

May 2010

## How Open is Japan Linguistically? Natives' Attitudes Toward Non-Natives' Use of Honorifics in Business Settings

Shoji Azuma  
*University of Utah*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/gbl>

### Recommended Citation

Azuma, Shoji (2010) "How Open is Japan Linguistically? Natives' Attitudes Toward Non-Natives' Use of Honorifics in Business Settings," *Global Business Languages*: Vol. 6 , Article 5.  
Available at: <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/gbl/vol6/iss1/5>

Copyright © 2010 by Purdue Research Foundation. Global Business Languages is produced by Purdue CIBER. <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/gbl>

This is an Open Access journal. This means that it uses a funding model that does not charge readers or their institutions for access. Readers may freely read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of articles. This journal is covered under the [CC BY-NC-ND license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Shoji Azuma  
*University of Utah*

## HOW OPEN IS JAPAN LINGUISTICALLY: NATIVES' ATTITUDES TOWARD NON-NATIVES' USE OF HONORIFICS IN BUSINESS SETTINGS

### INTRODUCTION

As Japan has emerged as an important trade partner of the United States, increasing interest has been paid to cross-cultural business communication with Japanese (e.g., Condon, 1984; Graham & Andrew, 1987; Hall & Hall, 1987; Haneda & Shima, 1982; Hilton, 1992; Johnston, 1980; Rowland, 1985; Tsuda, 1984; Yamada, 1989, 1997). From the viewpoint of Japanese language instruction, the strong interest in business is clearly observed in a survey conducted in the United States by the National Foreign Language Center (Jordan, 1991). According to the survey, the most important focus of interest in Japan among students is business (32.5%), followed by culture (22.6%). The Japan Foundation's 1995 worldwide survey of Japanese language instruction also shows that business is at the top of the list of interests among students of Japanese (see also Azuma, 1997; Gessel, 1997).

As we move into the 21st century in a globalized marketplace, we are facing a number of interesting issues we have not faced before. One of them is the emergence of bilingual foreign employees who work as colleagues in Japanese companies. Although most Japanese still consider Japan to be a monolingual country where Japanese is spoken only by native-Japanese (for the other view, see Smith, 1995; Weiner, 1997 among others), more and more Japanese are now facing these non-native speakers with whom they have had little contact before. These highly skilled foreigners have a working command of the Japanese language, and often many of them have attained native-like fluency. The number is relatively small, but it is steadily growing due to the "globalization" of Japanese companies (Nikkeiren, 1992) and the increase of advanced learners of Japanese (e.g., Brad & Huber, 1997; Kokusai Nihongo

Fukyuu Kyookai, 1992; Japan Foundation, 1995). Do Japanese workers feel comfortable with foreign colleagues who speak Japanese? Is it realistic to expect our Japanese-speaking American business students to find jobs in Japan and in Japanese companies? Will they be prejudicially treated regardless of their ability to speak the language? Miller (1977, 1982) predicts that foreign workers who have attained high fluency in Japanese will be treated poorly by Japanese natives. Miller (1977) argues the “mythic” role of the Japanese language for Japanese natives:

To speak and to use the Japanese language is to be a Japanese; to be a Japanese is to speak and to use the Japanese language. So long as each of these two balanced assumptions is maintained, they reinforce each other; but if either of them is disturbed in the slightest, both collapse. (71)

For Japanese, language and race are in an isomorphic relation. Miller (1977) goes on to say that “genuine fluency in Japanese by non-natives living and working in Japan provides overt evidence of . . . invasion of sociolinguistic territorial interests that are to be defended” (82). Foreigners with fluency in Japanese are a threat to the racial identity of the Japanese people. Miller calls this thesis the “law of inverse returns.” This essentially means that the more a foreign worker becomes fluent in Japanese, the less favorable treatment he/she will receive from native Japanese. Japan may not be open to Japanese-speaking non-natives.

