the former and the latter is who the addressee is. That is, one explanation can be that an older person is an addressee in the former while a younger person or a person who is about the same age is an addressee in the latter. Referent and addressee types are thus distinguished. Only the addressee type can signify the polite manner toward the addressee (Hagino, 2005), since it directly reflects the relationship between speaker and addressee. In other words, an expression without the addressee type can be defined as a non-polite expression. In the same manner, the expression with the addressee type is defined as a polite one.

Since verbs come at the end in Japanese sentences, how to end the sentence with or without one of these polite forms is considered a necessary choice in Japanese. Thus, as Watanabe (1971) claims, the Japanese honorific system is not a study of grammar. In addition, Maynard (1997) notes that, “the Japanese language has a built-in system of politeness strategies that require a choice of appropriate politeness levels” (p.56). Thus, traditional studies of politeness in Japanese focus on explanation of these levels of politeness, the central focus often being the ordering or ranking of expressions according to the level of politeness.

In relation to the level of politeness, in a conversation one may need to decide the level in accordance with social factors. It is said that the use of the addressee type at the end of the sentence/utterance can be considered natural (Kikuchi, 1997; Maynard, 1997;

Sakamoto, 2006). In particular, when having a conversation with a stranger, polite form is considered appropriate, at least at the outset (Ikuta, 1983; Kikuchi, 1997; Lauwereyns, 2002; Maynard, 1997; Niyekawa, 1991). In addition, it can be rude or ill-mannered for one not to use polite forms for situations such as asking a stranger for directions, or a service worker's reply to a customer request (Kikuchi, 1997). Regarding the choice of level of politeness, the reciprocal function of the honorific system is pointed out as a significant one in the Japanese language (Maynard, 1997; Neustupny, 1978; Niyekawa, 1991). Niyekawa (1991) points out that only when there is an obvious difference, such as age difference of more than ten years, great difference in implied social status, or some other background, the higher status person may or may not speak down to the lower-status person, shifting his or her speech level to a less polite one. Niyekawa adds that it is important that in hierarchical situations polite and non-polite speech levels are used non-reciprocally, while in-group situations, either polite or non-polite are used reciprocally. In particular, in out-group situations, a number of factors need to be considered for one's choice of level of politeness. One who is older or at a higher status may speak casually, but if the other is younger or in a lower status than that person, he/she is not expected to match the level of politeness, but rather expected to choose the more polite forms of speech. In this manner, Maynard (1997) points out that, "some American readers may find this asymmetric linguistic marking of social differentiation uncomfortable since it violates their ethic of 'equality'" (p. 62). In Japanese, however, the reciprocal aspect indeed is explained as a reflection of one's assessment of social factors as well as the first choice of level of politeness.

Above all, the previous studies have intensively focused on the relationship between social factors and language use in politeness from a normative view. That is, a number of principles have been identified as a Japanese norm. They have thus contributed to outlining the fundamental rules that are observed in hierarchal Japanese society, although recent studies on Japanese natural conversation show more dynamic uses of polite and non-polite forms that have been less focused on. The following section describes how the studies of politeness in Japanese have shifted from a traditional to a more discourse-focused concern with the actual language in use in relation to politeness.

Studies of Politeness in Japanese

The Japanese honorific system has been intensively studied from a sociolinguistic perspective, identifying rules in linkage with social factors. Since the honorific system constitutes the polite part of the Japanese language, these studies are at the centre of politeness study of the Japanese language. These studies have contributed significantly to a normative view of the use of the Japanese language, including phenomena such as levels of politeness in relation to social factors (Jordan & Noda, 1994; Kikuchi, 1997; Kindaichi, 1957/1988; Martin, 1964; Niyekawa, 1991; Neustupny, 1978; Shibatani, 1990; Tsujimura, 1996). Wetzel (2004) points out that the traditional studies mostly employ self-reports or questionnaires (Hill, Ide, Ikuta, Kawasaki & Ogino, 1986; Hori, 1986; Ide, 1989), rather than being based on “solid evidence came out of that boom about when, why and how people use *keigo* [the Japanese honorific system]” (p.13). The significance of studying natural discourse data has been identified as a fruitful alternative way of obtaining a view of Japanese language in use (Cook, 1996a, 1996b, 1999, 2002, 2006; Hinds, 1978; Maynard, 1991; Neustupny, 1986; Okamoto, 1998). Hinds (1978) writes

that levels of discourse above the level of the sentence can profitably be studied, while Neustupny (1986) also points out that the study of natural discourse is the most efficient way to examine the relationship between the honorific system and social factors.

As such, despite the contribution to development of the studies of Japanese politeness by the traditional studies, recent studies focus more on natural discourse and shed light on the dynamics of the use of the honorific system (Cook, 1996a, 1996b, 1999, 2002, 2006; Ikuta, 1983; Okamoto, 1997, 1998; Okushi, 1998; Yoshida & Sakurai, 2005). Cook (1996a) reports that the usage of polite forms does not simply indicate polite manners, and the use of non-polite forms is not a direct indication of a non-polite position (p. 175). Ikuta (1983) analyzed TV conversations between two interlocutors, focusing on the sentence-final form (i.e., polite/non-polite), and pointed out that one may shift the level of politeness as an indication of intimacy between interlocutors, a phenomenon which could not have been explained by traditional research methodologies which focus on sentence-level features. Thus, studies which examine natural data beyond the sentence level show deviations from the normative view in the use of polite and no-polite forms. That is, the studies reveal that Japanese strategically use polite/non-polite forms in actual conversation (Cook, 1996b, 1997, 1999, 2002, 2006; Ikuta, 1983; Okamoto, 1997, 1998; Okushi, 1998; Yoshida & Sakurai, 2005).

The study of the honorific system was the central focus of politeness study in Japanese, and it revealed significant normative views and rules. However, in natural conversation, the actual effect of the use of the Japanese honorific system can be evaluated from a different view, encompassing strategic use. By capturing these dynamic aspects of the use of polite/non-polite language in Japanese in one picture, Usami (1999b)

studied natural conversation between NSs. She applied the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987), and provided a full account of the dynamics in the use of Japanese polite markers within the politeness theory framework. However, there have been few studies of politeness from a second language learner perspective. A number of issues in relation to use of the Japanese honorific system have been reported by many educators, but there has been little research which examines learners' actual usage of polite/non-polite forms within a specific theoretical framework, although there are many that attempt to capture it from only a Japanese normative view. In the following sections, the necessity of research and theory of politeness in Japanese from a learner perspective is described.

Politeness Theory and Japanese

The Japanese honorific system has been extensively discussed by many researchers and scholars in relation to politeness (Hill et al., 1986; Ide, 1992; Hinds, 1978; Hori, 1986; Ide, Hill, Carnes, Ogino & Kawasaki, 1992; Jorden & Noda, 1994; Kikuchi, 1997; Kindaichi, 1957/1988, Martin, 1964; Niyekawa, 1991; Sakamoto, 1999; Shibatani, 1990; Tsujimura, 1978; Wetzel, 2004). Studies of politeness in Japanese traditionally employ a questionnaire which asks informants to report their possible linguistic behaviors in a given hypothetical situation (Hill et al., 1986; Ide, 1989; Ide et al., 1992). These studies indeed discover certain aspects of linguistic behaviors of NSs in relation to politeness, that is, how NSs think that they would use honorifics, polite or non-polite forms in a particular situation, but without sampling the actual language performance and its effect on communication. Among these studies, politeness is treated in a rather linear fashion, in which the use of honorifics is considered as the most polite

means of expression, the use of polite form signifies politeness, while the use of non-polite form indicates non-polite or rude expression. Because of this, traditional politeness studies in Japan are often considered normative studies of the Japanese honorific system (Coulmas, 1992; Usami, 1999b). However, the trend appears to have shifted since Brown and Levinson (1978) proposed politeness theory, and since then there have been extensive discussions about Japanese language in relation to politeness theory. For instance, on the one side of the discussion there is opposition to the applicability of the theory to Japanese language (Hill et al. 1986; Ide, 1989, 1992; Ide et al., 1992; Matsumoto, 1988, 1989, 1993). On the other side there is agreement that the theory is applicable for a language with an honorific system such as that of Japanese. In this chapter, these discussions will be described, along with a brief account of the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987). In addition, as a conceptual framework for the present study, discourse politeness will be introduced, situated within the theory of politeness of Brown and Levinson (Usami, 1998).

Universal Politeness Theory

The theory of politeness of Brown and Levinson (1978) is generally held up as one of the most significant movements in the history of studies of linguistic politeness (Ehlich, 2005), and the theory has had an enormous impact on politeness studies. The significance of the theory mainly lies in their views of language in relation to context and in the focus on the language use rather than level of politeness. Before this theory was proposed, the mainstream of politeness study involved investigating language forms and ranking the level of politeness of sentences that were decontextualized.

Brown and Levinson (1978), in contrast, “attempted to account for some systematic aspects of language usage” (p. 63). They explored language use and its effect on communication and interactions among interlocutors. They discovered that there is a universal politeness in language use by analyzing tape recorded usage of three different languages (i.e., English, Tzeltal and Tamil). That is, they demonstrated that there are common strategic language uses in these three languages in relation to politeness.

Although they proposed the ‘universality’ of politeness, they were operating with some suppositions. First, they viewed language use through the medium of a Model Person (MP), who “is a willful fluent speaker of a natural language, endowed with two special properties - rationality and face” (Brown & Levinson, 1978, p. 63). According to Brown and Levinson, ‘rationality’ means “the availability to our MP of a precisely definable mode of reasoning from ends to the means that will achieve those ends” (p. 63). In addition, ‘face’ is defined or operationalized, “our MP is endowed with two particular wants - roughly, the want to be unimpeded, and the want to be approved of in certain respects” (p. 63). Specifically, these two faces are defined as negative face and positive face. According to Brown and Levinson (1978), they are defined as follows:

- (a) negative face: the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction - i.e., to freedom of action and freedom from imposition
- (b) positive face: the positive consistent self-image or ‘personality’ (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants. (p.66).

With this definition of two faces (i.e., negative face and positive face), Brown and Levinson (1978) describe the actions that can threaten these two faces, which are defined as Face-threatening acts (FTA). Brown and Levinson identify five strategies to alleviate FTA for harmonious communication. According to them, these strategies are chosen by a speaker depending on the degree of FTA. These five strategies are defined as follows: (1) without redressive action, baldly (2) positive politeness (3) negative politeness (4) going off record (5) not doing the FTA. According to Brown and Levinson, as the speaker's risk of FTA also increases, the number of the strategy increases. That is, in the case of (4), the degree of FTA is relatively high and they claim that one can imply this without taking any strategic behavior. This is called an off-record strategy in which "there is more than one unambiguously attributable intention so that the actor cannot be held to have committed himself to one particular intent" (Brown & Levinson, 1978, p. 74).

In contrast, going on record is explained, "there is just one unambiguously attributable intention with which witnesses would concur" (Brown & Levinson, 1978, p.73). When one goes on-record, there are two strategies, which are positive politeness and negative politeness. According to Brown and Levinson (1978), "the linguistic realizations of positive politeness are in... the normal linguistic behavior between intimates" based on one's will, wanting positive face to be satisfied (p. 106), while the linguistic realizations of negative politeness are in "conventional indirectness, hedges on illocutionary force, or polite pessimism" (p. 134). Accordingly, they provide detailed strategies of both positive and negative types. There are fifteen strategies for positive politeness, such as using in-group identity markers, seeking agreement, saying a joke, giving a reason and so on, while there are ten strategies for negative politeness, such as

being conventionally indirect, apologizing, giving deference and so forth. For instance, when one needs to ask for help, which can be a FTA, negative politeness is considered to be applied rather than positive politeness, because one needs to retain some room for others to say no in order to reduce FTA. Given that, indirect utterances are preferred in this situation. For instance, when one asks for help, one may use 'Could you help me?' instead of 'Please help me'. This is because the former utterance encompasses more indirectness than the latter. Thus, Brown and Levinson claim that one chooses a certain linguistic behavior according to politeness theory when one communicates with others.

Brown and Levinson claim that there are three factors which determine one's linguistic behavior. They are social distance (D) between speaker (S) and hearer (H), relative power that H has over S (P), and the degree of impositions in the particular culture (R). With these three factors, Brown and Levinson propose a formula which can calculate the seriousness or weightness of FTA which is indicated as W_x . The formula is as follows: $W_x = D(S, H) + P(H, S) + R_x$. According to the result of W_x , one chooses a certain strategy. Thus, Brown and Levinson suggest that FTA is determined by the social distance between speaker and hearer, power that the hearer has over the speaker, and the degree of imposition of the action. With regard to the degree of imposition, Brown and Levinson emphasize that the factor of R encompasses cultural variation. That is, one culture or sub-culture may evaluate a certain action as a high degree of imposition, while it can be considered as less imposition in other cultures. This formula does not calculate the actual values, but it does calculate the conceptual weights of face-threatening acts in any cultures.

In line with politeness theory, Brown and Levinson describe a number of language uses (i.e., joke, indirect question) and their functions in three different languages. In their description, the use of honorifics such as Japanese honorifics is categorized as a negative strategy, defining its function as not to impose on one's face. By investigating a number of language uses of three different languages in the world from a universal viewpoint, Brown and Levinson attempt to capture the strategic language use that would be shared in any languages. Their politeness theory indeed has significance for the study of pragmatic politeness. Specifically, for the study of Japanese honorifics, it seems to have a positive effect, since the focus of traditional research on Japanese honorifics seemed limited to the level of politeness from a normative view. However, some linguists of Japanese opposed the theory (Hill et al., 1986; Ide, 1989, 1992, 2005, 2006; Ide et al., 1992; Matsumoto, 1988, 1989, 2003). The nature of this disagreement is described below.

Oppositions to Politeness Theory

Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) define the use of honorifics as a negative strategy to maintain the distance with an addressee so as not to impose face-threatening. Among Japanese scholars, there has been intensive argument about this. Particularly, one opposition is to the definition of face by Brown and Levinson, while the other disagreement is on the view of strategic language use as well as its categorization of Japanese honorifics as negative politeness (Hill et al., 1986; Ide, 1989, 1992, 2005, 2006; Ide et al., 1992; Ide & Yoshida, 1999; Matsumoto, 1988, 1989, 1993, 2003). These two points are described below.

First, Matsumoto (1988, 1989, 1993) argues that the concepts of face are different between western and eastern cultures, and that Brown and Levinson overlook cultural diversity. In addition, she claims that the use of Japanese honorifics cannot be captured by politeness theory, which discusses the language use with a presupposition of the FTA in one's linguistic behavior. According to Matsumoto, in Japanese, one has to choose the level of politeness even for a sentence with no face-threatening, such as 'Today is Saturday' which can be expressed in a neutral form in English. That is, in English 'Today is Saturday' can be used for anyone such as professors, friend and family. Matsumoto, however, claims that this is not the case in Japanese, and explains how such an expression is distinguished in Japanese in terms of politeness.

(1) Kyoo -wa doyoobi *da*.

Today -TOPIC Saturday COPULA-*plain*

'Today is Saturday'.

(2) Kyoo -wa doyoobi *desu*.

Today -TOPIC Saturday COPULA-*polite*

(3) Kyoo -wa doyoobi *degozaimasu*.

Today -TOPIC Saturday COPULA-*super polite*

(Matsumoto, 1988, p. 415)

In the sentences above, TOPIC and COPULA stand for topic particle and copular verb correspondingly. These three sentences can be translated into 'Today is Saturday' in English, but the sentence final expressions are different: *da*, *desu* and *degozaimasu*. (1) is considered non-polite form and conventionally considered for somebody who is younger or with intimate relationship such as friends and family members. In contrast, (2) is polite

form since it contains the polite copular verb, *desu*. In addition, (3) *gozaimasu* is expressed with the most polite form and is regarded as the one to use for somebody who is older or socially at a higher status, such as a teacher for students or a boss at a company, or someone who is not close, such as a stranger. Thus, Matsumoto claims that ‘Today is Saturday’ can be expressed with three different forms which adopt different levels of politeness in Japanese. In addition, she points out that Japanese speakers are always in need of choosing of one of them in their communication. Thus, Japanese differentiates the utterances that convey the same meaning, depending on the level of politeness. Although Brown and Levinson (1978) propose the politeness theory with the notion of FTA, by presenting these samples in which she claims that there is no face-threatening, Matsumoto opposes the theory of universal politeness. In brief, Matsumoto’s argument is that labeling the use of Japanese honorifics as negative politeness in the theory of universal politeness is not appropriate, but rather, Japanese honorifics is a device of Japanese social norms that expect one to choose a proper sentence-final polite marker.

In addition to Matsumoto’s argument, Ide (1989) opposes Brown and Levinson’s theory by claiming that it is not applicable to languages that have honorifics systems such as Japanese, although the theory can readily apply to western languages such as English. In opposition to the theory, Ide (1989) proposes two typologies of linguistic politeness. One is discernment and the other is volition. ‘Discernment’ is a concept that is introduced by Hill et al. (1986) who contrast the use of polite expressions between English and Japanese speakers. According to them, the original term of discernment is a Japanese word, *wakimae*. Ide (1989) explains that, “the choice of linguistic forms or expressions in which the distinction between the ranks or the roles of the speaker, the referent and the

addressee are systematically encoded will be called the discernment aspect of linguistic politeness” (p. 230). In addition, she points out that *wakimae*, discernment, is “realized mainly by the use of formal linguistic forms”, while volition is “realized mainly by verbal strategies” (p. 232). Thus, Ide explains that discernment functions for the wants of roles and settings, while volition is for face wants. Accordingly, Ide (1989, 1992, 2005, 2006) argues the significance of social norms in Japanese linguistic politeness in contrast to volition for one’s linguistic choice. Ide (1989) emphasizes that in Japanese, the use of honorifics is ‘socio-pragmatically obligatory’ due to the notion of discernment, but not a strategic use for saving negative face. To support her idea, Ide (2005) explains that politeness theory cannot apply to Japanese honorifics since Japanese honorifics can function as both positive and negative politeness by claiming that the use of honorifics according to expected social behavior can work to save one’s positive face since it can provide what he/she expects, which can be pleasure to both the speaker and the hearer. For instance, the use of polite expressions to one’s boss can be taken for positive politeness since it is based on ‘socio-pragmatically obligatory’ use. Thus, Ide (2005) emphasizes that the use of honorifics can be positive politeness when considering the socio-pragmatically obligatory language use. Ide claims that politeness theory, which defines the use of honorifics as negative politeness, cannot provide a full account for honorifics, and emphasizes the two separate concepts of language uses: discernment and volition. By pointing out these two notions, some Japanese scholars also oppose the universality of politeness theory as proposed by Brown and Levinson.

In short, the main disagreements with politeness theory can be summarized as follows: (1) Brown and Levinson’s theory is valid for volitional types of politeness but

not for discernment (*wakimae*) types of politeness, (2) the theory cannot fully explain utterances which are non face-threatening and (3) their classification of the use of honorifics into negative politeness is not appropriate.

In contrast to these arguments, politeness theory by Brown and Levinson is also discussed in a positive sense among some Japanese scholars (Carroll, 2005; Fukada & Asato, 2004; Kitamura, 2000; Takiura, 2005; Usami, 1997b, 1998, 1999b, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2002), who situate Japanese honorifics within politeness theory because of its emphasis on underlying universal principles.

Agreements with Politeness Theory

The scholars who agree with politeness theory claim that politeness theory is applicable to Japanese honorifics. However, they also differ in their claims as to how Japanese honorifics can fit with the theory. Particularly, Fukada and Asato (2004) suggest that Japanese honorifics are captured within negative politeness, while Usami (1999b) proposes a new framework for Japanese honorifics in order to provide a full account of it within politeness theory. These will be described in detail below.

Fukada and Asato (2004) oppose the notion of discernment introduced by Hill et al. (1986). They agree with politeness theory, saying that it is applicable to Japanese honorifics, including the full explanation for sentences which are non face-threatening. Fukada and Asato present a hypothetical account that divides cultural variation into two factors, P (power) and D (distance) factors, as well as R-factor (ranking of imposition), where Brown and Levinson include cultural variation. That is, Fukada and Asato (2004) claim as follows:

Since Japanologists generally agree that Japan is a vertical society where relative status difference, even very small, counts as significant, it would be reasonable to hypothesize the following cultural-specific valuation procedure for the two variables, power and distance. (p. 1996)

According to Fukada and Asato (2004), “when a person at a higher status is involved, distance and power are given markedly high values, which in turn, elevate the value of $W(x)$ ” (p. 1997). Thus, they claim that in their hypothetical framework, any act can be counted as a FTA in Brown and Levinson’s theory. With this framework, Fukada and Asato attempt to provide an account for the non-FTA sentence, ‘Today is Saturday’ that is presented by Matsumoto (1988) with Japanese equivalents. Fukada and Asato represent them:

(1) Kyoo -wa doyoobi *da*.

Today -TOPIC Saturday COPULA-*plain*

(2) Kyoo -wa doyoobi *desu*.

Today -TOPIC Saturday COPULA-*polite*

(Fukada & Asato, 2004, P. 1993)

Matsumoto (1988) points out that Brown and Levinson’s theory was flawed in regard to Japanese due to the fact that polite expressions are uttered even for a non-FTA in Japanese. With regard to the non-FTA, Fukada and Asato attempt to provide a full account for it by adding cultural value on both P and D factors. They explain the appropriateness of sentence (2) over (1) for a person who is at a higher status. Fukada and Asato (2004) describe the reason for this as follows:

Situations like (2), involving a high social status person, increase the values of power and distance. Hence, even though the degree of imposition is not high in this situation, the assessment of $W(x)$ will become high. This high $W(x)$ value calls for some sort of mitigation, and that accounts for the occurrence of honorifics, which we claim to be a negative politeness strategy (p. 1997).

In addition, Fukada and Asato attempt to reveal a weakness of previous arguments. They deny Ide's account for the use of honorifics due to socio-pragmatic obligation by considering the use of honorific forms when dishonorable acts are involved, which makes the sentence sound peculiar. As an example, they provide these two sentences:

(3) Sensee ga dookyuusei o koroshi-ta.

Teacher classmate kill-PAST

'My teacher killed my classmate'.

(4)? Sensee ga dookyuusei o o-koroshi-ninat-ta.

kill-HONO-PAST

(Fukada & Asato, 2004, p. 1998)

In the sentences above, PAST and HONO stand for past tense and honorific form correspondingly. Both of these two sentences mean "my teacher killed my classmate." Although the basic meanings are the same, the levels of politeness are various since (3) contains a non-polite form, *koroshita* (killed), while (4) has the referent honorifics, *okoroshininatta* (killed). The referent of the action, kill, is teacher. Fukada and Asato (2004) claim that (4) is formed in accordance with Ide's framework which emphasizes the discernment aspect of honorifics. That is, teacher is someone who is at a higher status and therefore the referent honorific should be used for the action when it is referred to.

However, Fukada and Asato state that sentence (4) is bizarre in the point that the action, kill, is expressed with honorifics, claiming that this illustrates that the use of Japanese honorifics is not “the socio-pragmatic equivalent of grammatical concord” (2004, p. 1998). However, this argument does not really seem to highlight any serious failure of Ide in her account of discernment, because the instances that Fukada and Asato present are quite peculiar (i.e., murder). In such a case, it is probable that one would be disqualified from being spoken to with honorifics even if he/she could be spoken to in a respectful manner within a standard socio-pragmatic norm. That is, it is possible to understand that non-use of honorifics to such a person satisfies the social expectation, although previous studies provide no account of it. In fact, it has been pointed out by other scholars that there are some words that cannot be used with honorifics, such as *steal* (Kindaichi, 2003). The word *kill* can be another example of this phenomenon, Fukada and Asato’s claim based on this one case does not seem to provide strong evidence to discount Ide’s account of discernment. Thus, although Fukada and Asato (2004) attempt to situate Japanese honorifics within politeness theory, their case for doing so seems to be in need of much reexamination.

In contrast to Fukada and Asato’s hypothetical account, Kitamura (2000) examined natural conversation data and attempted to describe the applicability of Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory to Japanese politeness phenomena (i.e. non goal-oriented conversation). The conversational data between intimate friends in Japanese indeed appears to have features consistent with politeness theory, and Kitamura concluded that, “‘politeness’ theory can be a powerful tool to analyze ‘politeness’ phenomena” (p. 7). Although Kitamura provided an explanation of the use of the

Japanese language with the framework of politeness theory, it is nevertheless a fact that that her view is limited only to non goal-oriented conversation.

Beyond these limited viewpoints on politeness in Japanese, Usami (1999b) attempted to explain it by providing a full account of the use of the Japanese honorific system within the framework of politeness theory. As described above, there are three major arguments by oppositions to the politeness theory: (1) the theory is valid for volitional types of politeness but not for discernment types, (2) it cannot fully explain non-FTA utterances and (3) its classification of the use of honorifics into negative politeness is not appropriate.

Regarding the first claim in relation to volition and discernment, Usami (2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2002) denies the distinctions for language use in various languages, and emphasizes that the use of Japanese honorifics can be situated within politeness theory, that is, the use of Japanese honorifics can be viewed as strategic use. The strategic use of Japanese honorifics has been noted by some researchers (Cook, 1997, 1999; Ikuta, 1983; Okamoto, 1997, 1998; Okushi, 1998; Yoshida & Sakurai, 2005).

With regard to the second argumentation, Usami (1999b) interprets that this claim is not strong opposition. Matsumoto (1988) presents a sentence, 'Today is Saturday' as one with no FTA. However, Usami points out that, "it [the sentence] can express a different FTA depending on various social contexts" (p. 25). That is, it is claimed that any sentences and utterances cannot be completely free from the social context where those sentences are produced. Thus, Usami (1999b) emphasizes that Matsumoto's view is limited saying that, "[it is] only from its propositional meaning at the sentence level" (p. 25).

Given that, Usami (1999b) claims that the use of honorifics system can be situated within politeness theory. Although her stance is consistent with politeness theory, Usami (1999b) claims that theories emerging from sentence level analysis, such as that of Brown and Levinson, are limited in terms of discovering dynamics occurring in actual conversation. As such, Usami proposes a discourse level view on politeness theory (1998, 1999b, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2002). According to Usami (1999b), analyzing a certain length of conversation at discourse level can uncover significant features of Japanese language such as speech-level shift, topic-initiation, and back-channels. By revealing the strategic use of speech-level shift from polite to non-polite forms within this notion, Usami (1999b) claims that the classification of the use of honorifics into negative politeness is not invalid, which is the third argumentation by the oppositions. Thus, by proposing discourse politeness as a sub-category of politeness theory, Usami (1998) claims that the use of the Japanese honorific system can situate within politeness theory.

By analyzing data at not only the sentence level, but also the discourse level, Usami (1998) came to propose the notion of discourse politeness. Usami insists that a language with honorifics such as Japanese can be analyzed within the framework of Brown and Levinson's theory, since the use of honorifics is strategic language use. Usami points out that the concept of discourse politeness enables the theory of universal politeness to theoretically encompass the use of honorifics.

In relation to previous discussions of politeness theory and Japanese honorifics, it is obvious that there are two major streams: one emphasizes the characteristics of the use of honorifics and inapplicability of politeness theory to Japanese due to the embedded social norms in its language system (Hill et al., 1986; Ide, 1989, 1992, 2005, 2006; Ide et

al., 1992; Matsumoto, 1989); the other attempts to apply politeness theory to the Japanese language (Kitamura, 2000; Fukada & Asato, 2004; Usami, 1999b). As Tokuda (2002) claims, these two directions occur due to different perspectives. In other words, Brown and Levinson seek an underlying principle, while their opponents may be looking in a different direction, which is that, “superficial similarities can result from different underlying principles”, as Matsumoto claims (1988, p. 404). The present study takes the former standpoint. As described above, among these arguments, oppositions to politeness theory may ignore the actual language use that has been pointed out by some studies. However, Usami’s (1999b) view seems to contain some rational account for the use of Japanese honorifics. In the following section, discourse politeness will be explained.

Pragmatic Politeness to Discourse Politeness

As described above, Usami (1999b) basically agrees with politeness theory and attempts to situate the use of the Japanese language within it. By doing so, Usami (1998) proposes the concept of discourse politeness as a sub-category of pragmatic politeness. According to Usami (1999b), discourse politeness is defined as “the dynamic whole of functions of various elements in both linguistic forms and discourse-level phenomena that play a part within the pragmatic politeness of a discourse” (p. 5). She distinguishes it from pragmatic politeness in the sense that the former can be viewed from a discourse level while the latter includes politeness at both sentence and discourse levels. Usami (1999b) proposes the concept of discourse politeness by pointing out that many previous studies had failed to identify the strategic language use of Japanese which can be revealed by discourse politeness. She claims that it is important to consider the management of discourse level features such as speech-level shift in language use in actual conversation.

Wetzel (2004) also writes about the significance of discourse phenomena in her book on Japanese honorifics.

Although Usami basically agrees with Brown and Levinson, she points out several pitfalls of their theory: their account for language use that functions in order to satisfy the social norm rather than one's strategic choice such as Japanese honorifics, and less focus on phenomena in ordinary conversation that may or may not contain face-threatening acts.

Based on her observation, Usami (1999b) explains that discourse politeness is derived from viewing language from a discourse level, such as speech-level shift, back-channels and topic-initiations, not only sentence level phenomena such as particular grammatical features. Usami (1999b) presents four proposals of how this new concept is significant for universal politeness theory. They are as follows:

1. The comparison of sentence-level linguistic expressions that are greatly influenced by structural differences between languages is unproductive.
2. Conventional discussions of honorific language that promote politeness as simply an issue of 'the degree of politeness of linguistic forms' at the sentence level, must give way to discussions that promote the perspective of pragmatic politeness as the "discourse level," thus dealing with actual language use.
3. When discussing non-honorific languages, more attention should be given to "language usage that conforms to social norms and conventions," which corresponds to pragmatic constraints of the principles of honorifics usage.
4. In both honorific and non-honorific languages, the discussion needs to deal with politeness at the discourse level. Both "the language use that conforms

to social norms and conventions” and “the individual speaker’s strategic language use,” as well as the interaction between the two should be considered. (p. 245)

In addition to these four proposals, Usami (1999b) emphasizes the significance of discourse politeness in terms of unmarked politeness. According to her, unmarked politeness can be recognized when it is not carried out as expected. That is, when the polite level is dominant, non-polite forms can be considered as marked and the dominant style, polite level, can be considered unmarked. In contrast, when the non-polite level is the dominant one, such as in conversation between close friends or family members, the polite level can be viewed as marked and non-polite as unmarked politeness. Usami names it unmarked politeness in contrast to marked politeness that is a strategic language use of politeness proposed by Brown and Levinson. Usami (1999b) suggests that the concept of marked and unmarked politeness is necessary for an understanding of discourse politeness. This is because in conversation in Japanese, the speech-level shift indicates one’s strategic use of language reflecting social factors.

By conducting a number of studies, Usami (1999b, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2002) proposes discourse politeness as a comprehensive theory which builds on the foundation of the work of Brown and Levinson. In her study, Usami (1993) qualitatively analyses natural conversation data. Usami (1999b) also conducts quantitative research by collecting 72 samples of natural conversational data. In both studies, only the power factor (P) is the variant while the distance factor (D) and ranking of imposition (R) are controlled due to the setting, which is a first-meeting situation. Based on these studies, Usami concludes that there is indeed a ‘default’ style which she claims is ‘unmarked’ politeness, in a situation where both interlocutors are unacquainted. According to the

results of this research, the polite form is the default form in such a context. Specifically, Usami (1999b) presents the average ratio of the sentence-final speech level in seventy-two conversations between NSs who are strangers to each other, and workers in Japan, as follows: polite: plain: incomplete-sentences = 6: 1: 3 (p. 12). Thus, in a conversation between unacquainted persons, it is apparent that the polite form is appropriate from a native Japanese perspective. By acknowledging a 'default' style, Usami (1999b, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2002) emphasizes that language use deviating from it can be captured as 'strategic' language use in Japanese. Her argument on this point seems to provide a logical explanation of a claim that has been taken for granted. Many scholars touch upon the fact that the polite form is an appropriate form for use with strangers from the perspective of Japanese communication norms (Kikuchi, 1997; Maynard, 1997; Niyekawa, 1991).

In addition to the default style, her study shows the impact of a power factor, which is age. In particular, it reveals that the older participant is likely to take the initiative to shift the level of politeness in discourse. Since Usami designed the studies setting the power factor as a variable factor while the other two factors, D and R, were unchanged, it can be said that the phenomenon of speech-level shift is consistent with politeness theory. That is, lower evaluation of the power factor allows the participants to shift their levels of politeness. Thus, discourse politeness enables researchers to capture strategic uses of Japanese language such as speech-level shift. Usami's study (1999b) also accounts for the phenomenon that Japanese do not only follow the rules of the honorific system, but deviate from the norm by using non-polite forms where polite form

is considered 'appropriate'. Thus, discourse politeness can capture specific dynamics in the use of Japanese language.

In light of all this, discourse politeness is an updated theory which enables politeness theory to apply to a language with an honorific system, such as Japanese. However, there is little study which examines politeness by learners within this framework. Research into the language use of learners of Japanese could yield significant results with important implications for teaching and learning of Japanese.

Politeness and Learners of Japanese

By proposing discourse politeness and situating it within politeness theory, Usami (1999b) implies that knowledge of discourse features such as speech-level shift is significant for learners of Japanese. She claims that with such knowledge, learners can minimize miscommunication with NSs, which has in fact been pointed out as a serious issue for learners (Carroll, 2005; Niyekawa, 1991). In the following section, the issue of cross-cultural communication is discussed. In relation to this, the motivation of the present study, which employs discourse politeness, is described.

Cross-Cultural Miscommunication in Japanese

In cross-cultural communication, misunderstandings may occur, and in Japanese, miscommunications between a NS and a NNS are not uncommon. In particular, miscommunication with regard to the use of the polite language is considered as more serious than others involving, for example, syntactic, lexical, or semantic errors or misunderstandings (Niyekawa, 1991). As Niyekawa explains, "an ordinary grammatical error made by the foreigner may simply seem cute to the Japanese, but an error in *keigo* [Japanese honorific system] tends to arouse an instantaneous emotional reaction" (1991,

p.14). In addition, she writes that “more frequently than the foreigner assumes, sociolinguistic error is taken as an intentional personal insult” (p. 14). For instance, when a younger NNS speaks to an older NS with non-polite form, the NS may be offended, since the choice of politeness by the NNS reflects his/her assessment of the properties of the Japanese interlocutor, such as age, social status. That is, the Japanese may think that he/she is being looked down upon by the other. Thus, the choice of polite and non-polite forms may cause serious issues with NSs. In addition, the seriousness of such a miscommunication is also evident in its treatment by NS. That is, as Carroll (2005) claims that, “errors in *keigo* [Japanese honorific system] may not be corrected overtly, they may not be tolerated internally” (p. 234).

It can be said that misunderstandings provoked by the use of polite and non-polite forms are serious and needed to be considered. Usami (1999b), therefore, examined conversations between NSs and provides some implications for learners of Japanese and Japanese language teaching. The present study also aims at arriving at implications for Japanese language teaching and learning. By doing so, the present study sheds light on the dynamics of conversations between a NS and a NNS in order to determine patterns and purposes of actual use of polite and non-polite forms by learners, and to discuss potential suggestions for such cross-cultural miscommunications.

In the previous section, the complexity of Japanese honorifics was explained with reference to communication between NSs of Japanese. It is also necessary to survey research which has been undertaken from a learner’s perspective, since there is little doubt that the complexity of manipulating social aspects of communication, assessments of positions of interlocutors in the social hierarchy, and choosing appropriate politeness

forms are causes of cross-cultural communication breakdowns or miscommunication between a NS and a NNS.

Learners and the Japanese Honorific System

In fact, the Japanese honorific system is considered one of the most difficult aspects of the language (Carroll, 2005; Coulmas, 1992; Kindaichi, 2003; Niyekawa, 1991; Ujihara, 1997; Usami, 2001c; Wetzel, 2004). The difficulty for even NSs has been mentioned in the research literature (Carroll, 2005; Coulmas, 1992; Kindaichi, 2003; Niyekawa, 1991; Ujihara, 1997; Usami, 2001c; Wetzel, 2004). Despite its difficulty, dealing with honorifics is a necessary skill for an adult (Hagino, 2005; Maynard, 1997). They are taught at school as a part of the Japanese honorific systems, and no doubt a learner of Japanese can be easily overwhelmed in the process of learning of Japanese honorifics as well as the entire linguistic and pragmatic system. In particular, learners' difficulties with the Japanese honorific system are explained in the choice of level of politeness according to social factors and the maintenance of the level (Bunkacho, 1993; Maynard, 1997).

With regard to this, one of the major Japanese textbooks, *An Integrated Course in Elementary Japanese GENKI*, (Banno, Ohno, Sakane & Shinagawa, 1999) explains for learners as follows:

License to use non-polite form is not mutual; senior partners may feel perfectly justified in using short forms [non-polite forms] while expecting their junior partners to continue addressing them with long forms [polite forms]. Thus if somebody who is older, say, your Japanese language professor, talks to you using

short forms [non-polite forms], they would be greatly surprised if you should return the favor. (p. 157)

In addition, it states that it may be uneasy to determine when it is appropriate to switch from polite form to non-polite form. Thus, it is pointed out that the choice and maintenance of level of polite (and non-polite) forms according to social factors is significant for learners. As shown above, instruction on this is provided for learners. However, some researchers point out that one of the key difficulties for learners of mastering the honorific system is in the nature of the instructions provided in course materials (Kawaguchi, 2006; Matsumoto & Okamoto, 2003). In particular, two issues are pointed out: the timing of introduction of honorifics as well as overemphasis on the use of polite form as a neutral form.

First, the timing of introducing the 'referent' type of honorifics is identified as a cause of difficulty (Ichikawa, 2005; Kawaguchi, 2006; Mizutani, 1989; Nakai, Oba & Doi, 2004; Sei, 2006; H. Tanaka, 2006; M. Tanaka, 2003). According to scholars, the referent type of honorifics is often introduced to learners at the end of the beginner level or the early intermediate level. Sei (2006) claims that dealing with referent honorifics in line with other grammatical points can cause learner misunderstanding because the Japanese honorific system is embedded in the entire language and not merely an aspect of study of grammar (Kawaguchi, 2002; Watanabe, 1971). In relation to the timing of the introduction, Carroll (2005) describes her experience as a learner of Japanese saying, "the sudden encounter with referent honorifics after a year or so made me wonder whom I had been offending by its absence in the preceding months" (p. 245). This late introduction of the referent type of honorifics is often pointed out as a particular problem for learners

who study in Japan (Nakai et al., 2004; M. Tanaka, 2003). Sei also points out that learners of Japanese in Japan have difficulty dealing with speech level (1995, 1997). As such, it is suggested that learners who learn Japanese in Japan need such knowledge in their real life outside of the classroom as they learn.

In addition, overemphasis on polite form is pointed out as a cause of difficulty for learners in mastering the use of the Japanese honorific system (Bunkacho, 1993; Matsumoto & Okamoto, 2003). It is claimed that overemphasis on one form does not lead to understandings of other forms, but rather it creates its own problems (Bunkacho, 1993). Matsumoto and Okamoto (2003) claim that polite form is often introduced as a safer form for learners and emphasized, but they point out that the overemphasis on polite form can hinder learners from acquiring different speech levels, as well as dealing with speech level shift, which can be found in an actual Japanese conversation.

Above all, the timing of the introduction of the referent type of honorifics and the overemphasis on the polite form are pointed out as significant barriers for learners to understand and use the Japanese honorific system and honorifics. Moreover, these difficulties may cause cross-cultural miscommunication between a NS and a NNS as described above.

In addition to these possible causes of miscommunication, a Japanese norm can be another cause of miscommunication. That is, NSs evaluating learners' use of polite and non-polite form as 'inappropriate' when it deviates from a Japanese native norm may result in miscommunication. It is questionable whether or not all such deviations are necessarily 'inappropriate', that is, it might be inappropriate from a Japanese native norm, but it may sometimes be a result of a learner's own strategic use.

Discourse Politeness and Learners

As recent researchers claim, there are dynamic functions in the use of polite and non-polite forms (Cook, 1996a, 1996b, 1997, 1999, 2002, 2006; Ikuta, 1983; Okamoto, 1997, 1998; Okushi, 1998; Yoshida & Sakurai, 2005). In addition, these uses of language may indeed be captured within a theory of discourse politeness. However, there have been few studies on actual use of polite and non-polite forms by learners of Japanese language (Muramatsu, 2008). That is, learners' uses of Japanese are still mainly examined solely from the perspective of a native Japanese norm and evaluated as deviations or inappropriate use (Cook, 2001; Ishida, 2001; Nakai et al., 2004; Naito, 2003; Ozaki, 1989; Park, 2006; Tokuda, 2002). These studies have made strong contributions to learning and teaching of Japanese language to NNSs, since they clarify learners' needs. However, as described above, the traditional normative view is no longer the only view of the honorific system, but a strategic use of polite (and non-polite) form may be analyzed within the framework of discourse politeness which is proposed by Usami (1999b). In relation, Thomas (1983) claims that learners need to use a target language depending on their own value systems, but they do not necessarily conform to the native norm.

As Usami (2003) claims, interaction between a NS and a NNS can be also analyzed from not only a Japanese native norm, but also from a dynamic perspective of the use of Japanese including at a discourse level. However, the actual language use by learners from a non- normative view in relation to politeness has been less of a focus in research. Given that, investigating learners' use of polite form in actual conversation might uncover what might be lacking in the studies from normative viewpoints.

Particularly, it would be beneficial for cross-cultural communication in Japanese between a NS and a NNS, since in cross-cultural communication, whose norm should be used is an important question (White, 1993). The clear-cut answer seems to still be under discussion. It is apparent that having an absolute answer for this question needs a great deal of discussion, and possible suggestions can be drawn by investigating learner's linguistic behavior in relation to politeness. As Neustupny (2005) claims, "to build up a repertoire of usable contact norms for non-J [Japanese] participants is an important task" (p. 313).

In light of this, the present study is an effort to shed light on learners' use of polite and non-polite forms within a framework of discourse politeness. In particular, learners outside Japan, in other words, learners of Japanese as a foreign language (JFL learners hereafter), are a central focus rather than those who are in Japan, because communication between a NS and a NNS outside Japan is likely to happen more frequently today than decades ago due to the increase of the number of Japanese who reside outside Japan as well as the increase of the number of JLF learners (Japan Foundation, 2006; The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2007). Despite these demographic facts, there has been little study on the actual use of language by learners outside Japan in relation to politeness. Issues of cross-cultural miscommunication do not only occur in Japan, but they are also significant issues outside Japan (Matsumoto & Okamoto, 2003). Although some researchers assume that these problems are more serious for learners in Japan (Nakai et al., 2004; M. Tanaka, 2003), there is no significant evidence or reason to believe that learners outside Japan are exceptions. As described above, in an internationalized society where Japanese may not be used only in Japan, learners outside Japan are important speakers of Japanese.

Moreover, among those learners outside Japan, advanced learners are the central focus of the present study for two reasons. First, miscommunication is an issue for any learners, but it is more serious for advanced speakers of Japanese. They are expected to have a minimum amount of knowledge as to how to speak and behave, since a fluent speaker of a foreign language is assumed to know the culture well (Niyekawa, 1991). That is, it is plausible that NSs would expect an advanced learner to handle the honorific system and, if it is not the case, they might interpret the misuses as stemming from the learner's intention. Second, discourse politeness is the conceptual framework of the present study. Discourse politeness is based on the theory of politeness by Brown and Levinson (1978) which is proposed with an assumption of a Model Person (MP) who is a fluent speaker. That is, when considering politeness within this theory, it is assumed that one is a fluent speaker. As such, the present study focuses on advanced learners of Japanese as reasonably fluent speakers of Japanese and significant users of it.