Although the “law of inverse returns” was put forth in the late 70’s, this theory has become fact for many people. For example, in a newspaper article titled “Japanese don’t care for fluent foreigners,” Lev (1996) cites various people’s comments on the issue: one American who works in Japan said “if someone [a foreigner] speaks fluently, then all of a sudden the theory that Japanese are impenetrable doesn’t hold much water. It threatens the status quo.” According to Lev (1996), one Japanese said “the majority of Japanese feel that foreigners are foreigners and Japanese are Japanese. There are obvious distinctions. Foreigners who speak fluently blur those distinctions, and that makes the Japanese feel uneasy.” Despite such anecdotal evidence, Miller’s law has not been scientifically tested.

As economies of the world become more intimately interconnected, and as individuals move more freely through business travel and

immigration, the need to understand how non-native foreign workers are viewed by natives becomes more and more important. Especially in a highly group-oriented society like Japan, the issue of a person being accepted as a member of the team becomes quite relevant to the productivity, satisfaction, and future advancement of the person. The present study will serve as a case study of the general question of how Japanese-speaking non-natives are viewed by natives in the workplace. Specifically, the present study tests the validity of the claim that the increase of a non-native's Japanese language ability will inversely affect his/her social acceptance by the Japanese people.

#### *Previous studies*

Several studies claim to find evidence against the validity of Miller's thesis (Haugh, 1998; Ota, 1993; Saint-Jacques, 1983). The method used by these studies was either interviews or questionnaires directly asking Americans/Japanese for their language experience and feeling. Given the major finding in the field of sociolinguistics that people do not always report what they actually do (e.g., Milroy, 1987), other evidence/data is needed. Furthermore, the studies did not control variables such as social occasions, topic and speaker/addressee, which are known to affect our linguistic behavior (e.g., Holmes, 1992).

#### THE STUDY

##### *Present study*

In the present study, we conducted a language attitude study of Japanese workers toward different levels of non-natives' Japanese as well as natives' Japanese. Here we chose honorifics as a relevant variable for the speaker's language ability. Unlike English, Japanese has a complicated system of honorifics in various verb forms as well as noun forms, and every single verb has several conjugations reflecting social relationships between a speaker and a hearer. Especially in business settings, it is considered to be very important to use appropriate honorific forms in order to function well in a Japanese society where vertical human relationships are highly valued. The importance of honorifics can be manifested in the large number of publications which stress the importance of showing respect to others (e.g., a business client) by using appropriate honorifics (e.g., Noguchi 1992). Thus, proper/improper

honorifics can serve as a vital factor for judging language ability in Japanese corporate settings. Specific questions we want to ask include the following: Do the Japanese view non-natives more favorably as they become more fluent by using appropriate honorific forms? What are the perceptions of native Japanese if non-natives do not use honorifics properly? After all, do the Japanese expect non-natives to use honorifics as skillfully as natives do?

*Honorifics in Japanese*

Japanese is a language where every sentence linguistically reflects the speaker's evaluation of his/her relation to the addressee/referent. English speakers, on the other hand, can use the same linguistic form *Today is Saturday* to anyone ranging from a professor, a friend, or, for that matter, even to a dog, although they may use connotations to express a certain attitude toward an addressee. However, in Japanese there is no neutral form as such, and a Japanese speaker always has to choose an appropriate verb form with respect to politeness/formality depending on to whom or about whom he/she is speaking (Matsumoto, 1989). Honorifics are used orally and also in writing, but in the present study we will limit ourselves to the oral use of honorifics.

A brief description of honorifics in the Japanese verb system is in order here. I will adopt the two-axis analysis of polite forms (e.g., Jorden, 1962; Martin, 1964). That is, there is a distinction between honorific and humble forms (i.e., *sonkeigo* and *kenzyoogo*) as one axis, and also there is another axis of "formality" or "style" (i.e., informal and formal). For example, a Japanese verb *iru* 'exist' can be represented in a two-axis dimension as in (1).