In the present study, advanced JFL learners are considered as important communicators in Japanese language. Based on this assumption, their linguistic behaviors are examined as significant information, including features of conversation between a NS and a NNS, as well finding possible reasons for cross-cultural miscommunication in Japanese. By doing so, the present study employs discourse politeness as a conceptual framework, which accounts for not only strategic language use, but also socio-pragmatically constrained language use. In addition, exploring the difficulty of learners of Japanese language in the use of honorifics relating to the situation is one of the central focuses of the present study. To achieve this goal, conversation data between a NS and advanced learners who are NNSs were collected and analyzed, revealing phenomena

which are compared to the result of Usami's study (1993, 1999b) to explore deviation from the 'default' as well as attempting to examine their use within the framework of discourse politeness.

By applying discourse politeness to the present study, phenomena which emerge from conversation between a NS and a NNS will reveal similarities with differences from 'default' conversation. The differences will probably contribute to understanding the nature of the miscommunication between NSs and learners of Japanese. In addition, the present study attempts to capture such phenomena within the framework of discourse politeness. That is, seeking the possibility of establishing learner's own 'default' style is another focus of the present study. In other words, a potential new perspective on the use of Japanese language by learners is another expectation of the study.

Research Questions

From the discussions of Japanese honorifics and discourse politeness above, it is obvious that the Japanese honorific system is an essential component of politeness study in Japanese. Researchers mostly discuss the normative view of the honorific system and focus on the level of politeness in a de-contextualized manner. In fact, the previous studies reveal significant aspects of the system in relation to politeness not only for NSs but also learners of Japanese. In this view of language use in relation to politeness, learners of Japanese are inevitably viewed from the perspective of Japanese norms and judged as either appropriate or not. Cross-cultural communication between a NS and a NNS is also evaluated exclusively from the Japanese native norm. This comparison is an essential method of revealing the necessary skills for learners. However, since Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) proposed politeness theory, politeness study in Japanese seems to

have shifted to the study of the effect of actual language use, and in fact there has been much research that suggests strategic language use of the Japanese honorific system by NSs. By capturing these phenomena of Japanese language within politeness theory, discourse politeness has been introduced as a systematic conceptual framework (Usami, 1998). This framework indeed provides a full account of the use of honorifics as strategic language use within politeness theory by analyzing actual conversational data between NSs.

However, there has been little research on the use of the honorific system by learners of Japanese, particularly advanced learners who can be considered as important communicators in Japanese. Particularly, as Muramatsu (2008) points out, there is little evidence on learners' choice of forms and speech level shifts in the field of Japanese language study. This motivated Muramatsu to conduct a study which examined learners' choice of forms and shifts as well as their motivations. The study uncovered some potentially important phenomena of learners' use of Japanese language in relation to sentence-final forms. However, the study employed an interview methodology in which the learners were allowed to prepare for the conversations to some extent. In order to examine more genuine phenomena of learners' use of sentence-final forms such as polite, non-polite forms, the present study focuses on natural conversation with a NS who is an unacquainted person, in order to examine how learners achieve discourse politeness in such a conversational context. By investigating such phenomena, deviations from those normally used by NSs need to be considered as evidence of the development of learners' knowledge of discourse politeness. This knowledge is often thought to be particularly important for learners in Japan, due to their real life experiences outside the classroom

(Nakai et al., 2004; Tanaka, 2003). However, there is no evidence that it is less important for learners outside Japan. Thus, the central focus of the present study is learner's discourse politeness, particularly, outside Japan.

As discussed above, discourse politeness is currently the most powerful concept of understanding politeness in Japanese within the framework of politeness theory. Within this conceptual framework, the present study has as a prime goal the revealing of possible behaviors and strategies that learners of Japanese may have in a first-meeting situation with a NS. In addition, as explained above, there are significant social factors that can influence one's linguistic choice. In other words, the use of language reflects one's assessment of these social factors. In this regard, there has been virtually no research in the field which examines learners' use of the honorific system in relation to their assessment of social factors. By examining the relationship between the use of language and assessment of social factors that are involved in a conversation, possible implications for language teaching and learning may be elaborated.

Moreover, speech-level shift is considered as one of the significant discourse features of Japanese, but remarkably few studies exist on how learners recognize it and how their recognition is reflected in their language use in an actual conversation. Some previous studies have researched learner's speech level only, but none of the studies examine how learners recognize NS interlocutors' speech-level shift (Muramatsu, 2008). As previous studies point out, acquiring speech-level shift is one of the most difficult aspects for learners (Sei, 1995, 1997). By examining how and why learners notice or do not notice speech-level shift, possible implications can be drawn for Japanese language

instruction. The present study is centred around four research questions arising from previous research in the field.

Question 1: How do learners of Japanese language outside Japan use polite and non-polite forms in a conversation with a NS with whom they are unacquainted?

Question 2: How do they assess power and distance factors in such a situation?

Question 3: How do they reflect their assessment in their ways of speaking in such a situation?

Question 4: Do they notice the shift of politeness levels by such an interlocutor and change their linguistic forms accordingly and why or why not?

Chapter 3: Methodology

Design of the Study

The present study is situated within the qualitative research paradigm, since the purpose of the study is to uncover phenomena within a certain event, rather than to generalize from it. It employs a single case study due to two reasons. First, it is due to the nature of the research questions, which explore possible phenomena of learners of Japanese in their language use and assessment of a certain situation. Second, according to Yin (2003), a case study has a distinct advantage when ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions are being asked about contemporary incidents rather than historical ones, over which the examiner has little control. In fact, the present study examines contemporary events rather than historical ones and it focuses on natural conversation. Thus, the present study may be labeled a case study. Based on the research questions, the ‘case’ of the present study is defined as ‘the use of Japanese by an advanced learner in a first-meeting situation’ which is asked in research question one. Within the case, three phases of data analysis are embedded according to the research questions (i.e., two, three and four). In order to explore the case, two stages of data collection have been designed: conversation data and interview data.

The basic design of the study replicates previous experimental studies by Usami (1999b) and Nishigori (1997), which analyze conversation between unacquainted interlocutors. Particularly, Usami (1999b) focuses on age and gender as target social variables that are defined as power (P) factor in Brown and Levinson’s theory. In her study, participants were asked to have a conversation with strangers from three different age groups and two gender groups. Usami (1999b) analyzed only the first three minutes of each conversation in order to eliminate the effect of distance (D) factor. In addition,

ranking of imposition (R), which is degree of imposition, was controlled by assigning participants to get to know each other, that is, by “limiting the broad topic of conversation to the one where no asymmetry of relevant knowledge would occur” (p. 45). The study by Nishigori (1997) basically replicates an earlier study by Usami (1993, 1995, 1998, 1999b). He also collected data from conversation between unacquainted interlocutors and analyzed the first five minutes. The study was designed to explore differences between a NS and a NNS in such variables as amount of utterances and speech style. For this purpose, Nishigori (1997) collected conversation data from two dyadic situations: one was between NSs and the other between NSs and NNSs, where NNSs were older than NSs.

In line with these previous studies, the present study is designed around a first-meeting situation where NNSs are younger than a NS. Since the central focus of the present study is to explore learners’ use of Japanese in relation to Japanese honorifics, it is expected that NNSs would have more opportunities to use polite markers. With regard to target social factors, the present study establishes a situation in which the P and D factors are social variables while the R factor is controlled as in the studies by Usami and Nishigori - that is, a first-meeting situation. In particular, the P factor is set by selecting an older person as the conversation partner for all participants. In addition, the distance factor is also set by the length of conversation, since twenty minutes may be long enough to establish or change the relationship between interlocutors, that is, the distance between them (Usami, 2001a). To explore the effect of the distance factor, two three-minute segments of the conversation are transcribed and analyzed. Thus, the present study is carefully designed to replicate previous studies within a case study framework in a

specific context. In addition, in order to explore learners' perceptions of overall speech-level change by a NS, intended change of level of politeness is designed in the study, and revealed to NNS participants in the interview sessions.

Regarding data analysis procedures, I basically follow Tannen (1984), who was a pioneer in linguistic-oriented analysis of face-to-face interaction (as cited in Maynard, 1999, p. 431). According to Maynard (1993, 1999), conversation analysis in the mode of Tannen (1984) can be categorized into six phases: (1) tape-recording of conversation, (2) transcription, (3) observation and analysis of data, (4) hypothesis, (5) incorporation of input from conversation participants and others and (6) verification of hypothesis. Since the purpose of the present study is to explore phenomena from collected conversation data, the 4th procedure – hypothesis - is replaced by the presentation of findings in the present study. Accordingly, procedure 6 - verification of hypothesis - is omitted in the present study. In addition, procedure 5 - incorporation of input from conversation participants and others - is conducted in the form of a follow-up interview with participants.

Regarding the transcribing procedure, which is the most significant phase, Basic Transcription System for Japanese (BTSJ) is employed. BTSJ has developed as the most suitable conversation analysis transcription system for Japanese language from a social psychological perspective (Usami, 1997a, 1997c, 1997d, 1997e, 2007). BTSJ is applied to the present study due to that fact that this system is developed specifically for natural conversation in Japanese - See Appendix A for more detailed information about BTSJ.

In order to refine the design of this study, a pilot study was also conducted. In the following sub-sections, the pilot study is described. The detailed information on participants, data collection and data analysis of the main study will follow.

Pilot Studies

In order to refine the design of the study, two pilot studies were conducted in advance of the present study. As Yin (2003) claims, a pilot case study is beneficial for refining data collection plans with respect to both the content of the data and the procedures to be followed (p. 79). Two pilot studies were conducted, with the second pilot study completed in a more refined manner than the first one.

Participants

Two NSs (NS1 and NS2 hereafter) volunteered to participate in the pilot study. Both of them were born in Japan and had graduated from university in Japan. NS1 is in early thirties while NS2 is in late thirties, and NS1 and NS2 have 5 and 12 years of working experience in Japan respectively. With regard to the NNSs of Japanese, two learners of Japanese language (NNS1 and NNS2 henceforth) volunteered for the pilot study. Both of them had finished the fourth year level of Japanese, which is the most advanced level of the Japanese program in the institution where the pilot studies were conducted. Both participants were in their early twenties, and neither of them had been to Japan nor worked as full-time workers in any country. Conversation data were collected from pairs - NS1 and NNS1, and NS2 and NNS2. None of the participants had met previous to the pilot study.

Procedures

There are two phases of data collection: conversation and follow-up interview for the non-native participants. For the conversation data, the dyads of participants were asked to have a natural conversation in order to get to know each other. In addition, the two NS participants were asked to change the dominant forms from polite to non-polite forms at roughly the halfway point of the conversation, as naturally as they could. For the purpose of the study, the intentional shift by the NS was revealed to the NNS participants after the conversation. The conversations were video-taped by permission of all the participants. After collecting the conversation data, follow-up interviews were conducted between the NNS participants and the researcher. The follow-up interviews were conducted on a separate day for approximately thirty minutes for each NNS participant. In the follow-up interview, NNSs' perceptions about their interlocutors' age and speech style in terms of politeness were elicited. In addition, their perception of the shift of speech level in the middle of the conversation was investigated. The interview was mainly conducted in English for the ease of conversation between the participants and the researcher.

Based on the experience of the first pilot study, some suggestions were drawn for the second pilot study. First, the explanations and instructions for both NS and NNS participants prior to the conversation were reexamined, since the conversation in the first pilot study seemed more an interview from NS1 to NNS1 than a conversation. Second, questions used for follow-up interviews were refined and the question sheet was prepared for the interview of NS2 (see Appendix B for more detailed information). As a result, the conversation data collected from the second pilot study seemed more natural than the first one.

Analysis and Results

Conversation data were transcribed using BTSJ. In the two conversations, both NS1 and NS2 indeed completed the shift of forms from polite to non-polite as instructed. However, NS1's shift was more obvious than that of NS2, since NS1 completely changed at a point from polite to non-polite forms while NS2 more gradually shifted from polite forms to mixture of non-polite and polite forms. Both NS1 and NS2 changed their linguistic forms after approximately 20 minutes of conversation. Based on this result, in the main study the NS was asked to shift her forms in the middle of the conversation, bearing in mind that it should be as natural as possible since NS2's shift was perceived as more natural than NS1's in the pilot studies. Regarding the use of polite and non-polite forms by NNS1 and NNS2, both of them shifted their forms accordingly, contrary to the Japanese norm. Their shift was not a complete change, but rather, they used a mixture of both polite and non-polite.

In the follow-up interview, the NNSs' perceptions of social factors such as power and distance, their awareness of the level-shift by the NSs and their language use in relation to their assessment of the situation were investigated. Both NNS1 and NNS2 perceived that their partners were much older than they, based on their appearance or polite manner of speaking. As for their use of polite and non-polite forms in response to the NS level-shift, NNS1 explained that he used a mixed style without being aware of it. For the use of polite form, NNS1 described that he thought he should be polite since the partner was a stranger. However, NNS1 ended up using non-polite form as well. According to NNS1, the non-polite forms occurred when he was not careful about using polite form. On the other hand, NNS2 stated that her partner's polite form affected her,

that is, she copied the partner's style. However, NNS2 also used non-polite form, and explained that her mixture of the two forms might be her habit. NNS2 also stated that she did not want to be too polite, rather she wanted to be both polite and friendly.

Based on the experience and results of these pilot studies, the main study was indeed expected to reveal some phenomena of the use of polite and non-polite forms by learners of the Japanese language (i.e., habitual use) as well as their difficulties with the reciprocal aspect of Japanese language (e.g., NNS2 attempted to copy the NSs' language use but failed).

Asked about the point where the NSs changed their forms from polite to non-polite forms, NNS1 stated that he did not notice it since he was too busy concentrating on what his partner was saying. NNS1 also remarked that his knowledge of both polite and non-polite forms enabled him to understand what NS1 was saying even though NS1 changed his forms. Based on these revelations of NNS1, it is plausible that what NNS1 focused on was to understand the content of the other's utterances, rather than the speech style, even though NNS1 considered NS1 to be older than he, and he stated that he knew he should be polite to strangers.

In contrast, NNS2 claimed to have noticed the shift by NS2. She evaluated this change as a sign of NS2's friendliness. NNS2 also stated that her perception of NS2's speech level shift made her more relaxed. From these results, it is expected that learners may have various strategies to carry on conversations with NSs. In addition, as evidenced by NNS2's claims, the understanding of the shift can be different from the Japanese native norm.

Above all, the two pilot studies were indeed beneficial in terms of refining the design of the overall study as well as confirming that the research questions are rational and can reveal some phenomena of learners' use of Japanese honorific system. In particular, these two pilot studies contributed to the present study with regard to the design of the data collection procedures. First, regarding the length of conversation, it is reduced to twenty minutes in the main study, since in the pilot studies thirty minutes were assigned but the data clearly showed that the learners could produce enough utterances in an even more limited length of time. Second, regarding the number of participants, the pilot studies employed single participants and they showed diversity in the use of polite forms in a first-meeting situation. Therefore, in order to explore the phenomena from a wider view, the main study employs multiple participants who have similar backgrounds in learning experience and age.

Participants

Non-Native Speakers (NNSs)

The seven participants in the present study are NNSs enrolled in advanced levels of a university program in Japanese as a foreign language in Canada. Initially seven data sets were collected, but analysis revealed that one of the participants rarely produced Japanese in the conversation, and so six data sets were ultimately analyzed. Prior to the study, all the honorific forms (super-polite, polite and non-polite forms) had been covered in their previous learning, confirmed by the background information sheet. The participants were in their early twenties, four of them male and two of them female. One of them was enrolled in the fourth year level of Japanese and the rest of participants were in the third year level. All of them volunteered for the study.

According to the initial background information sheets, their experiences in learning Japanese varied from two to five years, but their learning experiences at the university level are similar. Their majors were as follows: English, Information Technology, Computer Science, Business Commerce, Psychology, and Film Studies. All the participants had either Canadian nationality or permanent resident status. It is confirmed that none of them had a Japanese ethnic background. Four of them used English at home and three among the four used another language as well at home (Persian, Vietnamese, and Hindi). Two of the participants used languages other than English at home (i.e., Chinese, Russian). Thus, the backgrounds of the six participants in terms of first language (L1) vary but this diversity does not mean that they are disqualified from the present study, since the purpose is to investigate learners' performance in Japanese, not to study effects of first language on Japanese language ability. The study was designed to be limited to participants who had not been to Japan for the purpose of studying Japanese, and among the six participants two had been to Japan for two weeks to three months. Both of them are included in the study with the other four participants who had not been to Japan, since their purposes of staying in Japan were to sightsee or to study her major in English at a university in Tokyo. The two participants did not seem to have been exposed to Japanese language and culture significantly more than other participants who had not been to Japan but had a great deal of exposure in Canada through networks and media. The summary of the backgrounds of the six participants are presented with pseudonyms below.

Table 3

Summary of the Participants' Backgrounds

Name	Ben	Tom	Robert	Lena	Ken	Anna
JFL learning	2 years	3 years	3 years	3 years	5 years	3 years
Experience in Japan	None	None	None	None	2 weeks	3 months
L1	Russian	Chinese	English Hindi	English Vietnamese	English	English Persian

As described above, the present study employs a case study methodology focusing on language use in a particular situation by learners of Japanese, but not specifically zeroing in on the case of any one participant. The backgrounds of the six participants are similar in terms of learning experience of Japanese in and outside Japan, and age.

Japanese Native Speaker (JNS)

NS for the present study (JNS hereafter) was recruited through the researcher's social network. JNS was born in Japan and had 7 years of working experience in Japan and 8 years in North America. JNS was currently working in Canada and in her late thirties. Since the NNS participants were all in their early twenties (from 21 to 24 years old), the age difference ranges from 14 to 17 years. JNS's age is a key power factor in the study. As Niyekawa (1991) explains, "age is associated with rank and status" in Japanese society (p. 21). Usami (1999b) also set age as a variable in her study and examined its influence in the conversation between NSs. In addition to age, the fact that JNS speaks the Tokyo dialect, which is considered as standard Japanese, is the reason she was selected for the study. It was confirmed that JNS had been unacquainted with any of the NNS participants prior to meeting for purposes of data collection in this study.

Data Collection

Data were collected at two stages: conversation and follow-up interview. Prior to these two stages, the background information sheet was given to those who showed interest in volunteering for the study. This information sheet was created based on the contact profile devised by Freed, Dewey, Segalowitz and Halter (2004). This contact profile is designed for second language studies and selected for this study since it has been used in various contexts of language learners and it is evident that it enables researchers to elicit necessary information from participants such as learning experiences and the quantity and type of exposure to the target language (see Appendix C for more detailed information). JNS was also provided an information sheet which was different from the form for NNS participants (see Appendix D for more detailed information). In order to examine learners' assessment and performance as naturally as possible, the present study collected data which was in the form of casual conversation with JNS for approximately twenty minutes. The follow-up interviews were conducted afterwards. Two data collection procedures were utilized for the purpose of examining learners' linguistic performance in relation to their assessment of power and distance factors. Conversation data between the six NNS participants and JNS were video-taped for the purpose of transcribing. For videotaping, Sony handy-cam, a camcorder, was used. All the conversation data were collected in one week of February, 2008. Assigned time for each participant varied between morning and afternoon, due to the NNS participants' and JNS's schedule. The conversation took place in a room at the university, and the outside environment was generally quiet.

Conversational Data

For the conversation, all the six NNS participants were asked to get to know JNS by communicating with her. It was emphasized that they were not being tested, but expected to have a conversation with someone for approximately twenty minutes as if meeting for the first time. In addition, they were advised to use Japanese as much as they could, but they were not prohibited from using English. It was assumed that because the study was conducted in Canada where Japanese is a foreign language, it would be more natural to use English at times even during conversation in Japanese.

JNS was asked to change her overall speech level in the middle of the conversation from polite to non-polite after approximately 10 minutes. This was planned in order to examine how the two social factors (i.e., power and distance) might influence the nature of conversation between NS and NNS in a foreign context. The rationale for the shift is based on the fact that choice of level of speech is a fundamental and unavoidable aspect of Japanese conversation (Maynard, 1997; Sugito, 1987; Ishida, 2001; Enomoto & Marriott, 1994), and polite form is a common choice for first meeting settings (Niyekawa; 1991, Kikuchi, 1997; Maynard, 1997). In addition, Usami's (1999b) study, which showed that the use of non-polite form is reflected in the power relationships among NSs, was taken into consideration. That is, the JNS's speech-level change is designed as a power indication and as a cue for to investigating NNS participants' reaction and awareness. The potential risk that the shift might damage the naturalness of the conversation was taken into consideration, and this is part of the reason why the pilot studies were carried out. In the pilot studies, two NSs volunteered and they successfully completed the change of speech level downward. Likewise, the participants

in the pilot study stated that they conversed with the NSs naturally. The duration of the study, twenty minutes, is also a significant factor in the study. According to discourse politeness, a certain length of time can influence one's linguistic behavior, so the study set twenty minutes in order to examine the influence of the distance factor in relation to language use as well as power factors.

Follow-up Interview

For the purpose of examining learners' awareness of NS's downshift, follow-up interviews were conducted between NNS participants and the researcher afterwards. The follow-up was employed in the present study since it is a recommended process for the study of discourse politeness (Usami, 1997a) and also is considered as a method of strengthening the study, as Neustupny (1985) maintains. The interviews took place in the same room as data collection was conducted, at the beginning of March, 2008. Each interview took approximately fifteen to thirty minutes. The conversation between the participants and the researcher was mainly carried out in English for the ease of the participants. For purposes of research ethics, the fact of the intended downshift was disclosed at the beginning of the interviews by showing videos of the conversations. After the disclosure, the interviews were recorded with an audio-recorder for the researcher to refer back to the NNS participants' utterances.

Data Analysis

The collected conversation data were transcribed for the purpose of discourse level analysis such as the number of utterances and speech-level shift. Since the central focus of the study was to explore phenomena of the use of the Japanese honorific system by learners of Japanese, sentence-final form was analyzed in terms of number and type.

The use of the Japanese honorific system was set as the target focus since it is considered one of the difficulties and the causes of miscommunication with a NS for NNSs. As such, by analyzing the phenomena of learners' use of the Japanese honorific system, possible suggestions for both learners and teachers of Japanese language may be elaborated.

Regarding the types of sentence-final forms, polite form is an addressee type of honorifics and the only form used to show a polite attitude toward an addressee (Hagino, 2005). In addition to polite form, types of sentence-final form are categorized into four other groups: non-polite, non-marker, English, and other. Thus, the sentence-final form was set as the focus of analysis in the conversation data, with five possible types of forms. Using these criteria, two segments of three minutes each were transcribed from the twenty-minute conversations. Specifically, the first one was taken for three minutes from the first utterance of the conversation, and the other three-minute segment was taken after ten minutes from the first utterances. The first three minutes can be expected to contain the characteristic features of conversation between unacquainted persons, reflecting power factors such as age differences between interlocutors (Usami, 1993, 1998, 1999b). The second three-minute segment was a focus for the purpose of analyzing the influence of JNS's shift on the NNSs' speech as well as the influence of power and distance factors.

For transcribing, BTSJ was employed. BTSJ has been developed based on researchers' needs for analysis of natural conversation data in Japanese language. Using BTSJ, the two three-minute segments of each conversation were transcribed and these transcribed data were analyzed in terms of number of utterances, the ratio of types of utterance such as polite and non-polite, and speech-level shift. Since the focus of the

study is the use of the Japanese honorific system, all the utterances were analyzed and categorized as polite (P) or non-polite (N). In addition, it can be that an utterance is neither polite nor non-polite (Usami, 1999b), and these were categorized non-marker (NM), English (E) and others (/) which are difficult to determine (i.e., *ah, naruhodo*, ‘I see’ in English). Thus, five categories were predetermined for the transcribing process. Although BTSJ is originally designed for Japanese language, for international purposes roma-ji, which is a Roman alphabet-based writing system of Japanese is recommended (Usami, 1997a). Given that, the study presents the transcribed data in roma-ji. A sample transcription with BTSJ is presented below:

Table 4

Sample of Transcription

#1	#2	#3	#4	#5
1	*	P	JNS	Konnichiwa. <i>Hello.</i>
2	*	P	Ben	Konnichiwa. <i>Hello.</i>
3	*	P	JNS	Hajimemashite. <i>How do you do?</i>
4	*	P	Ben	Hajimemashite, Ben to moushimasu. <i>How do you do? My name is Ben.</i>
5	*	N	JNS	Ben-san? [↑] [confirming] <i>Ben-san? [↑] [confirming]</i>
6	*	P	Ben	A, hai. <i>Ah, yes.</i>
7	*	P	JNS	A, JNS desu, hajimemashite. <i>Ah, I am JNS, pleased to meet you.</i>
8	*	P	Ben	Hajimemashite. <i>Pleased to meet you.</i>

The number in the first column indicates the number of the utterance in sequence, the second column is for the marker that indicates whether the utterance is completed (*) or

not (/) (grammatically incomplete utterances can be complete utterances depending on the context), the third is for markers of type of utterance (i.e., P for polite, N for non-polite, NM for non-marker, E for English and / is for others), the fourth indicates who the speaker is and the last column contains the actual utterance in romanized Japanese with English translation below in italics.

In addition, in the follow-up interview the study investigated NNSs' assessment of the situation, in which the JNS was fourteen to seventeen years older than them, their awareness of JNS's shift of overall use of polite to non-polite forms as a power indicator, and their reasons for choosing specific linguistic forms. With regard to their choice of linguistic forms, they were asked for a sense of the overall use, but not for each utterance since the focus of the study is to explore the relationship between overall assessment of the situation and their linguistic selection. For the follow-up interview, several specific questions were formed following Usami's study (1999b). Several instances are presented as follows (see Appendix B for more detailed information):

1. How old do you think that your partner is? What made you think so?
2. How close did you feel the relationship with your partner? What made you feel so?
3. How did you decide your manner of speaking?
4. Did you notice that your partner changed her way of speaking from polite to non-polite form?
5. If yes, how did you feel about it? If no, why do you think that you did not notice it?

In addition to these questions about the conversation, two more questions were also asked to confirm the naturalness of the conversation:

6. Do you think that you conversed with your partner naturally?

7. Were you nervous while talking with your partner?

By adopting these analyses, the possible answers for the research questions were investigated. That is, learners' assessment of the first-meeting situation was basically explored as a follow-up. In addition, the influence of the assessment on the linguistic behavior and speech-level shift by JNS were investigated using both transcribed data of the video-taped conversation at a discourse level, and interview data.

Chapter 4: Findings and Discussions

By analyzing conversation data as well as interview data from the six participants, answers to the four research questions were drawn. Prior to the detailed explanations of findings from the present study, the possible answers for the research questions will be briefly explored.

The first research question asks how learners of Japanese language use polite/non-polite forms in a conversation with a NS with whom they are unacquainted. The analysis of the conversation data shows that most of the participants used polite form as their dominant style in the first three minutes. It is possible to say that this result is congruent with the Japanese native norm which claims that the polite form is the suitable form in a conversation with a stranger (Ikuta, 1983; Kikuchi, 1997; Lauwereyns, 2002; Maynard, 1997; Niyekawa, 1991).

In addition, question two focuses on the assessment of power and distance factors by learners. In relation to this, question three looks at the relationship between their assessment and their choice of forms. For these questions, data from both the interview and conversation present possible answers. That is, the NNS participants did assess that the JNS was older than they, but this assessment influenced none of their linguistic behaviors, but rather, they emphasized the fact that the JNS was a stranger as an influence on their choice of forms. That is, it is possible that the distance factor was the more influential for the participants of the present study. However, the findings are not by any means linear, but rather intricate. Therefore, detailed explanation is necessary to provide a full account for this phenomenon. In brief, the result could be an indication that

the participants evaluate the social variables in ways both similar and different from those of NS, since both the factors are significant variables.

Finally, question four examines the participants' awareness of shift of level of forms from polite and non-polite by the JNS, as well as its influence on the choice of linguistic forms. The awareness is investigated by the interview data while its influence was explored in the conversation data. Half of the participants noticed it while the others did not. Regarding the relationship between their awareness and choice of linguistic forms, an interesting phenomenon was found in relation to the distance factor. From this result, it is probable that the learners of Japanese have difficulty dealing with speech-level shift as Sei (1995, 1997) claims. However, the result also presents an alternative view of the learners' use of the Japanese honorific system, which can be explained within discourse politeness. That is, the NNS participants who placed a lower value on the distance factor of the context showed a high frequency of the use of non-polite forms, while the others who evaluated the distance factor more highly showed a greater tendency to use polite form or less use of non-polite form. In other words, the former group of participants utilized positive politeness, while the latter group employed negative politeness within a framework of discourse politeness.

Possible answers to the research questions have been briefly explored above, but the findings from the study show more complexity than this. In the following sections, first, detailed description of findings from both conversation and interview data are provided. Second, discussions interacting with these findings are presented as the heart of the study. Finally, limitations of the present study will be discussed.

Findings from Conversation: The Features and Change of Ways of Speaking

Overview of Conversation Data

Collected data from conversation between JNS and the six NNS participants were analyzed with a focus on the sentence-final form in order to examine the features of the participants' speech within a certain period of time, which relates directly to research question one: how do learners of Japanese language outside Japan use polite and non-polite forms in a conversation with a NS with whom they are unacquainted? Particularly, the ways of speaking shown from ratios of each type of utterance are closely examined as well as the ratios after JNS's shift of overall use of polite to non-polite forms, to investigate its influence on their speech patterns.

To begin with, the total numbers of utterances in each conversation are presented in Table 5 below. The table contains the total number of utterances as well as the number of utterances of each category, that is, C1 is for the first three-minute segment and C2 is for the three-minute segment after ten minutes from the first utterance.

Table 5

Total Number of Utterances and Those in C1 and C2

Pair	Numbers		Total
	C1	C2	
JNS-Ben	45	41	86
JNS-Tom	57	49	106
JNS-Robert	61	61	122
JNS-Lena	67	65	132
JNS-Ken	69	78	147
JNS-Anna	118	64	182
Average	70	60	129

According to table 5, the average numbers of utterances for C1 and C2 respectively are 70 and 60. In contrast, Usami's (2001b) study shows 101.8 as the average number of

utterances in three minutes. Her study dealt with data from conversation between NSs, based on a larger scale study (72 conversations in total). It is obvious that the average numbers of utterances here are smaller than the previous study by Usami. However, the present study does not focus on the number of utterances, but focuses instead on the percentages of each type of utterance in conversation with JNS. Thus, it can be said that the relatively small number of utterances does not affect the validity of the conversation data.

In addition, from an individual perspective, table 5 shows the variation in the total number among the six NNS participants as being from 41 to 118. In particular, the conversation between JNS and Ben was comprised of 41 utterances in C2, while that of JNS and Anna contained 118 in C1. These differences seem to be significant but among the 72 conversations in Usami's study, there were also outstandingly disparate numbers and a great deal of variance (i.e., 60 as the smallest and 150 as the largest). Regardless, the variation does not necessarily degrade the validity of the study. One possible reason for this variation in the present study is that Ben tended to produce longer utterances while Anna was more likely to speak in shorter utterances such as back-channels, particularly in C1. In order to illustrate this, two excerpts are presented in the tables below. As described above, the first column is for the number of utterances in sequence, the second column is for markers that indicate whether the utterance was completed or not, the third is for markers of type of utterance, the fourth is for the speaker and the last column contains the actual utterance in romanized Japanese with English translations below in the same column.

Table 6

Excerpt from Ben's C2

6	*	P	Ben	E-narete, a- jikan kaka, kakarimashita kedo (un), mou naremashita desu (un un). <i>Well, got used to, ah, it took, it took time (yes), I've got used to, used to it. (Oh, O.K.)</i>
7	*	P	Ben	A-nanka, I imaha hotondo mokuteki, hai, ichiou mokutekiha nanka ii sei, seisekiwo totte (un), a- nanka, ii shigoto no keiken wo moratte (un) kara, nanka, nihon no daigakuin ni hairitai desu. <i>Ah, like, now, now my purpose is, yes, basically my purpose is like to get a good, good grades (yes), ah, like, to have a good working experiences (yes), and then, like, I would like to enter graduate school in Japan.</i>
8	*	/	JNS	A- [showing surprise] Ah [showing surprise]
9	*	/	JNS	<Naruhodo.>{<} <i>I see.</i>
10	*	N	JNS	<Un.>{>} <i>Yes.</i>
11	*	N	JNS	Nihon de benkyou shitain da? <i>You want to study in Japan, don't you?</i>
12	*	P	Ben	Hai. <i>Yes.</i>
13	*	P	Ben	Ikitai desu. <i>I would love to go.</i>
14	*	N	JNS	A-, nihon de nani wo benkyou shitaino? [↑] <i>Well, what would you like to study in Japan? [↑]</i>
15	*	P	Ben	A-, maa watashino senmon wo (un) tuzuketai desu. <i>Ah, well, I would like to continue my major.</i>
16	*	P	Ben	A-, Emu bii ee toiu, a- daigakuin no puroguramu desu (un). <i>Ah, well, it a graduate program called MBA (a-ha).</i>
17	*	P	Ben	A- nihondemo yuumei nan <desu.>{<} <i>Ah, it is famous in Japan too.</i>
18	*	N	JNS	<Ano bijinesu>{>} none??[↓] [confirming] <i>Well, for business right?[↓] [confirming]</i>
19	*	P	Ben	A, bujines no daigakuin desu. (un) <i>Yes, graduate school for business. (yes)</i>
20	*	N	Ben	/brief pause/ a- totemo ii daigakuin ga aru, asokode... <i>/brief pause/ ah, there is a good graduate school, there...</i>

21	*	P	JNS	/brief pause/ toukyou desuka?[↑] /brief pause/ is it in Tokyo?[↑]
22	*	P	Ben	U--n, u-n, bashoha wasurete imasu kedo, a- nanka, a- hutatsu daigakuin ga arimasu. <i>Mmmmm, mm, I forgot the place, but ah, like, ah, there are two graduate schools.</i>
23	*	P	Ben	Sono, da, da, da, daigakuin ha (un), eigode (un) Em bii ee wo oshiete kuremasu. <i>That gu, gu, gu, guraduate school (yes) teaches MBA (yes) in English.</i>
24	*	N	JNS	A-, sokka, sokka. <i>Ah, I see, I see.</i>
25	*	P	Ben	A- dakara watashiha kono daigakuin wo hairitai desu. <i>Well, that's why, I would like to enter this graduate school.</i>
26	*	N	Ben	/brief pause/ [seems to be thinking] a-, nanka, a-, daigakuin no puroguramu wo, a-, benkyou dekirushi (un) a-, nihongo no jugyoumo (un), a-, tsuzuke, tsuzuke, tsuzukerukara (un), a-nanka (un un un) sugoku, <ii>{<}<< /brief pause/ [seems to be thinking] ha, like, ah, I can study, ah, MBA program (yes), ah, since I can also (yes) con, con, continue the study of Japanese, like (yes, yes, yes, yes), that's so,

Table 7

Excerpt from Anna's CI

34	*	P	Anna	Watashino sei desu kara. <i>It is because of me.</i>
35	*	N	Anna	Gomenne. <i>Sorry.</i>
36	*	N	JNS	E, doushite? [↑] <i>What, why?[↑]</i>
37	*	N	Anna	Doushite?? [↑] <i>Why?? [↑]</i>
38	*	N	Anna	Datte, JNS-san wa sugoku ishogashiin deshou?? [↑] <i>It's because, you are so busy, aren't you??[↑]</i>
39	*	N	Anna	Minna to jikoshoukai suru kara. <i>Because you Introduce yourself with everyone.</i>
40	*	P	JNS	Iie-, iie-. [in a soft voice] <i>No- no-. [in a soft voice]</i>
41	*	N	Anna	Hontou?? [↑] <i>Really?? [↑]</i>

42	*	P	JNS	Hai, tanoshimini shite <kimashita.>{<} <i>Yes, I was looking forward to it.</i>
43	*	N	Anna	<Hontou?>{>}[↑] <i>Are you? [↑]</i>
44	*	P	JNS	Hai. <i>Yes.</i>
45	*	N	Anna	Tsukareteruno? [↑] <i>Are you tired? [↑]</i>
46	*	P	JNS	Iie. <i>No.</i>
47	*	N	Anna	Hontou??[↑] <i>Are you sure?? [↑]</i>
48	*	P	JNS	Hai, daijoubu<desuyo.>{<} <i>Yes, I am alright.</i>
49	*	N	Anna	<E->{>} tsuyoine. <i>Oh, you are strong.</i>

By comparing these two excerpts, it is obvious that Ben's utterances are generally longer than Anna's. Particularly, utterances 7 and 26 in Ben's excerpt are relatively long.

Utterance #7:

A-nanka, I imaha hotondo mokuteki, hai, ichiou mokutekiha nanka ii sei,
seisekiwo totte, a- nanka, ii shigoto no keiken wo moratte kara, nanka, nihon no
daigakuin ni hairitai desu.

*Ah, like, now, now my purpose is, yes, basically my purpose is like to get a good,
good grades, ah, like, to have a good working experiences, and then, like, I would
like to enter graduate school in Japan.*

Utterance #26:

A-, nanka, a-, daigakuin no puroguramu wo, a-, benkyou dekirushi, a-, nihongo
no jugyoumo, a-, tsuzuke, tsuzuke, tsuzukerukara, a-nanka sugoku,

*Ah, like, ah, I can study, ah, MBA program, ah, since I can also con, con,
continue the study of Japanese, like, that's so,*

In contrast, overall Anna's utterances consist of single words such as *doushite?* (why?) in utterance 37, and *hontou?* (really?) in utterance 41. Thus, one possible reason for the different number of the total number of utterances could be the difference in the length of utterances.

With regard to the ratios of JNS and the NNS participants' utterances, Tables 8 and 9 below show them in each ratio of C1 and C2 to present that none of the conversations were dominated by one interlocutor.

Table 8

The Ratio of Utterances of both JNS and the NNS Participants in C1

	C1(%)		C1(%)	total(%)
JNS	44.4	Ben	55.6	100
JNS	57.9	Tom	42.1	100
JNS	49.2	Robert	50.8	100
JNS	58.2	Lena	41.8	100
JNS	49.3	Ken	50.7	100
JNS	44.1	Anna	55.9	100
Average	50.5	Average	49.5	100

Table 9

The Ratio of Utterances of both JNS and the NNS Participants in C2

	C2(%)		C2(%)	total(%)
JNS	39.0	Ben	61.0	100
JNS	65.3	Tom	34.7	100
JNS	55.7	Robert	44.3	100
JNS	56.9	Lena	43.1	100
JNS	56.4	Ken	43.6	100
JNS	40.6	Anna	59.4	100
Average	52.3	Average	47.7	100

According to Table 8 and 9 above, in both the first three-minute and the second three-minute segments, the ratios of the utterances of both JNS and the NNS participants are between 40 % to 60% except for two (i.e., JNS in L3 and Tom in C2). It is evident that in any of the conversations, one person did not dominate the conversation, but both of the interlocutors conversed more or less equally. In addition, as table 5 shows the variation in the total numbers of the utterances among the six participants, table 8 and 9 indicate that it is not because of JNS or the NNS participants, but rather, a result of the conversation flow. These tables provide support for the validity of the conversation data. That is, they were not monologues or speeches, but conversations between two interlocutors.

Next, the ratio of each type of utterance by JNS (i.e., polite (P), non-polite (N), non-marker (NM), English (E) and others (/)) will be presented in Table 10 in order to illustrate the tendency in the utterances at a discourse level.

Table 10

The Ratio of Each Type of Utterance of JNS in C1 and C2

	C1					
	P (%)	N (%)	NM (%)	E (%)	/ (%)	Total (%)
Average	75.6	16.6	4.2	0.0	3.7	100
	C2					
	P (%)	N (%)	NM (%)	E (%)	/ (%)	Total (%)
Average	8.0	81.6	3.2	0.0	7.3	100

Table 10 shows that the proportion of polite form in C1 is 75.6% while that in C2 is 8.0%, while the percentage of non-polite form in C1 is 16.6% and in C2 81.6%. These instances show that JNS did change her speech level between these two different parts of the conversations. This is significantly important since the present study is designed around

this shift as an indication of the power relationship between JNS and the participants.

That is, the present study focuses on whether or not the participants noticed this shift, and how they reacted to it, as is the focus in research question four.

Thus, the numbers from table 10 show that the JNS did shift her speech level downward. It is also confirmed by the researcher's observation that JNS was likely to shift downward approximately 7 minutes after the first utterance in all conversations.

According to Usami (2001b), in conversation between NSs who are unacquainted, the ratio of no-marker utterances is 25-30%. Table 10 seems discrepant with that result in that the numbers of NM in both C1 and C2 are smaller than in Usami's study (4.2% and 3.2%). Although NM utterances are considered a major feature of spoken Japanese (Usami, 1999b), the proportion of NM utterances is not the central focus of the study. The significant point from Table 10 is the fact that JNS's dominant type of utterance changed in terms of ratio.

Above all, it could be possible to say that the conversations between JNS and the six NNS participants were not unnatural in terms of JNS's total numbers and ratios, particularly in C1. That is, the situations could be considered as likely authentic for first-meeting settings where the NS is older. In the situation, the participants communicated with JNS in Japanese. Their ratios of each type of utterance are presented below.

Table 11

The Ratio of Each Type of Utterance of the NNS Participants in C1

	P (%)	N (%)	NM (%)	E (%)	/ (%)	Total (%)
Ben	88.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	100
Tom	66.7	16.7	0.0	12.5	4.2	100
Robert	80.6	9.7	0.0	6.5	3.2	100

Lena	67.9	17.9	7.1	3.6	3.6	100
Ken	48.6	31.4	0.0	11.4	8.6	100
Anna	40.9	53.0	6.1	0.0	0.0	100
Average	65.4	22.1	2.9	6.3	3.3	100

Table 12

The Ratio of Each Type of Utterance of the NNS Participants in C2

	P (%)	N (%)	NM (%)	E (%)	/ (%)	Total (%)
Ben	72.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	12.0	100
Tom	58.8	0.0	23.5	17.6	0.0	100
Robert	70.4	11.1	3.7	3.7	11.1	100
Lena	57.1	14.3	7.1	3.6	17.9	100
Ken	35.3	47.1	8.8	2.9	5.9	100
Anna	31.6	42.1	2.6	0.0	23.7	100
Average	54.2	21.1	8.3	4.6	11.8	100

According to Table 11, all the participants except for Anna show a large proportion of P-utterances, and that it could be said that their dominant speech style was polite form in the first three-minute segment. In addition, four of the six participants show the same feature in C2 according to Table 12. That is, it could be understood that their dominant speech style in the second three-minute segment was also polite form. However, by contrasting the ratios of P-utterances in C1 and C2, it can be also noted that the ratio of P-utterances for all the participants show a decrease from C1 to C2 (Ben, 88 to 72%; Tom, 66.7 to 58.8%; Robert, 80.6 to 70.4%; Lena 67.9 to 57.1%; Ken, 48.6 to 35.3%; and Anna 40.9 to 31.6%). By simply considering the fact that JNS had already shifted downward by then, it could be said that JNS's change of speech style likely affected them.

With regard to the ratio of N- utterances, some of the participants decreased between C1 and C2 (Tom, Lena and Anna) while others increased (Ben, Robert and Ken).

In addition, their ratios of N vary from 4.0% to 53% in C1 and 0.0% to 47.1 in C2.

Regarding the ratio of NM-utterances, it seems as low as JNS except for Tom (23.5%).

In relation to English utterances (E), Table 11 and 12 show a higher number than JNS, who produced 0% in both C1 and C2.

Thus, the detailed analysis of each type of utterance shows variation in the participants' linguistic behaviors in both C1 and C2. These results are relevant to research question one which deals with the phenomena of use of polite and non-polite forms by learners of Japanese in a conversation with a NS who is a stranger.

The phenomena shown above can be examined further from the perspective of a Japanese native norm. That is, these instances suggest that most of the participants linguistically behaved politely in the first three-minute segment, which fits with an expected Japanese norm in a first-meeting situation (Ikuta, 1983; Kikuchi, 1997; Lauwereyns, 2002; Maynard, 1997; Niyekawa, 1991). In addition, since the participants were younger interlocutors in the conversations, non-reciprocation was also expected from a Japanese viewpoint. However, the decreased ratio of P-utterances could be indicative of a tendency to reciprocatively use other forms rather than polite form. In order to investigate the reciprocative aspect of the participants' speech performance, the speech-level shift of the NNS participants was analyzed as well. That is, these numbers could be an indication of how the participants reacted to JNS's utterances.