(1)

	<i>Honorific</i>	irassharu	irasshaimasu
Polite			
	<i>Humble</i>	oru	orimasu
Plain		iru	imasu
		<i>Informal</i>	<i>Formal</i>

(adopted from Wetzel, 1994)

The vertical axis of polite forms encodes deference for some addressee/referent, whereas the horizontal axis encodes formality which is generally determined by the relationship between the speaker and addressee/referent (e.g., how well the speaker knows the addressee/referent). Honorific forms cannot be used in talking about the speaker or the speaker's in-group member. This is because the speaker is not supposed to show deference to him/herself or his/her in-group members (e.g., colleagues, family members). On the other hand, the humble forms can only be used in talking about the speaker or a member of the speaker's in-group. The focus of the present study is this vertical axis, which encodes the speaker's deference.

The various uses of the honorific/humble forms are illustrated in (2). Let's assume that the utterances were made in the context in which the speaker was referring to someone else's section head in a public setting. Although all utterances in (2) essentially mean "The section head is (here)," the acceptability varies depending on the appropriate choice of its verb form.

- (2)
- |     |              |            |                 |
|-----|--------------|------------|-----------------|
| (a) | Buchoo       | ga         | irasshaimasu.   |
|     | section head | nominative | exist-honorific |
| (b) | *Buchoo      | ga         | orimasu.        |
|     |              |            | exist-humble    |
| (c) | ?Buchoo      | ga         | imasu.          |
|     |              |            | exist-plain     |

Given that the speaker shows deference to the section head, the sentence in (2a) is the only appropriate one where the honorific *irasshaimasu* is used correctly to show deference to the referent (i.e., the section head). On the other hand, the sentence in (2b) is inappropriate and often considered to be rude because the humble form *orimasu* is used to refer to the section head. The section head cannot be humbled by the speaker (although the speaker can humble him/herself). The sentence in (2c) is marginal in the sense that the section head was not humbled but he/she was not given deference either.

In a hierarchical society like Japan, it becomes crucial to use an appropriate form with respect to honorifics. This is especially important in business settings where a businessperson talks to his/her client. In

order to gain social approval, the speaker has to always consider who he/she is speaking to/about in terms of his/her social status in relation to that of the speaker. Thus, the correct use of honorifics, for which English has no equivalent, serves as a vital factor for the speaker's ability in Japanese. Our research question is whether or not the non-native speakers' fluency in Japanese, which is reflected by the appropriate use of honorifics, is in a reverse relationship to native Japanese attitudes toward them. More specifically, we want to know what are the perceptions of native Japanese toward the skillful/non-skillful use of honorifics by non-native speakers as opposed to native speakers.

#### METHODS

The speech act is a situated activity which is embedded in the dynamics of social, cultural and political factors. Thus, in order to fully understand our speech behavior, all of the factors have to be considered in real day-to-day business settings. However, as a methodology, in this study we employed a clinical environment in order to isolate a specific feature of honorifics and keep other relevant factors controlled, with the full understanding that any results from this study should be interpreted with this constraint in mind.

For this study, Japanese subjects listened to the voices of six male office workers (in reality, two male office workers, will explain later) talking in Japanese. Subjects were asked via a questionnaire (Appendix 1) to evaluate each voice by rating it on a scale of 1–5 with 5 being the most positive rating and 1 being the least positive rating in the following 11 criteria (adopted from Wetzel, 1994) in (3).

- (3)
  - (a) Manners
  - (b) Capability
  - (c) Consideration
  - (d) Politeness
  - (e) Education
  - (f) Proactivity
  - (g) Reliability
  - (h) Amiability
  - (i) Flexibility
  - (j) Likability

(k) Confidence

Each of the six voice samples provided one side of a telephone conversation, in which the speaker was making an inquiry about a recent business deal. The script of the telephone conversation was taken from an actual conversation between two Japanese businessmen in an office setting and later modified to allow the three variations with respect to honorifics. Each sample lasted about one minute and contained 9 locations for the honorifics variations (Appendix 2). Three of the voices were native Japanese; one spoke in correct honorifics, the second spoke plainly (i.e., no use of honorifics), and the third spoke incorrectly in terms of the use of honorific/humble forms. The additional three voices were Americans who were fluent in Japanese with the same three variations as the native Japanese. The examples in (4) illustrate these three linguistic variations.

(4)

Correct: Eigyoobu no Yamada san wa *irasshaimasu* ka?  
sales dept. 's Mr. topic exist-honorific Q  
'May I speak to Mr. Yamada of the sales department?'