Table 13

The Number of Speech-Level Shifts by the NNS Participants

	Downshift (P-->N)		Upshift (N-->P)	
	C1	C2	C1	C2
Ben	2	0	4	7

Tom	2	0	3	9
Robert	3	0	2	12
Lena	3	0	2	9
Ken	8	1	0	6
Anna	20	0	4	9
Average	6.3	0.2	2.5	8.7

The speech-level shift was counted when the level of utterance shifted from that of the previous utterance of the interlocutor. That is, when the NNS participants responded with a non-polite utterance to the polite utterance by JNS, or with a polite utterance to a non-polite utterance by JNS, their utterances were counted as either downshift or upshift.

Table 13 above shows the number of speech-level shifts of both downshift and upshift in C1 and C2. Considering that the participants were younger and JNS was older, downshift from the participants would not be expected to occur in C1 since NS's dominant utterance level is polite, while upshift is expected in C2 since JNS's dominant utterance level is non-polite.

According to Table 13, the number of downshifts in C2 is almost 0 except for Ken (1). This could be due to NS's high ratio of N-utterances in C2 (i.e., average 81.6%). That is, downshift was not likely to happen. Regarding the number of downshifts in C1 where NS's dominant utterance is polite, Ken and Anna show the largest numbers (8 and 20) in contrast to other participants. One possible reason is that this is related to their high ratio of non-polite utterances in C1 (31.4% and 53% respectively).

On the contrary, the numbers of upshifts in C2 where JNS's main form was non-polite are relatively high for all the participants. These numbers are 39%, 90%, 63%, 56%, 50% and 75% of their utterances in C2 for Ben, Tom, Robert, Lena, Ken and Anna in that order. These instances may indicate that the NNS participants had skills of dealing with

reciprocation, which is considered one of the complex aspects of Japanese honorifics (Maynard, 1997). Thus, the results from analysis of speech-level shift also provide possible answers for research question 1 which focuses on the phenomena of the learners' use of language from the perspective of the asymmetry of Japanese language politeness levels.

A summary analysis of the conversation data from the perspective of research question one shows some interesting features. The numbers from the conversation data indicate that JNS did change her overall speech level between the first three minutes of conversation and the second three minute segment of conversation. Accordingly, all the participants decreased their ratio of polite utterances between C1 and C2. In addition, their ratio of non-polite utterance shows variation and the numbers of speech-level shifts of the participants show a high frequency of upshift in C2. In the following section, each participant's data will be discussed to provide a more detailed description of the performance of each participant with a summary table of their each type of utterances (Ben, Tom, Robert, Lena, Ken and Anna respectively).

Ben

Table 14

The Ratio of Each Type of Utterance of Ben in C1 and C2

	P (%)	N (%)	NM (%)	E (%)	/ (%)	Total (%)
C1	88.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	100
C2	72.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	12.0	100

According to table 14, the ratio of N-utterances increased from C1 to C2 (4% to 12%). In addition, his ratio of upshifts in C2 is relatively smaller than the others (39%)

although the number is not significantly different from others according to Table 13. One possible reason is that in the conversation between Ben and JNS, it was observed that Ben produced long and continuous utterances.

Table 15

Excerpt from Ben's C2

1	*	P	Ben	Koukou wo sotugyou shite kara, kanada ni hikkoshi mashita. <i>I moved to Canada after I graduated from the high school.</i>
2	*	P	Ben	A-daigakuno benkyou no tame ni desu (un, un). <i>Ah, it is for studying at University (a-ha, a-ha).</i>
3	*	N	JNS	Un-un, a- soukaa. <i>Oh, oh, I see.</i>
4	*	N	JNS	Jaa, saisho, daigaku ichinensei no toki wa chotto taihen ja nakatta? [↑] <i>Then, at the beginning, when you were a freshman, was it hard a bit?</i>
5	*	P	Ben	A-hai, taihen, taihen deshita. <i>Ah, yes, hard, it was hard.</i>
6	*	P	Ben	E-narete, a- jikan kaka, kakarimashita kedo (un), mou naremashita desu (un un). <i>Well, got used to, ah, it took, it took time (yes), I've got used to, used to it. (Oh, O.K.)</i>
7	*	P	Ben	A-nanka, I imawa hotondo mokuteki, hai, ichiou mokutekiwa nanka ii sei, seisekiwo totte (un), a- nanka, ii shigoto no keiken wo moratte (un) kara, nanka, nihon no daigakuin ni hairitai desu. <i>Ah, like, now, now my purpose is, yes, basically my purpose is like to get a good, good grades (yes), ah, like, to have a good working experiences (yes), and then, like, I would like to enter graduate school in Japan.</i>

As shown above, in the seven utterances between JNS and Ben, Ben produced five, a proportion of 61% in C2 in contrast to JNS's 39% from Table 9. That is, Ben spoke more than JNS and some of his utterances occurred without JNS's interjection, which could have made the upshift more unlikely to occur.

Tom

Table 16

The Ratio of Each Type of Utterance of Tom in C1 and C2

	P (%)	N (%)	NM (%)	E (%)	/ (%)	Total (%)
C1	66.7	16.7	0.0	12.5	4.2	100
C2	58.8	0.0	23.5	17.6	0.0	100

One outstanding phenomenon that was observed in Tom's speech is a decrease in the ratio of non-polite utterances from C1 to C2 (16.7% to 0%). This could be related to his high ratio of upshift in C2, 90%. That is, Tom seldom used non-polite form in C2 and mostly responded to JNS's non-polite form with polite form. In addition, Tom increased the ratio of no-marker and English utterances, from 0% to 21%, from 12.5% to 17.6% respectively.

Table 17

Excerpt from Tom's C2

11	*	NM	Tom	Ryokou shite.... <i>On a trip....</i>
15	*	NM	Tom	U-n, hikouki no ue de (<laughter>)... <i>Well, on the airplane (<laughter>)...</i>
46	*	NM	Tom	Demo, (un) terebide itsumo sakana toka nikutoka.... <i>But (yes), always meat and fish on TV....</i>
49	*	NM	Tom	Amaimonowa chotto.... <i>Sweets are a little....</i>

All of the four utterances above were Tom's utterances with no sentence-final markers. For instance, utterance 49, *amaimonowa chotto...*, was meant to express that he did not like sweets very much. This utterance could be uttered with either polite or non-

polite marker: *amaimonowa chotto sukijanaidesu* (*desu* as polite marker), or *amaimonowa chotto sukijanai* (no polite marker).

Robert

Table 18

The Ratio of Each Type of Utterance of Robert in C1 and C2

	P (%)	N (%)	NM (%)	E (%)	/ (%)	Total (%)
C1	80.6	9.7	0.0	6.5	3.2	100
C2	70.4	11.1	3.7	3.7	11.1	100

Robert decreased the ratio of P-utterances from C1 to C2 and increased the ratio of N- utterances in C2 in contrast to that in C1. Although Robert increased the ratio of N- utterance in C2, the number of upshifts in this segment is 12 according to table 13, which is 63% of his utterances in C2.

Lena

Table 19

The Ratio of Each Type of Utterance of Lena in C1 and C2

	P (%)	N (%)	NM (%)	E (%)	/ (%)	Total (%)
C1	67.9	17.9	7.1	3.6	3.6	100
C2	57.1	14.3	7.1	3.6	17.9	100

Lena decreased the ratio of both P- and N-utterances from C1 to C2. She also increased the ratio of the utterances categorized as others (/) in C1 (3.6%) in contrast to C2 (17.9%). This could be due to her frequent response by laughter or some utterances that were not audible.

Ken

Table 20

The Ratio of Each Type of Utterance of Ken in C1 and C2

	P (%)	N (%)	NM (%)	E (%)	/ (%)	Total (%)
C1	48.6	31.4	0.0	11.4	8.6	100
C2	35.3	47.1	8.8	2.9	5.9	100

The ratio of N-utterances in C1 is relatively high, 31.4%, and Ken increased it to 47.1% in C2. Since the ratio of P-utterances in C2 is 35.3%, non-polite form is dominant for Ken in C2 where JNS dominantly used non-polite form.

Anna

Table 21

The Ratio of Each Type of Utterance of Anna in C1 and C2

	P (%)	N (%)	NM (%)	E (%)	/ (%)	Total (%)
C1	40.9	53.0	6.1	0.0	0.0	100
C2	31.6	42.1	2.6	0.0	23.7	100

Finally, Anna shows a high ratio of N-utterances. However, Anna decreased the ratio of N-utterances from C1 to C2 (53% to 42.1%). Although Anna decreased this ratio, her ratio of N-utterances in C2 is as high as that of Ken, who increased that ratio (47.1%). While Ken's dominant style was non-polite only in C2, Anna predominantly used non-polite in both C1 and C2 according to the ratios shown above. That is, Anna's overall speech level can be considered non-polite. Ken and Anna show a similarity in the number of speech-level shifts as well, in that they show a significantly large number of

downshifts in C1 (8, 20 respectively), which could be related to their high ratio of non-polite utterances in C1.

In sum, these instances from conversational data suggest that the NNSs in the present study performed in the same manner as NS in the first three minutes in which polite form is expected. They also suggest that their use of polite form as the conversation continued countered the Japanese norm which expects a younger interlocutor to maintain the level of politeness.

Moreover, detailed examination of the six NNS participants suggests that the causes of the decrease can vary among them, since they show a variety of patterns in their ratio of non-polite, no-marker, English and other utterances. Thus, analyzing individual conversation data also shows diversity as a feature of the NNS participants' use of polite and non-polite forms, which is a central focus of research question one.

In relation to these results, analyzing interview data would be beneficial to enrich the picture of the participants' behaviors in the first-meeting setting and to explore the potential answers for other research questions. The interview data will be presented in the next section.

Findings from Interview: Assessment, Decisions and Awareness of the Shift of Forms

In the follow-up interviews, the NNS participants were asked about their assessment of JNS's age and their relationship with her, the influence of their assessment on their ways of speaking, and awareness of JNS's shift of forms. The analysis of these data aims at finding possible answers for the rest of the research questions which focus on learners' assessment of social factors and relationship between their assessment and

choice of forms. Main questions that were used in the follow-up interview are presented below (see Appendix B for the complete list of questions).

Table 22

Main Questions for the Follow-up Interview

#	Questions
Q5	How old do you think that your partner is?
Q6	What made you think so? Do you think your judgement affect your performance and way of speaking?
Q7	How close did you feel the relationship with your partner? (At the beginning and as the conversation went on)
Q8	What made you think so?
Q9	How did you decide your manner of speaking?
Q10	Why did you use a specific form?
Q15	Did you notice that your partner changed her way of speaking from polite to non-polite from?
Q16	If yes, how did you feel about it? Do you think it affected your manner of speaking?
Q17	If no, why do you think that you did not notice it?

First, overall results are presented due to the nature of the study which is to explore the phenomena of NNSs' perceptions in relation to their linguistic performance. Second, the findings from each participant will be presented individually as more detailed information. Finally, possible themes drawn from the analysis integrated with both conversational and interview data will be described as discussions.

Overall View of Interview Data

The interview data based on the questions above is briefly summarized in the table below.

Table 23

Summary of Interview Data

	Ben	Tom	Robert	Lena	Ken	Anna
Q5. JNS's age	Older	Older	Older	Older	Older	Older
Q6. Reason & influence	Appearance	Appearance	The content	Appearance	Appearance	Appearance
	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
Q7. Relationship	Not so close	Not so close	Not so close	Not so close -> closer	Not so close -> closer	Very close
Q9, 10. Ways of speaking	Be polite	Habit First time to meet	Habit	First time to meet	Naturally came out	Naturally came out
Q15. JNS's shift	NOT notice	NOT notice	NOT notice	Noticed	Noticed	Noticed
Q16, 17. Reason, thought & influence	Nervous	Too busy	Focus on content	JNS was older	JNS adapted	JNS adapted
				Shouldn't reciprocate	Comfortable and easier	Casual

These instances suggest that there are common features among the participants regarding assessment of power and distance factors, its influence on their ways of speaking, and awareness of JNS's shift of her speech level. The first two features are examined as keys for research question two: How do they assess power and distance factors in such a situation? and three: How do they reflect their assessment in their ways of speaking in such a situation? The last feature is described as key for research question four: Do they notice the shift of politeness level by an interlocutor and change their linguistic forms accordingly, and why?

Assessment of power and distance factors. Regarding the power factor, which was controlled by JNS's age, all the participants assessed that JNS was older than they. They mainly considered JNS's appearance in their assessment of age except for Robert who considered JNS's speech content.

With regard to the distance factor (i.e., the evaluation of the relationship with JNS), all of them judged that their relationships were distant at the beginning of the conversation, except for Anna, who evaluated it as very close. The reason for such assessments was that they were strangers each other. In contrast, they showed differences in terms of changes of their assessments of their relationship as a distance factor in the twenty minutes of conversation.

Ben, Tom and Robert mentioned that their assessment of the distance factor did not change in the entire twenty minutes (i.e., not so close), while Lena and Ken said that it did change to become closer as the conversation went on. One possible factor which may account for this change is that both Lena and Ken found common things with JNS in their conversations, while Ben, Tom and Robert did not. Lena and Ken asked several questions about JNS. For instance, Lena asked where JNS worked and found that she had a friend who used to work at the same place. Ken also found that JNS worked for a restaurant where he would love to go someday. The excerpt is shown below.

Table 24

Excerpt from Ken's C1

18	*	P	JNS	A-, kanada niwa shigoto de (hai) hai, kimashita. <i>Well, I came (yes) because of a job, yes.</i>
19	*	P	Ken	A-, doko desuka? [↑] <i>Ah, where is it? [↑]</i>
20	*	P	JNS	E-, watashi wa maaketto de, ano- resutoran de hataraitte imasu. <i>Well, I work for, well, for the restaurant in the market.</i>
21	*	N	Ken	Docchi no resutoran? [↑] <i>Which one? [↑]</i>
22	*	P	JNS	Ano, "restaurant name" to iu <resutoranga>{<} arundesu kedo, <i>Well, there is a restaurant called "restaurant name" but,</i>
23	*	N	Ken	<"Restaurant name.">{>} [surprise] <i>"Restaurant name." [surprise]</i>

24	*	P	Ken	Soudesuka. [↓] <i>Is that so? [↓]</i>
25	*	P	JNS	Hai. <i>Yes.</i>
26	*	N	Ken	Ittakoto nai. <i>I haven't been there.</i>
27	*	N	Ken	Dakedo, ikitai. <i>But, I want to go.</i>

As shown above (i.e., the utterances 26 and 27), Ken showed interest in the restaurant where JNS worked. Similarly, Anna, who evaluated distance factor as very close, also asked questions about JNS and said that she found that she had been to the restaurant where JNS worked.

Table 25

Excerpt from Anna's C1

64	*	P	JNS	Watashi, e-tto watashi wa, "city name" no resutoran de hataraitte <imasu.>{<} <i>I, well, I am working at the restaurant in "city name".</i>
65	*	NM	Anna	<O-.>{>} <i>Oh.</i>
66	*	P	Anna	Donna resutoran desuka? [↑] <i>What kind of restaurant is it? [↑]</i>
67	*	NM	JNS	E-tto, eijian hyuujon tteiun desu kedo, (e-) iroiro<...>{<}<<. <i>Well. It is called Asian Fusion, but (Oh), various...</i>
68	*	N	Anna	<"Restaurat name" janai?>{>}[↑] <Isn't it "restaurat name" ?>{>}[↑]
69	*	N	JNS	"Restaurat name". <i>"Restaurat name".</i>
70	*	NM	Anna	O-. <both laughter> <i>Oh. <both laughter></i>
71	*	P	Anna	Wakarimasu. <i>I know it.</i>
72	*	P	JNS	Wakarimasuka? [↑] <i>Do you know it? [↑]</i>
73	*	P	Anna	Hai. <i>Yes.</i>

In the subsequent parts of the conversation, Anna also mentioned that she had been to the restaurant. On the contrary, Ben, Tom and Robert did not ask such questions to JNS, but rather, they introduced themselves or tended to answer the questions posed by JNS.

Table 26

Excerpt from Ben's C1

29	*	P	JNS	Omoshiroi desuka? [↑] <i>Is it interesting? [↑]</i>
30	*	P	Ben	Hai, hai, taitei omoshiroi desu. <i>Yes, yes, most of them are interesting.</i>
31	*	P	Ben	Demo-, tokidoki tumarani jugyou mo arimasu. (<laughter>) <i>But, sometimes there are boring classes. (<laughter>)</i>
32	*	P	Ben	Hai. <i>Yes.</i>
33	*	P	JNS	Syourai souiu, ano-, okanewo atsukau oshigoto wo shitai desuka? [↑] <i>Well, do you want to have a job dealing with money in the future?</i>
34-1	/	/	Ben	A-, sounee, watashino baaiwa, a-nanka, a-iroirona, ironna jugyouwo (hai) yatte mimashita kara (hai), a-nannka "name of major" ni, a- kanren duketa, a-, ## o-, nanka topikkuha, <shigotomo>{<},, <i>Ah, let me see, in my case, ah, like, ah several, I took several classes (yes), well, like, the topic, mmm, which is related to my major, including jobs,</i>
35	*	N	JNS	<"name of major" ne.>{>} <i>"name of major".</i>
34-2	*	P	Ben	A-, kiraija naidesu kara, (Ee,ee) kono senmonka de, a-, shigoto wo shitai desu. <i>Ah, I don't mind it (A-ha), I would like to work, ah, [related to my major.</i>
36	*	P	Ben	Demo, hokano jugyouwa ,nanka, u-n, Seibutsugaku toka (Ee), a-, Butsurigaku toka (Ee,ee) a-, amari kiniitte nai desu. (<laughter>) <i>But, other classes, like, mmm, biology (yes), ah, physics (a-ha), well, I am not very interested in. (<laughter>)</i>
37	*	P	Ben	Hai. <i>Yes.</i>
38	*	P	JNS	Soudesuka-. [↓] <i>Is that so? [↓]</i>
39	*	P	JNS	Jaa, doushite nihongo dattan desyou? [↑] <i>Then, why is that Japanese? [↑]</i>
40	*	NM	Ben	Aa, nihongo...(<laughter>)

				<i>Oh, Japanese...(<laughter>)</i>
41	*	P	Ben	Maa sorewa, konomino, konomi, konomino mondai to omoimasu, (hai), dato omoimasu. <i>Well, it's about personal pre, pre, preference. (yes). I think so.</i>

Table 27

Excerpt from Tom's C1

26	*	P	JNS	Ano, NNS2-san wa ano-, ano-, "university name" de nihongo wo benkyou sarete irun desuka? [↑] <i>Well, are you, ah, ah, are you studying Japanese at "university name"?</i> [↑]
27	*	P	Tom	Hai, ima nihongono sannensei desu. <i>Yes, I am in the third year level of Japanese.</i>
28	*	P	Tom	"Teacher's name"-sensei to isshoni, a-, nihongowo benkyou shite imasu. <i>I am studying Japanese with "teacher's name".</i>
29	*	P	JNS	Soudesukaa. [↓] <i>Is that so?</i> [↓]
30	*	P	JNS	Ano-, doushite nihongowo benkyoushitainaa to omottan desuka? [↑] <i>Well, why did you think that you wanted to study Japanese?</i> [↑]
31	*	P	Tom	Hai /brief pause/. <i>Yes /brief pause/.</i>
32	*	P	Tom	Anime ga suki desukara, (A), nihongo wo (hai) benkyou shiteimasu. <i>Since I like Anime (A), I am (yes) studying Japanese.</i>
33	*	N	Tom	Itsuka jimaku wo minaide mite hoshii. <i>Someday, I would like to be seen, without captions.</i>
34	*	P	JNS	Soudesue, soudesune. <i>I agree, I agree.</i>
35	*	P	JNS	Ano-, Miyazaki Hayao kantoku no eiga toka sukidesuka? [↑] <i>Well, do you like the movied by the Producer, Miyazaki Hayao?</i> [↑]
36	*	P	Tom	A, mi, mitakotoga arimasen kara, u-/brief pause/, chotto, /brief pause/ nagai shiri-zu ga sukidesu. <i>Ah, since I, I haven't seen it, mmm. /brief pause, a little, /brief pause/, I like longer series.</i>

Table 28

Excerpt from Robert's C1

30	*	P	Rob	Chotto shoukai shimasu. <i>I will introduce myself a little.</i>
31	*	P	Rob	A-, computaa wo senkou shiteimasu. <i>Ah, my major is computer.</i>
32	*	P	Rob	Sosite, yonenn, e-, daigaku yonennsei desu. <i>And then, I am in the forth, well, the forth year at university.</i>
33	*	N	JNS	Diagaku yonensei?? [↓] Hai. <i>The forth year?? [↓] O.K.</i>
34	*	P	Rob	Hai. <i>Yes.</i>
35	*	P	Rob	A-, soshite, nijuu yon sai, nijuu yon, nijuu yon sai desu. <i>Er, then, twenty four years, twenty four, twenty four years old.</i>
36	*	P	JNS	Hai. <i>O.K.</i>
37	*	P	Rob	Uun, soshite yonenn nihongo, nihongo wo totteimasu. ([nodding]) <i>Well, then I have been taking Japanese for four, four years.</i> ([nodding])
38	*	P	Rob	Soshite, a-n, sukina supoutsuwa <laughter>, sukina supoutsuwa (hai) batominton, karate, fen, fenshingu, resuringu, sono taipuno supoutsu desu. <i>Then, er, the sports that I like are <laughter>, the sports that I like are (yes) badminton, karate, fen, fencing, wrestling, that kind of sports.</i>
39	*	P	JNS	NNS3-san, supoutsu man desu ne. [↓] <i>You are such a sport man, aren't you? [↓]</i>
40	*	P	Rob	Hai. <both laguhter> <i>Yes. <both laughter></i>
41	*	P	JNS	Soudesuka. [↓] <i>I see. [↓]</i>
42	*	E	Rob	Huhun. [English pronunciation] <i>Huhun. [English pronunciation]</i>
43	*	P	JNS	NNS3-san nihongo wa sukidesuka? [↑] <i>Do you like Japanese language? [↑]</i>
44	*	P	Rob	Nihongo, a-, ichinensei no toki, zenzen kiita kotoga arimasen deshita. (hai) <i>I hadn't heard about Japanese at all when I was a freshman. (yes)</i>
45	*	P	Rob	So-, ichinen nihongono, jugyoun no ato, u-, nihongo, a-, nihongo omoshiroi desu. <i>Then, after I learned it for a year, Japanese, Japanese became interesting to me.</i>
46	*	P	JNS	Omoshiroidesuka? [↓] <i>Is it interesting? [↓]</i>
47	*	P	Rob	Hai. <i>Yes.</i>

As shown in excerpts 26, 27 and 28, Ben, Tom and Robert communicated with JNS without asking about JNS, in particular without touching upon what JNS did, though they were asked which year they were in, but rather they focused on self-introductions or answering questions from JNS. They were more passive participants in the conversation, taking less initiative than did Ken and Anna. These instances suggest that the flow of the conversation may have affected the evaluation of distance with JNS.