Incorrect: Eigyoobu no Yamada san wa *orimasu* ka?  
exist-humble

Plain: Eigyoobu no Yamada san wa *imasu* ka?  
exist-plain

(Q stands for a question morpheme)

A matched guise technique was used for this study in order to control for aspects of individual's speech such as tone of voice and pitch that cannot be easily manipulated. The technique has been used to assess the attitudes of listeners toward various dialects of their language among sociolinguists (e.g., Labov, 1972; Lambert, 1967; Wetzel, 1995). In this technique, the listeners are led to believe that each voice they hear belongs to a different speaker, although the same speaker is heard more than once. For this study, one native Japanese spoke in three difference

voices (i.e., correct, plain, incorrect) and also one American spoke in three different voices. Thus, although six voices were presented to the subjects as different speakers, in reality there were only two speakers. Each speaker played three voices.

### *Participants*

For this study, it was thought to be important to have actual business people who have experience with honorifics in business settings in order to ascertain the actual language attitudes in business environments. To this end, fifty-six native Japanese employees at banks in the Tokyo area were recruited for the experiment. All were male and their age ranged from 28 to 41. Although they were told to feel free to drop out in the middle of the experiment if they wanted to, none of them did so and everyone completed the experiment. Each session was conducted in a group of 3-5 subjects, and was carried out from June to August, 1997.

### RESULTS

The experimental design for the present study is characterized as a two-way factorial design with two independent variables: voice of speaker (i.e., native vs. non-native) and form (i.e., correct, plain, incorrect). Dependent variables were the rated scores of the 11 criteria.

In order to determine if there was any main effect of the two independent variables (i.e., form and voice), the following procedure was adopted. Ratings (on a 1-5 scale with 5 as the most positive score) to eleven different questions were totaled and divided by eleven to find a mean value. By using this mean as the dependent variable, ANOVA was conducted. First, a comparison was made between native speakers and non-native speakers. Non-native speakers received significantly higher scores than natives,  $F(1, 330) = 24.11, p < .0001$ . Japanese subjects viewed non-natives' speech more positively than native speakers' speech.

Table 1  
*Mean ratings for voice of speakers*

Voice	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Native	2.84	.844
Non-native	3.25	.771

---

Next, a comparison was made between the forms. Not surprisingly, the correct form received the highest score, and then came the plain form which was followed by the incorrect form. It was found that the differences between the forms were statistically significant,  $F(1, 330) = 24.91, p < .0001$ . A Tukey's HSD comparison finds that while the plain and the correct forms did not significantly differ from each other, the incorrect form had a significant difference when compared to the plain,  $Mdiff = -.5284 (p < .0001)$ , and the correct,  $Mdiff = -.6721 (p < .0001)$ , forms. The incorrect form was rated more negatively than the plain and the correct forms. The interaction of the voice and form variables was also statistically significant,  $F(2, 330) = 3.88, p < .025$ , though not to the degree that the main effects were.

Table 2  
*Mean ratings for form*

Form	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Plain	3.17	.801
Correct	3.32	.716
Incorrect	2.64	.826

Next, the 11 criteria were used as dependent variables and MANOVA was conducted. It was found that the main effects for voice were significant for the ratings of the following eight criteria: manners,  $F(1, 330) = 62.64, p < .0001$ , consideration,  $F(1, 330) = 57.25, p < .0001$ , politeness,  $F(1, 330) = 36.59, p < .0001$ , education,  $F(1, 330) = 34.59, p < .0001$ , reliability,  $F(1, 330) = 5.91, p < .025$ , amiability,  $F(1, 330) = 68.80, p < .0001$ , flexibility,  $F(1, 330) = 28.59, p < .0001$ , and likability,  $F(1, 330) = 46.89, p < .0001$ . The non-native's speech was rated significantly more positively than the native's speech in the above criteria. The effects of voice on the specific ratings for capability, proactivity, and confidence were not statistically significant.