Above all, the participants' assessment of power and distance factors were examined as a key for research question two: How do they assess power and distance factors in such a situation? These instances suggest that physical appearance was a primary determiner of their assessment of JNS's age. In addition, the fact that the addressee was a stranger could have been a determiner of their initial assessment of the distance factor. Moreover, finding a common topic could change their assessment of the relationship with JNS, which is a distance factor.

Assessment & decisions of linguistic behaviors. In the previous section, how the participants assessed the both power and distance factors were examined. In this section, the relationship between their assessment and decisions about linguistic behaviors is the focus, aiming at possible answers for research question three.

With regard to the assessment of the power factor, four among the six participants (i.e., Ben, Robert, Lena and Ken) stated that it did not influence their linguistic behaviors. Among them, Ben and Lena explained that they decided their manners of speaking based on the fact that JNS was a stranger. In contrast, Robert and Ken explained that they did not choose, but rather, they relied on habit. Specifically, Robert mentioned that polite utterances were the only form that he could spontaneously use, while Ken spoke naturally

so as to feel comfortable. Given that, it could be said that Ben and Lena were influenced by the distance factor rather than the power factor in their choice of linguistic behaviors, while Robert and Ken were influenced by neither power nor distance factors.

In contrast, the other two (i.e., Tom and Anna) said that their judgments of the power factor affected their linguistic performance. Both of them remarked that they would have been more polite if JNS had appeared much older, such as a twenty-year difference, or if JNS had been in her late thirties. Nevertheless, there seems to be a difference between Tom and Anna in regard to their decision of the manner of speaking. Tom explained that he considered politeness due to the fact that JNS was a stranger, while Anna spoke naturally and had no conscious control of her manner of speaking. Given that, it could be said that Tom decided his manner of speaking depending on the distance factor, as Ben and Lena did. On the contrary, it is probable that Anna was not influenced by either power or distance factors in her manner of speaking, similar to Robert and Ken.

Thus, how the participants chose their manner of speaking shows variation in this particular study. The NNS participants did not value the power factor as the determiner of the manner of speaking, one reason for which could be the significance of the distance factor in a first-meeting situation, which is congruent with the Japanese norm. It also should be noted that three cases out of the six pointed out that there was no influence of power or distance on their decisions, which may imply that examining these cases within the context of Japanese communication norms is likely to be relatively fruitless.

Awareness of NS's shift and the distance factor. Finally, it is necessary to look at the participants' awareness of shift of dominant speech level by JNS and its influence on

their linguistic performance, as a search for answers to research question four: Do they notice the shift of politeness level by their interlocutor and change their linguistic forms accordingly, and why?

Regarding JNS's shift of speech level, the awareness and assessment of distance factors seem relevant. That is, Ben, Tom and Robert, who asserted that the distance with JNS did not change throughout the conversation, said that they did not notice the shift. On the other hand, Lena and Ken, who mentioned that they had become closer to JNS as the conversation went on, said that they had noticed the shift. In addition, Anna, who had felt the relationship with JNS to be very close from the beginning to the end, mentioned that she had noticed it as well.

It is possible that the speech behavior of these three participants (i.e., Ben, Tom and Robert) was less affected by social factors which can affect the use of linguistic behaviors, but more affected by the individual's own behavior, grammatical features, or content. In addition, possible reasons why Lena, Ken and Anna noticed JNS's shift is that they were sensitive to the distance factor more than the other three, or that they felt intimacy with JNS.

Lena, Ken and Anna noticed JNS's shift. However, their impressions of this vary. Lena explained that she understood it as a marker of the fact that JNS was an older interlocutor. In contrast, Ken and Anna assumed that JNS had adapted to them, and they did not see it as a power factor.

In short, it could be said that those who felt closer to JNS noticed the shift, while those who felt distance did not notice it. This is the answer to the question of the participants' awareness of the shift by JNS and its reason.

Previous to the discussions integrating with both conversational and interview data, the results from each participants will be presented individually to provide a detailed account for their assessment and awareness.

Ben

Table 29

Summary of Ben's Answers for Interview

#	Answers
Q5	Much older than I.
Q6	Appearance only. Generally, no. Tried to use polite form all the time since JNS was a stranger.
Q7	Not so close for the entire conversation
Q8	First time to meet and JNS was a stranger.
Q9	1. Whether the person is stranger or not 2. Age
Q10	Use only polite form to a stranger.
Q15	No.
Q17	Nervousness and basically didn't pay attention to more detail, rather focused on being polite.

Ben evaluated JNS's age as much older than himself due to her appearance, but he denied that this had any influence on his linguistic behavior. He described the reason by saying, '*Because I tried to use desu-masu form (polite form) all the time even if it is not older person, until I know this person like 'shitashii hito" (close to him)*'. Regarding the relationship with JNS, Ben stated that it was not close throughout the twenty minutes, and he explained his decision about the way of speaking in the situation by saying, '*Basically my main concern was to keep a level of politeness, to keep my face at a good level. Basically look like a polite person*'. In addition, he described his rules of how to decide his way of speaking. According to him, first he was concerned with whether or not the person was a stranger, and then he took the person's age into consideration. Ben also

said that he would use polite form even for a Japanese child if the child were a stranger since he wouldn't know him/her. Thus, he attempted to use polite form in the conversation with JNS due to the fact that they did not know each other. Despite that, the conversation data shows his use of non-polite utterances which Ben explained as misuses, saying, *'I even noticed during the conversation just was kind of late to come back'*. As for JNS's shift of overall use of forms, he stated that he did not notice it. Ben explained that he focused on being polite rather than focusing on details of JNS's utterances. This may suggest that sentence-final markers are not a priority for him in spontaneous conversation, since they do not directly relate to his own politeness, or he was preoccupied with his own polite speech.

Tom

Table 30

Summary of Tom's Answers for Interview

#	Answers
Q5	10 years older, and it is a big difference in terms of life experiences.
Q6	Appearance, the manner of speaking. Somewhat. If JNS was 20 years older, I'd probably feel that I have to talk about more important stuff.
Q7	Not so close for the entire conversation.
Q8	First time to meet
Q9	Habit
Q10	A little bit of politeness because teacher emphasizes that it's not polite to use informal.
Q15	No
Q17	Too busy to think what I must say, or grammars such as particles.

Tom evaluated JNS's age as ten years older than him, due to her appearance and the manner of speaking. He remarked that his assessment affected his linguistic

performance, saying, *'The age assumption probably affected my performance because if JNS was 20 years older than me, I'd probably feel that I have to talk about more important things'*. Regarding the relationship with JNS, Tom said that it was not close throughout the conversation.

As for his decision of his manner of speaking, he mentioned that it was his habit. In addition, he said that he also considered politeness to a certain extent due to the fact that JNS was a stranger to him. In relation to this, he explained that he had learned that it was not polite to use informal speech to person who was a stranger and that informal form (polite form) could be used between close friends and people at the same age.

With regard to JNS's shift of her manner of speaking, he remarked that he had not noticed it. He explained that it could be because he was too busy thinking of what to say, to keep the conversation going, and to form a sentence with accurate structures and particles. Thus, Tom also did not prioritize the sentence-final marker, but focused on the grammatical elements or context as Ben did.

Robert

Table 31

Summary of Robert's Answers for Interview

#	Answers
Q5	Much older than I
Q6	Content. No.
Q7	Not close at all for the entire conversation.
Q8	Nothing in common.
Q9	Polite form is the only form that I can use. Because I have been using for years.
Q10	It is kind of habit although I know how to use the short form.
Q15	No.
Q17	Looked at the content over the politeness. In addition, I could have noticed if it

were the written form, but not in a spoken.

Robert assessed that JNS was much older than himself due to JNS's way of speaking and the content. Robert stated that his assessment did not affect his performance and manner of speaking. Regarding the relationship with JNS, Robert described it as not close, and it had not changed for the entire twenty minutes.

For the decision about the manner of speaking, Robert explained that polite form was the only form that he could comfortably use, saying:

I say it (polite form) is a habitual way because if I would use short form, I actually have to think about it...It is kind of habit although I know how to use the short (plain) form. I just have a habit of speaking like that'.

Thus, Robert explained that he used polite form as a habit. The conversation data, however, shows some use of non-polite form as well. Robert explained:

I tried to think of letting sentence forming up, the problem with me speaking in Japanese is if I want to write down anything, I can write on perfectly, ... when it comes to speaking, it's kind of different in terms of thinking what to say, like building the sentence in your head, that I wasn't used to.

In relation, Robert explained that he had had a considerable amount of exposure to reading in Japanese but little to speaking and listening.

With regard to the JNS's shift of her manner of speaking, Robert mentioned that he did not notice it and explained it by saying:

I've been on chat programs like yahoo messenger Japan and basically for reading purposes. All I did was read the chat words over and over just speed reading and basically I've noticed that everyone was using short (plain) form. I have noticed

because it was reading or writing. It wasn't speaking. In terms of hearing, I did not realize. I don't really realize.

In relation, Robert mentioned that he could have noticed JNS's shift if it had been in reading, but not in conversation. In addition, he described:

I did look at the polite form, the important thing is to understand what she (JNS) is saying otherwise we would not be able to have a discussion. It's basically the content and understanding what the content is, otherwise there is no content we won't be able to be on the same page. So I don't look at the polite form as a priority. So I just looked at the content over the politeness because even any forms people understand, but if you use polite form and then screwed up on content, there is no point on that.

This comment seems to indicate that Robert paid more attention to the content than to sentence-final polite markers as Ben and Tom remarked. This could be one reason why Robert did not notice JNS's shift in her manner of speaking.

Lena

Table 32

Summary of Lena's Answers for Interview

#	Answers
Q5	A little older than I.
Q6	Appearance and the manner of speaking. No.
Q7	Not so close at the beginning and became closer
Q8	Something in common
Q9	First time to meet.
Q10	JNS was a stranger. But I still sometimes switch due to the feeling of closeness with JNS.
Q15	Not right away but eventually yes. I don't know the exact point though.

Q16	I thought 'can I switch?' but then, 'no I shouldn't switch.' because I feel she's still older, so I didn't switch. So I thought she switched because she thought because she's older (?). So she can switch. Because I've been told by many people some of my friends are Korean and same system.
-----	--

Lena assessed JNS's age as a little older than herself due to both her appearance and the manner of speaking. She mentioned that her assessment did not affect her linguistic performance. Regarding the relationship with JNS, Lena stated that it was not so close at the beginning, but it became closer.

As for her manner of speaking, Lena described how she decided her manner of speaking saying *'It wouldn't be plain (non-polite) form because I know for the first time meeting, you are not supposed to use short form. I was trying to use polite form, but I still sometimes switched.* The ratio of each type of utterance for Lena indeed shows the use of both polite and non-polite forms (67.9% & 17.9% in C1, and 57.1% & 14.3% C2 respectively).

With regard to the JNS's shift of the manner of speaking, Lena explained that she noticed it though not immediately. In addition, she recalled her thoughts when she noticed it, *'I thought "can I switch?" but then "no, I shouldn't switch" because I feel she is still older so I didn't switch'*. Lena explained that she noticed JNS's shift, and thought that she should not have reciprocated. On the contrary, her ratios of polite utterances show a decrease from C1 and C2 (67.9% to 57.1%). These data suggest that the decrease could be due to the influence of JNS's shift, whether or not she was conscious of it, or it could be due to her perception of a closer relationship with JNS, as she described the shift of her evaluation of the distance factor with JNS from 'not so close' to 'closer'. The latter suggestion could be explained from the perspective of politeness theory (Brown and

Levinson, 1978, 1987), which explains positive politeness as a strategy of harmonious communication. In particular, it is probable that Lena utilized the strategy of using in-group identity markers (i.e., non-polite form) in accord with her low evaluation of the distance factor.

Ken

Table 33

Summary of Ken's Answers for Interview

#	Answers
Q5	A little older than I.
Q6	Appearance and the manner of speaking. No. I just, be myself. Don't think about it.
Q7	No so close and it became gradually closer.
Q8	Something in common.
Q9	To make myself feel comfortable.
Q10	Mixed use of both polite and non-polite forms wasn't decided in my head. It just comes out that way.
Q15	Yes
Q16	She adapted to me. I felt more comfortable. It was easier for me.

Ken judged JNS's age as a little older than himself due to her appearance and the manner of speaking. He explained that his judgment of JNS's age did not affect his linguistic performance. Regarding the relationship with JNS, Ken described that it was not so close at the beginning but it became closer in the end.

With regard to his manner of speaking, he said, '*Probably I just ended up alternating between plain and polite forms. It wasn't decided in my head. It just comes out that way*'.

Regarding JNS's shift, he said that he noticed it and thought that JNS had adapted her manner of speaking to his. Ken explained that he then felt more comfortable and it was easier for him. In addition, he remarked:

I was surprised when she said 'irasshaimasuka' (referent type of verb meaning 'to be'). It's a little too much for me. I thought it's too polite for me. I am not superior. I don't really talk like this way at all. I mean I learned it last year, but I guess I never really use because we just use polite form and plain (non-polite) form in class. We don't talk in keigo (honorifics) anything like that. I am not used to it.

This description of his perception of politeness forms and their usage could be related to the delayed introduction of Japanese honorifics in language programs, as pointed out by many scholars (Ichikawa, 2005; Kawaguchi, 2006; Mizutani, 1989; Nakai et al., 2004; Sei, 2006; H. Tanaka, 2006; M. Tanaka, 2003). As well, this may be a function of having few opportunities to use such forms in real life, since he describes his major contact with Japanese language outside the classroom as listening to music in Japanese. In any case, in the conversation with JNS, he commented that he did not choose politeness forms, but naturally conversed. In addition, the ratio of polite utterances decreased and his evaluation of the relationship with JNS changed from not so close to closer. Given that, it could be said that Ken also employed positive politeness rather than following the Japanese native norm which expects one to maintain the use of polite form. That is, it is probable that he might have used in-group identity markers to claim in-group membership with JNS.

Anna

Table 34

Summary of Anna's Answers for Interview

#	Answers
Q5	Older than I, but 10 years maximum.
Q6	Appearance. Yes. If JNS was 20 years older like 40s or late 30s, I would have been worried about being polite very much, if she would've been younger, I would've been more colloquial.
Q7	Very close for the entire conversation.
Q8	Something in common, and the ways she speaks
Q9	Mostly it just came naturally. I had no control.
Q10	Speaking in Japanese is my passion and I could not control my manner of speaking.
Q15	I caught a little bit.
Q16	I noticed a little bit, but I thought she was adapting to me. I felt that I could be more casual.

Anna evaluated JNS's age as a little older than her, due to her appearance. Anna estimated that JNS was about ten years older than she, which was not a significant difference for her. She remarked that her assessment affected her performance and way of speaking, saying:

If it would have been someone older, I would have been so much more nervous and I would've worried very very much about being polite and truthfully when she started speaking, she was using very polite form and I felt that I should also attempt to make considerable more polite form. If she would've been younger, I would've been more colloquial, probably said a lot silly things, she was a good age because she has a maturity but still young.

Regarding the relationship with JNS, Anna described it as very close.

As for her way of speaking, Anna explained that first she was concerned with making an effort to talk in a certain way considering politeness, but soon she forgot, since she felt that she had a good conversation with JNS. According to Anna, the way she spoke was natural and she had exerted no conscious control of politeness forms.

She recalled JNS's shift of her manner of speaking and said that she caught a little, and she thought JNS was trying to help her by adapting to her. Anna also explained that JNS's shift had an influence on her way of speaking, saying:

I felt that I could be more casual. If she had been much older, if she had been like 20 years older like 40s or late 30s, I would have felt a lot more like I would have kept polite form maybe throughout whole thing.

Thus, Anna's case shows that a ten-year age difference is not a significant difference for her, which could be one cause of her high ratio of non-polite utterances in both C1 and C2 (53.0% and 42.1%).

Discussion

As shown above, the six NNS participants show distinctive features in both conversation data and interview data, and these features are briefly summarized below as Table 35. As a heart of the research, key contributions of the study are presented as discussions integrating both conversational and interview data. This further analysis aims at providing detailed answers to the original research questions, the phenomena of the actual use of polite and non-polite forms by the NNS participants in terms of two aspects: the relationship between assessment of social factors and the actual use of Japanese in the first-meeting setting, the relationships between the assessment and decision, and the reaction to the shift of the speech level. The first viewpoint is linked to research question

one, which is intended to explore phenomena or features of learners' use of polite and non-polite forms. The second is for question four, which focuses on the shift. Following these discussions, an exploratory approach to capturing the participants' speech features within discourse politeness theory will be discussed.

Table 35

Summary of Data

	Ben	Tom	Robert	Lena	Ken	Anna
JNS's age	Older	Older	Older	Older	Older	Older
Reason	Appearance	Appearance	The content	Appearance	Appearance	Appearance
Influence	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
Relationship	Not so close	Not so close	Not so close	Not so close → closer	Not so close → closer	Very close
Style of Speaking	To be polite First time	Habit (polite) First time	Habit (polite)	First time	Habit (natural)	Habit (natural)
Downshift (cause)	No notice	No notice	No notice	Noticed (JNS's Age)	Noticed (JNS adapt)	Noticed (JNS adapt)
P-Utterance in C1 and C2	Decreased	Decreased	Decreased	Decreased	Decreased	Decreased

Polite Speech and Decision of Linguistic Behaviors

According to the conversation data, the ratio of polite utterances among other types of utterances is the highest in the first three-minute segment of conversation for Ben, Tom, Robert, Lena and Ken (88.0%, 667%, 80.6% and 67.9% respectively), and considerably lower for Anna (48.6%). This suggests that they dominantly used polite forms in the first three-minute segment with JNS, who was a stranger to them, which seems congruent with the result of Usami (1999b).

Among them, Ben, Tom and Lena indeed chose polite form since the situation was a first-meeting setting, which seems congruent with the claim that the polite form is

expected (Kikuchi, 1997; Lauwereyns, 2002; Niyekawa, 1991; Usami, 1999a). These facts imply that the three participants used the fact that JNS was a stranger to them for their determination of their ways of speaking. If this is in fact the case, it could be said that their decision is compatible with the Japanese norm.

In contrast, two cases, Robert and Ken, show minimal or no link between their manners of speaking and decisions, due to their adhering to their habitual manner of speaking. Anna's case is similar, although her dominant speech style was non-polite throughout the entire twenty-minute communication (53.0 % in C1 and 42.1% in C2). Possible reasons for this could be their neglect of Japanese norms or, more likely, lack of knowledge of the expectation of certain behaviors in a first-meeting setting from a Japanese viewpoint.

In sum, the participants' linguistic behaviors could be considered as both 'appropriate' and 'inappropriate' from a Japanese native standpoint.

Learners and Speech-Level Shift

The participants claimed that the power factor did not play a significant role in their choice of polite utterances. However, as Usami (1999b) claims, the fact that an interlocutor is older does significantly relate to the need for speech-level shift, which can be observed in Japanese conversation as strategic language use. In the present study, JNS's downward shift deliberately occurred after approximately ten minutes of conversation. The participants' awareness of JNS's downshift was examined, as well as their assessment of the distance factor. The results from both conversations and interviews suggest that there seems to have been an influence of JNS's downshift on the decrease of participants' production of polite utterances.

According to Japanese conversational norms, it is expected that the participants keep the polite speech style they maintained in the first three minutes of conversation. However, the conversation data indicates a decrease in the ratio of polite utterances for all the participants between C1 and C2, between which JNS shifted downwards. One possible reason for this can be drawn from the data, that is, the influence of JNS's way of speaking. The decrease occurred whether or not they noticed it, and it appears to have been largely irrelevant to their decisions about their manner of speaking.

Another possible reason for the fact that the participants appeared to ignore the JNS shift could be that the NNS participants were not used to hearing or noticing speech-level shift occurring in a limited conversation. As some participants pointed out, they remembered how polite and non-polite forms should be distinguished, but their descriptions were similar to those in the course textbook. That is, although they knew the rules, they may not have been aware of possible features of Japanese language politeness strategies in longer stretches of discourse. If this were the case, it could be said that they could not distinguish each type of utterance and their fit with the situation, while dealing with several social factors – all of which are necessary skills for NSs to communicate (Enomoto & Marriott, 1994; Ishida, 2001; Kabaya, 2006; Maynard, 1997; Sugito, 1987). These observed phenomena in the data and the possible causes support the claim that proper use of language in accordance with several contextual and social factors is one of the major problems for advanced learners (Kabaya, 2006; Mizutani, 1989).

Thus, the data in the present study may show learners' difficulty in coping with the complexity of speech level in conversation. This highlights the significance for

learners of Japanese language of knowledge of speech level as well as skills of dealing spontaneously with a number of non-linguistic cues.