Table 3  
*Mean ratings of specific criteria for voice*

Criteria	Voice	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Manners	Native	2.95	.824
	Non-native	3.62	.749
Capable	Native	2.84	1.14
	Non-native	2.95	1.00
Considerate	Native	2.71	.743
	Non-native	3.32	.735
Politeness	Native	2.82	1.13
	Non-native	3.46	1.01
Educated	Native	2.63	1.11
	Non-native	3.18	1.01
Proactive	Native	3.11	.863
	Non-native	3.14	.796
Reliability	Native	2.68	1.085
	Non-native	2.90	.831
Amiability	Native	2.80	.786
	Non-native	3.48	.742
Flexibility	Native	2.98	.665
	Non-native	3.37	.723
Likeable	Native	2.79	.908

	Non-native	3.39	.774
Confidence	Native	2.99	1.030
	Non-native	2.90	.983

The effect of voice on rating derives from the consistently higher ratings given to non-native speakers on all variables except for confidence, where this was reversed, but did not approach statistical significance.

Next, in each conversational form (i.e., plain, correct, and incorrect), a comparison was made between natives and non-natives. For this purpose, the mean rating was used as a dependent measure for testing of the effects of form. In the plain form, there was no statistically significant difference between native speakers and non-native speakers, although the non-native speakers' score was slightly higher than the natives'. In the correct form, non-native speakers were rated more positively than native speakers, and this difference was significant,  $F(1, 110) = 17.11, p < .0001$ . In the incorrect form, again, non-native speakers were rated more positively than native speakers, and this difference was also significant,  $F(1, 110) = 16.92, p < .0001$ . Thus, in both correct and incorrect forms, non-natives were rated more positively than natives, but there was no significant difference in the plain form.

*Mean ratings for form and voice*

---



---



---

Next, in each voice, a comparison was made among forms. Among native speakers, it was found that the difference between ratings, based on form, were statistically significant,  $F(2, 165) = 17.79, p < .0001$ . A Tukey's HSD found that the incorrect form differed significantly from the correct form,  $Mdiff = .71, p < .0001$ , and the plain form,  $Mdiff = .79, p < .05$ , while the plain and correct forms did not significantly differ from each other. Thus, native speakers' use of incorrect forms was rated more negatively than their use of plain forms and correct forms. Interestingly, there was no difference between the use of the plain form and the use of the correct form (although the plain form received a slightly higher score than the correct form).

*Mean ratings for form in native speakers*

---

---

---

*Post hoc comparisons for mean ratings by form in native speakers*

---

---

Among non-native speakers, it was found that the difference between ratings, based on form, were statistically significant,  $F(2, 165) = 10.61$ ,  $p < .0001$ . A Tukey's HSD found that the correct form differed significantly from the incorrect form,  $M_{diff} = .63$ ,  $p < .05$ , and the plain form,  $M_{diff} = .36$ ,  $p < .025$ , while the plain and the incorrect forms did not significantly differ from each other.

---

---

*Mean ratings for form in non-native speakers*

---

---

---

---

*Post hoc comparisons for mean ratings by form in non-native speakers*

---

---

## DISCUSSION

### *Natives' overall attitudes toward non-native speakers of Japanese*

One of the important findings in this study is that Japanese subjects were overall more favorable toward non-natives' Japanese than natives'. The overall effect of voice was significant. Japanese subjects appreciated non-natives' efforts to speak the Japanese language, giving them higher scores than natives. This "over-reaction" may be due to the commonly held perception among Japanese that the Japanese language is one of the most difficult languages and almost impossible for foreigners to learn (Lev, 1996). Japanese regarded non-native speakers of Japanese as more well-mannered, considerate, polite, educated, reliable, amiable, flexible and likable than native speakers of Japanese. It seems that native Japanese value non-natives' efforts to use Japanese even when they make linguistic mistakes. Although non-natives' Japanese may not be perfect, the fact that they are using the Japanese language contributes to a positive characterization (e.g., amiable, considerate). These results suggest that native Japanese view non-natives who are speaking Japanese positively, contrary to the claim that non-native speakers of Japanese will be treated poorly.

Our next question is the nature of the dynamic relationship between fluency and positive attitude. For example, do Japanese view non-natives less positively as their Japanese becomes better or vice versa?