Learner's Data Features from Discourse Politeness Perspective

The NNS participants' linguistic behaviors are discussed above in relation to their decisions of manner of speaking and speech-level shift. It should be emphasized that these results were analyzed from a Japanese normative viewpoint. However, from the perspective of discourse politeness, these data could also be understood as illustrations of the participants' own ways of coping with pragmatic politeness. This exploratory approach is undertaken in order to examine pragmatic politeness of advanced learners. The present study assumes that the advanced learner can be considered as a significant participant in communication between a NS and a NNS, particularly in a foreign context.

According to Usami (1999b), discourse politeness can capture the strategic use of Japanese within politeness theory, which includes the notion of positive and negative politeness. By doing so, Usami suggests that analyzing data at the discourse level is necessary with an established 'default' style of conversation. Deviation from the default is captured as a movement, that is, a type of strategic language use.

The present study approached the data from a perspective of discourse politeness. By viewing the data collected for the present study within this framework, the possible strategic uses of Japanese were observed in the data from the participants. For instance, Ben, Tom and Robert evaluated that the distance factor (D) did not change. The other factors, power (P) and ranking of imposition (R) remained. Given that, the value of W_x , which can be calculated P, D and R, was calculated as the same for the entire twenty minutes for the three participants. In fact, they showed that their dominant speech styles

in both C1 and C2 were polite form. This suggests that they employed negative politeness so as not to damage JNS's face.

In addition, Ken evaluated that the relationship with JNS (D) changed to be closer. That is, the value of W_x reduced in twenty minutes. In fact, Ken's dominant forms changed from polite (48.6%) to non-polite (47.1%) form. Given that, his case indicates that he adjusted his strategies from negative to positive depending on the value of W_x . That is, it could be said that he strategically used Japanese. Moreover, Anna evaluated the relationship (D) as very close and it remained the same for twenty minutes. Her dominant forms were non-polite forms in both C1 and C2 (53.0%, 42.1% respectively). Her case implies that she strategically used Japanese to show positive politeness to JNS due to the lower values of W_x .

One possible suggestion to be drawn from these examples of communication is that the participants' ways of speaking as shown above could be 'strategic' use of Japanese, considering politeness. If this is the case, an advanced learner may have his or her own politeness strategy that can deviate from the Japanese norm. As such, it may show the possibility that the learners can have their own 'default' style in communication with a NS in the first-meeting situation.

By viewing the situation in such a way, what Ken and Anna said, 'adapted to them', should not be dismissed as merely deviant. They understood using their own speech style seemed to be a transfer of their norm as English speakers, what Maynard describes as "equality" (1997, p.62). By doing so, they likely felt more comfortable to communicate with a NS.

In sum, it is probable that the Japanese norm is not necessarily prioritized in conversation between a NS and a NNS. Particularly, in a foreign context, awareness of this could be beneficial in reducing misunderstanding by NSs - as Niyekawa (1991) claims, Japanese can be offended by misuses of the honorifics more than grammatical mistakes. Understanding the difficulties and the differing intentions of NNSs might help to avoid this type of interpretation.

Above all, it could be said that the participants valued the addressee's age as less significant than the distance factor in a first-meeting situation. In addition, it was shown that their manner of speaking in Japanese and their assessment could be irrelevant. Regarding the shift of level of forms such as polite and non-polite in a certain discourse, the participants could not cope in the same way as Japanese due to the difficulty in handling the speech level. It should be noted that these possible answers were discussed from the perspective of the Japanese norm. However, beyond viewing them from a Japanese normative perspective, the present study may suggest the value of perceiving them within the framework of discourse politeness.

Limitations of the Study

The central purpose of the present study was to reveal features of linguistic behaviors of learners of Japanese language within the framework of pragmatic politeness. To this end, actual conversation data were collected from the six participants. The conversations were carried out with a previously unacquainted NS in a foreign language context. The present data show possible features of politeness strategies of learners of Japanese language. However, there exist some limitations in the design and validity of the study, and some issues related to the naturalness of conversation data.

Regarding the transcribing process, it could have restricted the validity of the data since it was completed solely by the researcher. A secondary inspection, as Usami (2001b) and Nishigori (1997) employed in a similar study, might have increased the data validity.

In addition, naturalness of the conversation data could be a limitation of the present study. That is, the influence of the planned or “staged” downward shift of speech level could have constrained the fluency and the naturalness of the discourse of the JNS, since she had to be aware of the timing of it and plan ahead how to speak. Since examining learners’ awareness of the addressee’s downward shift was one of the central focuses of the present study, it was designed based on the results of two pilot studies which showed unnatural downshift phenomena when the conversation was left totally open, and shift left to occur naturally. A planned shift of speech level, as in the present study, guaranteed consistency of conditions for all six participants, but may have distorted the flow of communication slightly.

Regarding naturalness of the data, nervousness of the participants should be noted as an affective factor. It is apparent that feeling nervous when communicating in a second language with a NS of a target language is not unusual. In fact, some of the participants pointed out that they could have spoken in a more appropriately if they had not been nervous.

Moreover, the proficiency of the participants may have limited the validity of the data since the politeness theory is based on the presupposition of a Model Person (MP) who is a fluent speaker, according to Brown and Levinson (1978). Though all the

participants were enrolled in advanced level courses, their proficiency was not evaluated with any tests. In fact, some grammatical errors were observed in their utterances.

In addition, the present study was designed based on the results from Usami's studies (1993, 1999b) for the purpose of contrasting the data obtained from a NS and a NNS with those from dyads of NSs. However, Usami (1999b) collected data on a larger scale, aiming at generalization, while the present study employed much smaller samples due to the nature of the study, which is to investigate the phenomena rather than generalize. In addition, in her study, the participants were not students but workers in Japan. Thus, though the present study attempts to contrast the collected data with Usami's study, these two significant differences might have limited the authenticity of comparison.

Finally, it should be noted that there might be an influence of the gender of the JNS on the use of Japanese by NNS participants. In fact, two female NNS participants explained that they felt their relationship with JNS was "close" or "became closer" while three out of four male NNS participants felt "not close" for the entire conversation. Assigning only a female Japanese speaker to them might be another limitation in the present study.

Thus, the present study contains several factors that might have limited the validity of results. These limitations would need to be acknowledged for further study.

Chapter 5: Conclusion and Implications

The central focus of the present study was to explore features of the use of polite and non-polite language by JFL learners. The present study examined this phenomenon from three significant viewpoints: learners' assessment of social factors such as power and distance, the influence of the factors on their use of polite forms, and shift of speech level. In order to capture these phenomena within politeness theory, the focuses on assessment and its influence on their language use were set for the present study as they are claimed to be factors for the study of politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1978, 1987; Usami, 1993, 1997b, 1998, 1999b). In addition, speech level was examined as an important feature of the use of Japanese in relation to pragmatic politeness (Usami, 1999b). In fact, the study of speech level has intensified among scholars of Japanese language (Cook, 1996a, 1996b, 1999, 2002, 2006; Ikuta, 1983; Muramatsu, 2008; Naito, 2003; Nakai et al., 2004; Okamoto, 1997, 1998; Usami, 1993, 1995, 1998, 1999b; Yoshida & Sakurai, 2005). Usami (1999b) states that in Japanese conversation, an older interlocutor is likely to use non-polite form more, and a younger interlocutor is unlikely to reciprocate it. This has been recognized as a Japanese norm (Ikuta, 1983; Kikuchi, 1997; Lauwereyns, 2002; Maynard, 1997; Niyekawa, 1991). Based on this assumption, the present study designed a deliberate speech-level shift by the older Japanese native participant. The advanced learners in the study showed two reactions: asymmetric and reciprocal. That is, some learners indeed followed the Japanese norm, and others did not. On one hand, this result shows the learners' capability of dealing with speech-level in the actual conversation. Since asymmetric use of polite and non-polite forms is claimed to be one of the complexities of the Japanese language system (Niyekawa, 1991; Sei, 1995,

1997, 2006), this result shows learners' ability in spite of their limited length of learning and limited opportunities for exposure in real life. On the other hand, the present study also uncovers the fact that some learners reciprocated the use of non-polite forms. From the perspective of Japanese norms, this could be considered as a 'failure' as Thomas defines it (1983). This 'failure' can be found in their choice of forms in relation to assessment, since all the learners excluded the influence of the Japanese participant's age, which could be a significant factor. Thus, by viewing their linguistic performance from a Japanese norm, the result could be either 'appropriate' or 'failure'. 'Appropriate' language use from the study was found in the use of polite form dominantly, which can be considered as evidence of ability in Japanese language in a first-meeting setting, since it is a Japanese characteristic manner (Kikuchi, 1997; Niyekawa, 1991; Usami, 1999a; Lauwereyns, 2002). Nonetheless, finding learners' 'appropriate' and 'inappropriate' language use is beneficial for improvement of language proficiency as well as instruction of language. Furthermore, as Thomas (1983) claims, recognizing these distinctions is significant in order to ensure that the learners know what they are doing in a second/foreign language. For that reason, the present study also analyzed the data from a Japanese normative viewpoint. As a result, the study probably suggests that knowing the norm, as well as how a NS performs in a certain situation, is necessary for learners.

The evidence in this study implies that viewing learners' use of polite/non-polite forms can be done outside of the native norm. By applying the notion of discourse politeness, the present study attempts to capture the use of polite language by learners within politeness theory, which proposes positive and negative politeness. As a result, the study presents a potential view on it, which is that learners may utilize positive or

negative politeness strategies in their use of Japanese for harmonious communication. In the study, learners indeed mentioned that they attempted to have a good conversation with the NS who was a stranger, or not to reduce her face. Thus, it can be possible that the learners communicated considering politeness in a certain manner that could be different from NSs. The manner by learners could be established as a 'default' if a sufficient amount of conversation data were collected.

In conclusion, examining the use of polite (or non-polite) language by learners from the perspective of discourse politeness seems to yield significant information, not only for learners, but also NSs. That is, viewing their linguistic behaviors from solely Japanese norms may only present learners' 'appropriate' or 'inappropriate' use of language. Discourse politeness, however, could capture the linguistic behaviors of advanced second language speakers as their politeness strategies for effective communication. In addition, it can be said that the present study shows the possibility and necessity of establishing their own default style in conversation with an acquainted NS. The sample data of the present study is too small to establish this, but this study could serve as a basis for an attempt to do so.

Implications

Some implications may be drawn from the present study. They are: suggestions for NSs in terms of cross-cultural communication, and practical ideas for Japanese language teaching.

As described above, the concept of default style seems advantageous for communication between a NS and a NNS. Particularly, it can be beneficial for an advanced learner of Japanese as a foreign language who has less social exposure, yet

experiences some opportunities of communicating with Japanese in foreign countries. That is, if the default style is established and both a NS and a NNS are aware of it, misunderstandings such as NSs' feeling of offense (Niyekawa, 1991) could be avoided. This may minimize the miscommunication between a NS and a NNS. This does not necessarily mean that learners can speak as they want without proper understanding of Japanese norms, nor that we should ignore their fossilization of development. Instead, it emphasizes that in cross-cultural communication in Japanese, particularly that occurring in a foreign context, the Japanese norm is not necessarily dominant if both interlocutors understand the default style in such a situation. Consequently, it is suggested that learners of Japanese need to have knowledge of discourse features, such as speech level, of Japanese, as well as the norm for smooth communication. At the same time, it is also suggested for NSs that they should understand how Japanese is used by NNSs including their own use of Japanese in such a situation. In this internationalized generation, in which a number of foreigners study Japanese and a tremendous number of Japanese travel, live and study in foreign countries, there is little doubt that Japanese people may have more opportunities to use Japanese outside Japan than before, despite the fact that Japanese is officially used only in Japan.

The knowledge arising for the present study has implications of a practical nature for learners, who may be equipped with knowledge of how an actual Japanese conversation is carried out, including discourse features such as speech level. The use of natural conversation as a source of teaching/learning is one powerful tool for this. Dialogues in Japanese textbooks are well-designed, but they represent limited input and the discourse features are often overlooked (Matsumoto & Okamoto, 2003). To raise

learners' awareness in classroom activity, transcribing an actual conversation can be useful. When it is introduced in a classroom, the central focus – speech level shift, for example - should be assigned. In relation, Cook (2001) reports that with such instruction, learners become aware of how the sentence-final forms operate in an actual conversation. Without such awareness-raising, it is possible that learners may not pay attention to them, as indicated in the present study. The details of NS's utterances were not the central focus for the learners when having a conversation (e.g., Ben). According to the level of learners, their own conversation can be a sample for transcribing. That is, an advanced learner may record his/her conversation with a NS for the purpose of comparing it with that between NSs. Accordingly, a teacher should carefully explain the possible differences between a NS and a NNS speech phenomena, emphasizing that the distinctions are not necessarily mistakes, and they could be their own choices. In relation, it is necessary to explain that to use language according to their will, understanding of embedded meaning/risk of such use is important. That is, teachers should avoid stating what an 'appropriate' usage is without making learners explore and decide for themselves and reflect on norms and appropriateness in various contexts. This could be one possible practical approach to raise learners' awareness of pragmatic aspects of language, such as politeness. As Matsumoto, Shimizu, Okano and Kubo (2004) claim, awareness is the key for such pragmatic knowledge, simply because pragmatic politeness cannot be achieved by memorizing, but rather, needs to be acquired.

The significance of natural conversation or discourse is emphasized more than ever in the study of Japanese politeness. Accordingly, as an implication for Japanese language teaching, utilizing natural conversation is beneficial in raising learners'

awareness of discourse features such as speech level. To present a more comprehensive framework of the use of polite language by learners and Japanese language teaching, it is recognized that much further research is inevitable.

Further Studies

The implications presented above are based on the assumption that advanced learners can have their default style of the use of polite (or non-polite) speech. This is because it would be useful not only for Japanese studies, but also cross-cultural communication in general. If such an assumption and implications are to be truly realized, studies based on a larger scale sample are necessary, including more precisely controlled sample validity such as learners' background, proficiency and gender. In addition, the present study only focuses on the sentence-final marker to investigate the learners' speech features at the discourse level. However, other discourse features such as topic-initiations, overlapping of utterances, and conversation flows in a certain situations also need to be closely examined, as previous studies indicate their likely significance (Nishigori, 1997; Usami, 1993, 1999b). Furthermore, it can be assumed that the default style of learners who have been to Japan for a certain period would be different from that of those who have not, due to the amount of exposure to social interaction. Future research may reveal what the learners in a foreign context need as well.

Appendix A

Basic Transcription System for Japanese (BTSJ)

Basic rules for transcription

The present study basically follows rules of BTSJ defined in Usami (2007).

Definition of Utterance

Utterance is a basic unit of analysis and it is defined as one sentence by one interlocutor. However, in a spontaneous conversation, sentence is not likely to completely form with all the necessary elements such as subject, object and verb. Rather it is likely to be one word, or incompletely formed. According to Usami (2007), whether one sentence is an utterance or not is judged by either change of a speaker or pause. In this sense, back-channels which are often observed in an actual conversation are also considered utterance. The utterance can include more than one sentence. For instance, ‘So desune, so desune’. ‘So desune’ can be an independent sentence, however, these two sentences are uttered by the same person without pause. In such case, these two utterances are counted as one utterance. In addition, one utterance can be intermitted. In other words, two clauses or sentences can be counted as one and can be assigned the same number. The sample way of numbering the utterances are as follows.

- | | | |
|------|---|--|
| 50-1 | P | Kikunoga, a-, nare, narenainode,,
<i>Listening, er, I am not used to, I am not used to listening,</i> |
| 51 | J | un, un, un, un.
<i>yes, yes, yes, yes.</i> |
| 50-2 | P | kikunoga <muzukashiidesu.>{<}
<i>listening is hard for me.</i> |
| 52 | J | <Soune, soune.>{>}
<i>I see, I see.</i> |

An utterance is counted as a basic unit for counting as described above. BTSJ is originally developed for transcribing Japanese in Japanese language. However, romanizing is also recommended in an international situation. Since the present study is conducted in a foreign context, all the scripts are romanized and italicized English translations are provided under each utterance.

Description of Each Code.

- * : If the utterance is completed which is signaled by the period, asterisk is marked in a sell along transcription. The utterance can be completed with any type of utterance and can be grammatically incomplete.
- / : If the sentence is not completed, slash is marked in a sell along transcription, and the utterance is continued in a separate column.

- ... : When the utterance is not completed, the final part marked with the dots.
- [] : Interlocutor's specific feature or information in relation to an utterance such as laughter is described in a bracket. For instance,
- 97 * P <Ho, hontou?{>} [↑] [surprised]
<Re, really?>{>} [↑] [surprised]
- 33 * P Hai, "name of the book store". [English pronunciation]
Yes, "name of the book store". [English pronunciation]
- ? : When an utterance is a question, it is closed with a questions mark.
- ?? : When an intonation is raised but the sentence is not necessarily an interrogative, a double-questions mark is indicate.
- [↑] : Rising intonation is indicated with [↑] at the end of the utterance.
- [↓] : Falling intonation is indicated with [↓] at the end of the utterance.
- /pause/ : When a certain period of pause is observed, it is specified as indicated.
- <>{<} : This is a code for overlapped utterance. <> indicates the part the overlapped.
- <>{>} : This is a code for the sentence which overlaps the other's sentence where <> specify the overlapped part.
- “ ” : When an individual specific name is mentioned, it is indicated with double-quotation mark.
- << >>: When one utterance is not completed but interrupted by the other and results in finishing the original utterance, the original utterance is marked as indicated.
- () : Short utterances including nodding and back-channels such as *un*, *hee* in the other's utterance are marked in a parentheses.
- <> : When one laughs while speaking, it is written down in <>.
- (<>) : When the laughter occurred in the other's utterance, it is shown in a parentheses and <>. For instance,
- 50 * J Hai. (<laughter>)
Yes. (<laughter>)
- # : When the utterance is not partially or completely audible, the same number of sharp-mark is given to estimated number of syllables.

Appendix B

Sample Questions for Follow-Up Interview

1. Name:
2. Have you ever met and talked with your partner before?
3. Please explain about your first language and the language you use at home.
4. If it was the first time, what was your concern when you talked with your partner?
Being friendly/ Being polite/ Being nervous/ Others
5. How old do you think that your partner is?
Much younger than I/ A little younger than I/ About the same age as I
A little older than I/ Much older than I
6. What made you think so? Do you think your judgment affect your performance and way of speaking?
Appearance/ The introduction and content of the conversation
The manner of speaking/ Other. Please describe
7. How close did you feel the relationship with your partner? (At the beginning and as the conversation went on)
Very close/ Close/ Not so close/ Not close at all/ Other. Please describe
8. What made you feel so?
The way he/she speaks/ Looks older/ Looks younger
Looks about same age as me/ Something in common/ Other. Please describe
9. How did you decide your manner of speaking?
Based on the guess of partner's age
Based on the feeling of closeness with the partner
Based on both above
This is the only form that I can use
Other. Please describe
10. Why did you use a specific form? or Why did you use a mixture of several forms (non-polite and polite)?
11. How did you feel about your partner's manner of speaking?
12. How did you feel about your own manner of speaking?
13. Was there any point that you felt uncomfortable while communicating with your partner? Why?

14. Did you notice that your partner changed his/her way of speaking from polite to non-polite form?
15. If yes, how did you feel about it? Do you think it affected your manner of speaking?
16. If no, why do you think that you did not notice it?
17. Do you think that you conversed with your partner naturally?
18. Were you nervous while talking with your partner?
19. Why/why not? Did it affect your performance in the conversation? How?
20. Were you aware of being video-taped while communicating with your partner?
21. Do you think it affected your manner and performance?
22. If you have any comments on the conversation that you had with a NS, please describe.

Thank you. Your participation and cooperation are appreciated very much.

11. At the university level, which class have you taken?

Course	Numbers of term	Hours per week	Title of textbook

12. Have you studied Japanese as self-study? If yes, when, how and how long?

No Yes: When() how ()

How long ()

Did you use any textbooks or materials? If yes, please describe below.

13. What year are you in school? (circle one):

First year Second year Third year Forth year other

14. What is your major? _____

Part2: Contact to Japanese

17. On average, how often do you communicate with native or fluent speakers of Japanese in Japanese?

Never 1) a few times a year 3) monthly 4) weekly 5) daily

18. Use this scale provided to rate the following statements.

Never 1) a few times a year 3) monthly 4) weekly 5) daily

I try to speak Japanese to:

- _____ My instructor outside of class
- _____ Friends who are native or fluent speakers of Japanese
- _____ Classmates
- _____ Strangers whom I thought could speak Japanese
- _____ others

19. For each of the items below, choose the response that corresponds to the amount of time you estimate you spend on average doing each activity in Japanese. Use this scale provided below.

Never 1) a few times a year 3) monthly 4) weekly 5) daily

- _____ Watching Japanese language television, movies or videos
- _____ Reading Japanese language newspapers, magazines, magazines, web-site or e-mail
- _____ Listening to songs or radio in Japanese

20. Please list any other activities that you commonly do using Japanese.

Thank you for your cooperation

Appendix D

Background Information Sheet (Native Speaker)

This information will be used for the research purpose only and will be accessed by only the researcher and the supervisor.

You are encouraged to answer all the questions. You may, however, decline answering some questions.

1. Name:

2. Gender: F M

3. Age:

4. The period of living in Canada:

5. Working Experience

Year	Job	Country
<i>Ex. 1999-2004</i>	<i>Ex. System-Engineer</i>	<i>Ex. Japan</i>
<i>Ex. 2004-present</i>	<i>Ex. Programmer</i>	<i>Ex. Canada</i>

Thank you for your cooperation.