*The relationship between non-natives' fluency and natives' attitudes*

First of all, the overall form effect shows that the incorrect form was viewed more negatively than both the plain and the correct forms, which is expected given that appropriate use of honorifics is considered important in Japanese society. However, the analyses based on the voice shows that there are several fundamental differences between native speakers and non-native speakers. When speakers were non-natives, correct forms enjoyed the most favorable rating ( $M = 3.58$ ) and then plain form followed ( $M = 3.21$ ) and finally the incorrect form was least favorable ( $M = 2.95$ ). This is opposite of what we expect from the “law of inverse return.” According to the law, the skillful command of Japanese exemplified by the correct form by non-natives would be rated least favorably, but what we observed is just the mirror image of this prediction. Instead, the correct form was definitely more appreciated than the other two forms.

Interestingly, there was no statistically significant difference between the plain form and the incorrect form, although the plain form was rated slightly more favorably than the incorrect form. Or to put this differently, the incorrect form was not more penalized than the plain form (i.e., the difference of 0.26 was not significant) and the Japanese subjects were very forgiving to non-natives when they used the incorrect form. We may describe this schematically as in the following:

Non-natives: correct > (plain = incorrect)

The plain and the incorrect were grouped together and the correct form was viewed more positively than the other two. When non-natives spoke correctly, they were more appreciated than natives. Interestingly, when they spoke incorrectly, they were still viewed more positively than natives. This is good news to non-native speakers of Japanese. They are encouraged to try to speak Japanese by using appropriate honorifics. Even if they make mistakes, they should not be afraid of speaking

Japanese, because they are not likely to be penalized to the same extent as native Japanese.

*Natives' attitudes toward their own peers*

The same situation did not hold when the speakers were native speakers of Japanese. First, contrary to expectations, the order of the positive ratings is plain ( $M = 3.14$ ), correct ( $M = 3.06$ ) and then incorrect ( $M = 2.34$ ). Secondly, the incorrect form was severely penalized compared to the other two forms. Thirdly, there were no perceived significant differences between the plain and the correct form. We may describe this schematically in the following:

Natives: (plain = correct) > incorrect

Unlike the situation for non-natives, the plain and the correct forms were grouped together and they were viewed more positively than the incorrect form. Interestingly, the correct form was not as much appreciated as in the case of non-natives.

CONCLUSION

The experiment on attitudes toward natives' and non-natives' different linguistic forms has shown that Japanese subjects have different attitudes toward non-natives and natives. Toward non-natives, the Japanese subjects were very positive when non-natives used the correct form. Furthermore, the Japanese subjects were forgiving even when non-natives used the incorrect form. Toward natives, the Japanese subjects did not display the same degree of positiveness. When the subjects heard natives using incorrect forms, the speakers were penalized and viewed negatively. Furthermore, the correct form was not much appreciated. As a matter of fact, the correct form was viewed less favorably than the plain form, although the difference was not statistically significant.

The results in the present study did not offer any evidence to support the "law of inverse return" (Miller, 1977). Contrary to the prediction, Japanese subjects appreciated very much when non-natives spoke Japanese by using correct honorifics, giving higher scores on personal traits questions than their fellow Japanese. In other words, as non-native speakers' Japanese progresses by using more correct honorifics, they are more favorably viewed by native Japanese. Taken as a whole, the results

from the present study suggest that non-natives should be encouraged to learn to speak correctly using appropriate honorifics and also they should not be afraid of making mistakes. The more they speak correctly, the more favorably they will be viewed by native Japanese, contrary to the prediction of the “law of inverse return.” As far as language attitudes go, the present study provides an optimistic forecast: Japanese are open and ready to welcome their Japanese-speaking non-native colleagues in Japan.

Finally, it should be pointed out that the results in the present study were derived from a rather small group of speech samples, specifically from Japanese male office workers and Americans as non-natives in an experimental setting, focusing on a specific linguistic variable (i.e., honorifics). Thus, the result of the present study should be interpreted with this constraint in mind. Obviously, factors such as gender, nationality, age, geography (i.e., dialects) and setting play an important role in language attitudes. For example, it will be interesting to examine language attitudes with respect to the gender of native speakers as well as that of non-native speakers. Equally, it will be interesting to examine language attitudes with respect to the function of race and nationalities (see Du-Babcock & Babcock, 1996 for the situation in Taiwan). For these, we have to wait for further studies.

## REFERENCES

- Azuma, S. 1997. Facing diversification in the purpose of study: Business Japanese. *Association of Departments of Foreign Languages Bulletin*, 28 (2), 17–20.
- Brad, R., & Huber, B. J. 1997. Foreign language enrollments in United States institutions of higher education, fall 1995. *Association of Departments of Foreign Languages Bulletin*, 28 (2), 53–61.
- Carmichael, K. 1996. Conceptualizing business communication. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 33 (3), 327–329.
- Condon, J. C. 1984. *With respect to the Japanese: A guide for Americans*. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.
- DuBabcock, B., & Babcock, R. D. 1996. Patterns of expatriate-local personnel communication in multinational corporations. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 33 (2), 141–164.

- Gessel, V.C. 1997. Teaching “the Devil’s Own Tongue”: The challenges of offering Japanese in a college environment. *Association of Departments of Foreign Languages Bulletin*, 28 (2), 6–10.
- Graham, J. L., & Andrews, D. J. 1987. A holistic analysis of Japanese and American business negotiations. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 24 (4), 63–77.
- Hall, E. T., & Hall, M. R. 1987. *Hidden differences: Doing business with the Japanese*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press.
- Haneda, S., & Shima, H. 1982. Japanese communication behavior as reflected in letter writing. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 19 (1), 19–32.
- Haugh, M. 1998. Native-speaker beliefs about *Nihonjinron* and Miller’s “Law of Inverse Returns.” *Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese*, 32 (2), 27–58.
- Hilton, C. B. 1992. Japanese international business communication: The place of English. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 29 (3), 253–265.
- Japan Foundation. 1995. *Survey report on Japanese-language education abroad 1993*. Tokyo: Ministry of Finance
- Johnston, J. 1980. Business communication in Japan. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 17 (3), 65–70.
- Jorden, E. H. 1962. *Beginning Japanese*. New Haven: Yale UP.
- . 1991. *Japanese Language Instruction in the United States: Resources, Practice, and Investment Strategy*. Washington, D.C.: National Foreign Language Center.
- Kokusai Nihongo Fukyuu Kyookai. 1992. *Ippan gaikokujin ni taisuru nihongo kyooiku no jittai ni kansuru chyoosa kenkyuu houkokushyo*. Tokyo: Kokusai Nihongo Fukyuu Kyookai.
- Lambert, W. E. 1967. A social psychology of bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 23 (2), 91–108.
- Lev, M. 1996. Japanese don’t care for fluent foreigners. *Deseret News*, A10.
- Martin, S. E. 1964. Speech levels in Japan and Korea. In D. Heims (Ed.), *Language in culture and society* (407–415). New York: Harper & Row.
- Matsumoto, Y. 1989. Politeness and conversational universals: Observations from Japanese. *Multilingua*, 8, 207–221.

- Miller, R. A. 1977. *The Japanese language in modern Japan: Some sociolinguistic observations*. Washington D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.
- . 1982. *Japan's modern myth*. New York: John Weatherhill.
- Milroy, L. 1987. *Observing and analysing natural language*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Nikkeiren. 1992. *Gaikokujin shuyain no saiyo to shoguu*. Tokyo: Nikkeiren.
- Ota, A.S. 1993. The foreign language learners in Japanese society. *Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese*, 27 (2), 205–228.
- Rowland, D. 1985. *Japanese business etiquette: A practical guide to success with the Japanese*. New York: Warner Books.
- Saint-Jacques, B. 1983. Language attitudes in contemporary Japan. *The Japan Foundation Newsletter*, 11 (1), 7–14.
- Smith, H. W. 1995. *The myth of Japanese homogeneity: social ecological diversity in education and socialization*. Commack, N.Y.: Nova Science.
- Yamada, H. 1989. *American and Japanese topic management strategies in business meetings*. Ph. D. Dissertation. Georgetown University.
- . 1997. *Different games, different rules*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Weiner, M. 1997. *Japan's minorities: the illusion of homogeneity*. New York: Routledge.
- Wetzel, P. 1994. Contemporary Japanese attitudes toward honorifics. *Language Variation and Change*, 6, 113–147.