References

- Banno, E., Ohno, Y., Sakane, Y., & Shinagawa, C. (1999). *An integrated course in elementary Japanese genki 1*. Tokyo: The Japan Times.
- Bohn, M. T. (2004). Japanese classroom behavior: A-micro-analysis of self-reports versus classroom observations-with implications for language teachers. *Applied Language Learning*, 14(1), 1-35.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In, E. N. Goody, (ed.), *Questions and politeness* (pp. 56-289). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bunkacho. (1993). *Taigu hyogen* (13th ed.). Tokyo: Okurasho Insatsu Kyoku.
- Carroll, T. (2005). Beyond keigo: Smooth communication and the expression of respect in Japanese as a foreign language. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 175/176, 233-247.
- Cohen, A. D., (1997). Developing pragmatic ability: Insights from the accelerated study of Japanese. In, H. M. Cook, K. Hijirida and M. Tahara (eds.), *New trends and issues in teaching Japanese language and culture* (pp. 133-159). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i.
- Cook, M. H. (1996a). Japanese language socialization: Indexing the modes of self. *Discourse Processes*, 22, 171-197.
- Cook, M. H. (1996b). The use of addressee honorifics in Japanese elementary school classroom. In H. Hoji (Series Ed.) & N. Akatsuka, S. Iwasaki, & S. Strauss (Vol. Eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics Vol.5* (pp. 67-81). Stanford, CA: Center for the study of language and information Leland Stanford Junior University.
- Cook, M. H. (1997). The role of the Japanese masu form in caregiver-child conversation. *Journal of pragmatics*, 28, 695-718.
- Cook, M. H. (1999). Situational meanings of Japanese social deixis: The mixed use of the masu and plain forms. *Journal of Linguistics Anthropology*, 8(1), 87-110.
- Cook, M. H. (2001). Why can't learners of JFL distinguish polite from impolite speech styles? In K. R. Rose and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 80-102). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, M. H. (2002). The social meanings of the Japanese plain form. In H. Hoji (Series Ed.) & N. M. Akatsuka & S. Strauss (Vol. Eds.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics Vol.10* (pp.150-163). Stanford, CA: Center for the study of language and information Leland Stanford Junior University.
- Cook, M. H. (2006). Japanese politeness as an interactional achievement: Academic consultation session in Japanese universities. *Multilingua*, 25, 269-291.
- Coulmas, F. (1992). Linguistic etiquette in Japanese society. In R. J. Watts, S. Ide & K. Ehlich (Eds.), *Politeness in language* (pp. 299-323). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ehlich, K. (2005). On the historicity of politeness: An empirical study of American English and Japanese. In R. Watts, S. Ide & K. Ehlich (Eds.), *Politeness in language: studies in its history, theory and practice* (2nd ed.) (P.71-107). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Enomoto, S., & Marriott, H. (1994). Investigation evaluative behavior in Japanese tour guiding interaction. *Multilingua*, 13(2/1), 131-161.
- Freed, B. F., Dewey, D. P., Segalowitz, N., & Halter, R. (2004). The language contact profile. *Studies of Second Language Acquisition*, 26, 349-356.
- Fukada, A., & Asato, N. (2004). Universal politeness theory: Application to the use of Japanese honorifics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, 1991-2002.
- Hagino, S. (2005). *Hontou no keigo* [Genuine Japanese honorifics]. Tokyo: PHP Kenkyujo.
- Hatasa, Y. (2008). Beikoku ni okeru gaikokugo toshiteno nihongo kyoiu [Japanese as a foreign language education in America]. In Y. Hatasa (Ed.), *Gaikokugo toshiteno nihongo kyoiu: Takakuteki shiten ni motodoku kokoromi* [Japanese as a foreign language education: Multiple perspectives] (pp. 1-15). Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Hill, B., Ide, S., Ikuta, S., Kawasaki, A., & Ogino, T. (1986). Universal of linguistic politeness: Quantitative evidence from Japanese and American English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 10, 347-371.
- Hinds, J. (1978). Conversational structure: An investigation based on Japanese interview discourse. In J. Hinds & I. Howard (Eds.), *Problems in Japanese syntax and semantics* (pp. 79-121). Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Hori, M. (1986). A sociolinguistic analysis of the Japanese honorifics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 10, 373-386.
- Ichikawa, Y. (2005). *Shokyu: Nihongo bunpou to oshiekata no pointo* [Beginners: Points of Japanese grammars and how to teach]. Tokyo: 3A Corporation.
- Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua*, 8(2/3), 223-248.
- Ide, S. (1992). Nihonjin no uchi soto ninchi to wakimae no gengo shiyo [Japanese cognition of uchi and soto, and the use of language according to wakimae]. *Gengo* [Language], 21, 42-53.
- Ide, S. (2005). How and why honorifics can signify dignity and elegance: The indexicality and reflexivity of linguistic rituals. In R. T. Lakoff & S. Ide (Eds.), *Broadening the horizon of linguistic politeness* (pp. 45-64). Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publication Company.
- Ide, S. (2006). *Wakimae no goyouron* [Pragmatics of wakimae]. Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.
- Ide, S., Hill, B., Carnes, Y. M., Ogino, T., & Kawasaki, A. (1992). The concept of politeness: An empirical study of American English and Japanese. In R. J. Watts, S. Ide & K. Ehlich (Eds.), *Politeness in language* (pp. 281-297). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ide, S., & Yoshida, M. (1999). Sociolinguistics: Honorifics and gender differences. In N. Tsujimura (Ed.), *The handbook of Japanese Linguistics* (pp. 444-480). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Ikuta, S. (1983). Speech level shift and conversational strategy in Japanese discourse. *Language Sciences*, 5(1), 37-53.
- Ishida, K. (2001). Learning the pragmatic functions of the Japanese 'masu' and plain forms. Proceedings from *the Annual Meeting of the Pacific Second Language Research Forum*. Retrieved December 20, 2007, from ERIC database.

- Ishihara, N. (2007). Subjectivity, second/foreign language pragmatic use, and instruction: evidence of accommodation and resistance. Study I. Emulating and resisting pragmatic norms: learner subjectivity and foreign language pragmatic use. Study II. Centering second language (SL) speakers' experience: a study of SL speakers' resistance to pragmatic norms of the SL community. Study III. Web-based curriculum for pragmatics instruction in Japanese as a foreign language: an explicit awareness-raising approach. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67(07), 2433A. (UMI No. 3225746)
- Japan Foundation. (2006). *Present condition of overseas Japanese-language education Survey report on Japanese-language education abroad 2006: A summary*. Tokyo: Japanese Language Department: The Japan Foundation.
- Jorden, E. H., & Noda, M. (1994). *Japanese: The spoken language*. Ann Arbor, MI: Edwards Brothers.
- Kabaya, H. (2006). Keigo hyougen to keigohyougen kyouiku [Honorific expressions and teaching on honorific expressions]. In H, Kabaya, Y, Kawaguchi, M, Sakamoto, R, Sei, & M, Utsumi (Eds.), *Keigo hyougen kyouiku no houhou* (pp. 3-45). Tokyo: Taisyukan Shoten.
- Kabaya, H., Kawaguchi, Y., & Sakamoto, M. (1998). *Keigo hyougen* [Honorific expressions]. Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.
- Kawaguchi, Y. (2002). Kaigai ni okeru taigu-hyogen kyouiku no mondaiten: Taiwan deno kensyukai ni okeru 'jizenkadai' bunseki 3 [Issues of teaching taigu-hyogen overseas: Analysis prior to teachers education in Taiwan]. Retrieved July 1, 2008, from <http://dSPACE.wul.waseda.ac.jp/dSPACE/bitstream/2065/3467/1/33003.pdf>
- Kawaguchi, Y. (2006). Shokyu karano keigo hyougen kyouiku [Teaching honorific expressions from beginners]. In H, Kabaya, Y, Kawaguchi, M, Sakamoto, R, Sei, & M, Utsumi (Eds.), *Keigo hyougen kyouiku no houhou* (pp. 108-142). Tokyo: Taisyukan Shoten.
- Kikuchi, Y. (1997). *Keigo* [Honorifics]. Tokyo: Koudansha.
- Kindaichi, H. (1988). *The Japanese language*. Rutland, VT: The Charles E. Tuttle Company, Inc. (Original work published 1957)
- Kindaichi, H. (2003). *Atarashii nihongo no yoshuho* [New method of previewing Japanese]. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten.
- Kitamura, N. (2000, July). *Adapting Brown and Levinson's "politeness" theory to the analysis of casual conversation*. Paper presented at the 2000 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society. Retrieved June 10, 2008, from <http://www.als.asn.au/proceedings/als2000/kitamura.pdf>
- Lauwereyns, S. (2002). Hedges in Japanese conversation: The influence of age, sex, and formality. *Language Variation and Change*, 14, 239-259.
- Martin, S. E. (1964). Speech levels in Japan and Korea. In D. Hymes (Ed.), *Language in cultural and society* (pp.407-415). New York: Harper and Row.
- Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12, 403-426.
- Matsumoto, Y. (1989). Politeness and conversational universals: Observations from Japanese. *Multilingua*, 8(2/3), 207-221.
- Matsumoto, Y. (1993). Linguistic politeness and cultural style: Observations from Japanese. In H. Hoji (Series Ed.) & P. M. Clancy (Vol. Ed.), *Japanese/Korean*

- linguistics Vol.2* (pp.55-67). Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information Leland Stanford Junior University.
- Matsumoto, Y. (2003). Reply to Pizziconi. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 1515-1521.
- Matsumoto, Y., & Okamoto, S. (2003). The construction of the Japanese language and culture in teaching Japanese as a foreign language. *Japanese Language and Literature*, 37, 27-48.
- Matsumoto, Y., Shimizu, T., Okano, H., & Kubo, M. (2004). Kizuki to sentaku: Shakai-gengogakuteki noryoku no yosei o mezasu nihongo-kyoiku no igi [Awareness and choice: Implications of Japanese language instruction aiming to cultivate learners' sociolinguistic competence]. *Gengogaku to Nihongo kyouiku [Linguistics and Japanese Language Education]*, 3, 41-58.
- Maynard, S. K. (1991). Pragmatics of discourse modality: A case of da and desu/masu forms in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 15, 551-582.
- Maynard, S. K. (1993). *Kaiwa bunseki* [Conversation analysis]. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Maynard, S. K. (1997). *Japanese communication: Language and thought in context*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Maynard, S. K. (1999). Discourse analysis and pragmatics. In N. Tsujimura (Ed.), *The handbook of Japanese linguistics* (pp. 425-443). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Mizutani, N. (1989). Taigu hyogen shidouno houhou [Teaching politeness in Japanese]. *Journal of Japanese Language*, 69, 24-35.
- Muramatsu, C. (2008). Hanashi kotoba no buntai: Futari no nihongo gakushusya no buntai no sentaku to shifuto no douki ni tsuiteno kousatsu [A style of spoken language: A study on the choice of style and motive of shift of two learners of Japanese language]. In Y. Hatasa (Ed.), *Gaikokugo toshiteno nihongo kyouiku: Takakuteki shiten ni motoduku kokoromi* [Japanese as a foreign language education: Multiple perspectives] (pp. 265-281). Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Naito, M. (2003). Aizuchi no spiichi rebel to sono shifuto ni tsuite [Speech level of back channels and its shift]. *Sekaino nihongo kyouiku*, 13, 109-125.
- Nakai, Y., Oba, M., & Doi, M. (2004). Danwa rebel deno kaiwa kyouiku ni okeru shidou koumoku no teian: Danwa kaiwabunseki teki apurochi no kanten kara mita danwa ginou no koumoku [Suggestions for teaching points of conversation at discourse level : Discourse ability from a perspective of analysis on conversation]. *Sekai no nihongo kyouiku*, 14, 75-91.
- Neustupny, J. (1972). Remarks on Japanese honorifics. *Linguistic communications*, 7, 78-117.
- Neustupny, J. V. (1978). *Post-structural approaches to language: Language theory in a Japanese context*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.
- Neustupny, J. (1982). *Gaikokujin tonu komyunikeeshion* [Communication with foreigners]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Neustupny, J. (1985). Problems in Australian-Japanese contact situations. In J. B. Pride (Ed.), *Cross-cultural encounters: Communication and mis-communication* (pp. 44-64). Melbourne, Australia: River Seine Publications.
- Neustupny, J. (1986). Language and society: The case of Japanese politeness. In E. Ochs, & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics* (pp. 59-71). New York: Academic Press.

- Nishigori, J. (1997). Gaikokujin to nihonjin no shotaimenkaiwa no bunseki: Suuryotekini mita tokucho to insho no keisei nit suite [Conversation analysis between unacquainted foreigners and Japanese: Features and impressions from quantitative perspective]. *Nihonjinnno danwa kodono script strategy no kenkyu to multimedia kyozaisho shisaku*, 58-74. Retrieved May 1, 2008, from <http://nihongo.human.metro-u.ac.jp/kokubun/mic-J/nihongo/mic-j-kaiwa.html>
- Niyekawa, A., M. (1991). *Minimum essential politeness: A guide to the Japanese honorific language*. Tokyo: Kodansha International.
- Ogino, T., Misono, Y., & Fukushima, C. (1985). Diversity of honorific usage in Tokyo: A sociolinguistic approach based on a field survey. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 55, 23-39.
- Okamoto, S. (1997). Social context, linguistic ideology, and indexical expressions in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28, 795-817.
- Okamoto, S. (1998). The use and non-use of honorifics in sales talk in Kyoto and Osaka: Are they rude or friendly? In H. Hoji (Series Ed.) & N. Akatsuka, H. Hoji, S. Iwasaki, S. Och, & S. Strauss (Vol. Eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics Vol. 7* (pp. 141-157). Stanford, CA: Center for the study of language and information Leland Stanford Junior University.
- Okushi, Y. (1998, March). *Use of Japanese honorifics in daily life: What the traditional theories do not say*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Seattle, WA.
- Ono, S. (1999). *Nihongo renshucho* [Practice note of Japanese]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Ozaki, A. (1989). *Requests for clarification in conversation between Japanese and non-Japanese*. Canberra, Australia: Pacific Linguistics.
- Park, Y. (2006). Honorific behavior in both language of Japanese-Korean bilingual junior and high school students. *Mathematical Linguistics*, 25(6), 262-281.
- Sakamoto, M. (1999). Keigo hyougen no imisuru mono [How do expressions of politeness function in Japanese discourse?]. *Kanagawa University studies in language*, 73-83. Retrieved July 1, 2008, from http://nels.nii.ac.jp/els/110001057685.pdf?id=ART0001218791&type=pdf&lang=jp&host=cinii&order_no=&ppv_type=0&lang_sw=&no=1214879498&cp=
- Sakamoto, M. (2006). Keigohyogen kyouiku niokeru gokai wo donoyouni kangaeruka [How to consider misunderstandings in teaching of honorific expressions]. In H, Kabaya, Y, Kawaguchi, M, Sakamoto, R, Sei, & M, Utsumi (Eds.), *Keigo hyougen kyouiku no houhou* (pp. 143-177). Tokyo: Taisyukan Shoten.
- Sei, R. (1995). Issues of business people of advanced Japanese. *Journal of Japanese Language Teaching*, 87, 139-152.
- Sei, R. (1997). Foreign staff and Japanese staff: Barriers in business communication in Japanese. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 10, 57-73.
- Sei, R. (2006). Kizukiyuudou wo motomete: Syakaijin, daigakusei ni hitsuyouna taigu-hyogen kyouiku wo mosakusuru [Looking for awareness: Investigation on needs of teaching of taigu-hyogen for workers and university students]. In H, Kabaya, Y, Kawaguchi, M, Sakamoto, R, Sei, & M, Utsumi (Eds.), *Keigo hyougen kyouiku no houhou* (pp. 47-77). Tokyo: Taisyukan Shoten.
- Seigal, M. (1996). The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competence: Western women learning Japanese, *Applied Linguistics*, 17(3), 356-382.

- Shibatani, M. (1990). *The languages of Japan*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Shirado, T., Marumoto, S., Murata, M., & Ishihara, H. (2006). Using Japanese honorific expressions: A psychological study. *ACM Transactions on Asian Language Information Processing*, 5(2), 146-164.
- Sugito, S. (1976). Shokuba de no keigo [Honorific speech at the work place]. *Gengo Seikatsu*, 295, 30-41.
- Sugito, S. (1987). Doitsujin to nihonjin no keikoudou [Politeness behavior of Germans and Japanese]. *Gengo*, 16(8), 50-55.
- Takanashi, Y. (2004). TEFL and communication styles in Japanese culture. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 17(1), 1-14.
- Takiura, M. (2005). *Nihon no keigoron: Politeness riron kara no saikentou* [Honorific in Japanese: Reconsideration from theory of politeness]. Tokyo: Taishukan.
- Tanaka, H. (2006). *Nihongo no oshiekata handobukku* [Handbook of how to teach Japanese]. Tokyo: Kokusaigo gakusha.
- Tanaka, M. (2003). Beginning level Japanese language education and attitudinal expressions. *Jinbun syakaigakubu kiyou*, 3, 61-72.
- The Agency for Cultural Affairs (2007) Keigo no tousein [A guideline for honorific expressions]. Retrieved on January 21, 2008, from http://www.bunka.go.jp/1osirase/bunkasingi_keigo_tousin.html
- The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. (2007). Annual report of statistics on Japanese nationals overseas. Retrieved July 8, 2008, from <http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/toko/tokei/hojin/07/pdfs/1.pdf>
- Tannen, D. (1984). The pragmatics of cross-cultural communication. *Applied Linguistics*, 5(3), 189-195.
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 91-112.
- Tokuda, M. (2002). L2 learners' perceptions of politeness in Japanese: The evaluations of non-native speaker speech in L2 Japanese (Doctorial Dissertation, University of Hawaii, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60, 3345.
- Ujihara, K. (1997). Keigo kyouiku o kangaeru [Thinking about honorific language education. *Nihongogaku [Japanese Language Studies]*, 16, 55-66.
- Usami, M. (1993). Shotaimen nishakan no kaiwa no kozo to wahsa ni yoru kaiwa no sutorategi. [Discourse structure in dyadic conversation between unacquainted people and the speaker's conversational strategy]. *Human Communication Studies*, 21, 25-39.
- Usami, M. (1995). Danwa reberu kara mita keigo shiyou: Spichi reberu shifuto seiki no joken to kinou [Use of honorifics from discourse level: conditions for speech-level shift occurrence in Japanese discourse]. *Gakuen*, 662, 27-42.
- Usami, M. (1997a). Kihontekina mojika no gensoku no kaihatsu nitusite [On the development of a basic transcription system for Japanese (BTSJ)]. *Nihonjinno danwa kodono script strategy no kenkyu to multimedia kyozaio shisaku*, 12-26. Retrieved May 1, 2008, from <http://nihongo.human.metro-u.ac.jp/kokubun/mic-J/nihongo/mic-j-kaiwa.html>
- Usami, M. (1997b). *Kotoba ha shakai wo kaerareru* [Language can change the society]. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten.
- Usami, M. (1997c). Nihonjin no danwa koudou: Kaiwa no sutorategii no kenkyu gaiyou [Discourse behavior of Japanese: Research summary of conversational strategy].

- Nihonjinno danwa kodono script strategy no kenkyu to multimedia kyozaio shisaku*, 4-5. Retrieved May 1, 2008, from <http://nihongo.human.metro-u.ac.jp/kokubun/mic-J/nihongo/mic-j-kaiwa.html>
- Usami, M. (1997d). Shizen kaiwa bunseki eno gengoshakaishinrigakuteki approach [Sociopsychological approach to the analysis of natural conversation]. *Nihonjinno danwa kodono script strategy no kenkyu to multimedia kyozaio shisaku*, 1-5. Retrieved May 1, 2008, from <http://nihongo.human.metro-u.ac.jp/kokubun/mic-J/nihongo/mic-j-kaiwa.html>
- Usami, M. (1997e). Shizen kaiwa no mojika shiryō sakusei to sono deta besu ka ni kansuru ichikōsatsu [A study on drawing up transcribing documents and creating a database of natural conversation]. *Nihonjinno danwa kodono script strategy no kenkyu to multimedia kyozaio shisaku*, 6-11. Retrieved May 1, 2008, from <http://nihongo.human.metro-u.ac.jp/kokubun/mic-J/nihongo/mic-j-kaiwa.html>
- Usami, M. (1998). Discourse politeness in Japanese conversation between unacquainted people. *Human Communication Education*, 11, 49-61.
- Usami, M. (1999a). Danwa no politeness. [Discourse politeness]. *Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyūjo*, 9-58.
- Usami, M. (1999b). Discourse politeness in Japanese conversation: some implications for a universal theory of politeness. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(09), 3345A. (UMI No. 9946934)
- Usami, M. (2001a). Danwa no poraitonesu: Poraitonesu no danwarironkōsō [Discourse politeness: A design of discourse theory of politeness]. *Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyūjo*, 9-58.
- Usami, M. (2001b). Discourse politeness toiu kanten kara mita keigo shiyōno kinō: Keigo shiyōno atarashii toraekata ga politeness no danwarironni shisasuru koto [Discourse politeness from a perspective of the function of the use of honorifics: Implications for discourse theory of politeness by a new perspective of the use of honorifics]. *Gogaku kenkyūjo ronsyū*, 6, 1-29.
- Usami, M. (2001c). Nijū-ichi seiki no shakaito nihongo: Politeness no yukuewo tyushinni [Society in the twenty first century and Japanese language: A direction of politeness]. *Gekkan Gengo*, 30(1), 20-28.
- Usami, M. (2002). Politeness riron no tenkai [Expansion of politeness theory]. *Gengo [Language]*, 31(7), 100-107.
- Usami, M. (2003). Ibunka sesshoku to poraitonesu: Disucosu poraitones riron no kanten kara [Cross-cultural interaction and politeness: From a perspective of discourse politeness theory]. *Kokugogaku [The Society of Japanese Linguistics]*, 53(3), 117-132.
- Usami, M. (2007). Basic Transcription System for Japanese: BTSJ. *Nihonjinno danwa kodono script strategy no kenkyu to multimedia kyozaio shisaku*, 17-36. Retrieved May, 23, 2008, from <http://www.tufs.ac.jp/ts/personal/usamiken/btsj070331.pdf>
- Yin, R. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Yoshida, M., & Sakurai, C. (2005). Japanese honorifics as a marker of sociocultural identity: A view from non-Western perspective. In R. T. Lakoff & S. Ide (Eds.), *Broadening the horizon of linguistic politeness* (pp. 197-215). Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publication Company.

- Watanabe, M. (1971). *Kokugokoubunron* [Japanese syntax]. Japan: Haniwa-shobo.
- Wetzel, P. J. (2004). *Keigo in modern Japan: Polite language from Meiji to the present*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- White, Ron. (1993). Saying please: Pragmalinguistic failure in English interaction. *ELT Journal*, 47(3), 193-202.