Appendix 1

*Questionnaire (translation)*

If there were a word to express what kind of person this is, what would you say? Consider the following diversified pairs of words, and circle the appropriate numbers between the two words, as shown in the example.

Example:

boring            1        2        3        4        5        interesting  
(this would rank as remarkable interesting)

- |                      |   |   |   |   |   |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| (a) bad-mannered     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| well-mannered        |   |   |   |   |   |
| (b) incapable        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| capable              |   |   |   |   |   |
| (c) inconsiderate    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| considerate          |   |   |   |   |   |
| (d) impolite         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| polite               |   |   |   |   |   |
| (e) uneducated       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| educated             |   |   |   |   |   |
| (f) passive/inactive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| positive/proactive   |   |   |   |   |   |
| (g) undependable     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| dependable           |   |   |   |   |   |
| (h) cold/unfeeling   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| amiable              |   |   |   |   |   |
| (i) stubborn         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| flexible             |   |   |   |   |   |
| (j) dislikable       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| likable              |   |   |   |   |   |
| (k) doubting         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| confident            |   |   |   |   |   |

[Note: One sheet per voice for a total of seven sheets]

## Appendix 2

### Script

あ、もしもし、いつもお世話になっております。東洋産業のワトソンと申しますが、営業部の山田 さんは、いらっしゃいますか／いますか／おりますか。

はい、

東洋産業のワトソン でございます／です／でいらっしゃいます。

いつも、お世話になって おります／います／いらっしゃいます。

あ、はい、こちらこそ、あ、はい、あの、ちょっと うかがいたい／聞きたい／お尋ねになりたいんですけれども、

あの、先日、送っていただいた新製品のカタログのことで、ちょっと うかがいたい／聞きたい／お尋ねになりたいんですが、、

はい、はい

当社へ一度、来ていただいて／来て／うかがって、実物をもとに説明していただけますか／くれませんか／さしあげませんか。

あー、そうですか、それは大変、助かります、、はい、、はい

えーと、それですね、あの、価格の幅なんですけど、、単価にして、3万から3万5千円ということですね、、はい、、

はい、、はい

あー、そうですか、あの、、そうすると、購入時に、お支払いすればよろしい／払えばいい／お支払いになればいいということですね、、はい、分かりました。

はい、、はい、、はい、、

それでは、後日、こちらの日程をつめたところで、、また、連絡させていただきます／します／なさいますので、一つよろしくお願ひします。

こちらこそ、はい、、失礼します。

[The underlined segments indicate the three linguistic variations in the order of correct, plain and incorrect forms.]

### Translation for the script

Hello. This is Suzuki of Toyo Industries. How are things going? —yes—,  
—yes—, good—, well, I am wondering if I could speak to Mr. Yamada  
of the Sales Department. —yes—  
— silence— [An operator will connect to Mr. Yamada.]  
Hello, — Yes, — Hi, this is Suzuki of Toyo Industries. How are things  
going? —yes—  
Well, —Yes — Uh, ha — Well, I would like to ask you a question, but  
—  
Well, this is about the catalogue you sent me the other day, — yes, —  
yes—  
What kind of parts do you use for the product? —yes, —yes, —yes—  
Well, then, as for the sales price, —yes, —yes, — what you are saying is  
about 30,000 yen to 50,000 yen a piece, am I right? — yes, —yes—  
Well, that's fine. —then, we have to pay when the products were  
delivered to us, right?  
—yes, —yes, —yes—  
Well, then we will get back to you once we have finalized our dates. —  
We will talk later, right? — yes, —yes, —  
Thank you, —yes, yes, —we will talk to you later.—

*Note*

I am grateful to Tyler Anderson, Edward Byrnes, Eric Laursen  
for their assistance. I am also grateful to Patricia Wetzel for  
giving me access to her study.