

THE DISTRIBUTION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF JAPANESE VOCATIVES IN BUSINESS SITUATIONS

Tamaki Kitayama

Abstract

This paper aims to analyse the types of Japanese vocatives used in business situations, and demonstrate the characteristics of their distribution with different politeness levels as shown in films on human relationships in large traditional corporations in and around Tokyo. The discussion builds on the theory of “discernment or social indexing politeness” (Hill et al. 1986; Ide 2006; Ide et al. 1986; Kasper 1990; Geyer 2008), and positions that of “strategic or volitional politeness” (ibid.) with the variables of “power” and “distance” proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). In a society of collectivism under a vertical structure with seniority system, people have their own *ba* (‘place’) (Nakane 2005) where they are expected to choose socially accepted language and behaviour according to whom they address; namely, seniors or juniors, and *uchi* (‘in-group’) or *soto* (‘out-group’) members. The use of vocatives is fixed based primarily upon “power” (age and status) and “distance” (in- or out-group), and is hardly flexible to changes in form in business or private situations. “Power” prevails in addressing in-group members; whereas “distance” determines the choice of vocatives used between out-group people. Within a group, indirect polite forms are used to address superiors, whilst direct familiar forms are chosen when speaking to subordinates, which presents a nonreciprocal use of terms; power downwards and reserve upwards. The intentional individual use of last name+*-san* (‘Mr./Ms.’) is also argued here as it has dichotomous aspects of politeness; sounding more polite to address a subordinate, and less polite when used with a boss. To out-group members, people tend to choose more of polite forms to each other. These vocative choices reflect the relative position of the Japanese interdependent “self” (Morisaki & Gudykunst 1994; Gudykunst et al. 1996; Spencer-Oatey & Franklin 2009) with “other- and mutual-face” (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel 2002), which follows social norms, striving to meet expectations made by groups it belongs to and identifies itself with.

Keywords: Vocatives; Last names; Position titles; *-San* (‘Mr./Ms.’); Nonreciprocal use; Politeness; Discernment; Social norms; “Power” & “distance”; Japanese films; Business situations; Collectivism; *ba* (‘place’); Seniority system; *Uchi* & *soto* (‘in-group’ & ‘out-group’).

1. Introduction

From an anthropological viewpoint, it has been noted that addressing a person involves a taboo element as it indirectly “touches” the other party (Takiura 2007: 34). Knowing “people’s names is to have power over them” (Sawyer 1994: 2672). Japanese society, which has yet to be adequately defined as retaining vertical (Takiura 2005: 252) structure of collectivism¹ and the notion of one’s own *ba* (‘place’)² in it, can easily be

¹ Lebra (1976: 257) contrasts “the Western model based on the complex of individuality, autonomy, quality, rationality, aggression, and self-assertion” with “the traditional [Japanese] complex of

anticipated to be static in which people use nonreciprocal terms of address.

Brown and Gilman (1960: 256-260) ... view difference in power as leading to non-reciprocal address practices, ... the 'power semantic' works only in a static society in which everybody has a clearly defined place. (Clyne et al. 2009: 28)

Lebra (1976: 112) describes the importance of the group in Japan as the *uchi* and *soto* ('in- and out-group') distinction characterises "human culture in general, but it is essential in determining the way Japanese interact." Wetzel's (1985: 136) data suggest that "Japanese cognitively represent situations in terms of their group rather than individual identity, [which is] a cognitive habit that specifically reflects characteristics in that culture, and manifests itself in situationally dependent language choices not typically found in Western countries." Tsukimoto (2008: 207) is consistent with Wetzel (1985) when he compares the Japanese brain with the English one, and observes that cognitive-based situations are greatly reflected in Japanese linguistic-based structures. When "a Japanese 'faces the outside' (confronts another person) and affixes some position to himself socially, he is inclined to give precedence to institution over kind of occupation In group identification, a frame such as a 'company' or 'association' is of primary importance; the attribute of the individuals is a secondary matter" (Nakane 2005: 2-3). The Japanese are "other directed," and their "sense of identity anchored in group belongingness is ... sustained by going along with peers Group identification is so internalized that even the inner experience of an individual tends to have collective implications" (Lebra 1976: 29-35). Matsumoto (1988: 405) points out that "a Japanese generally must understand where s/he stands in relation to other members of the group or society Acknowledgement and maintenance of the relative position of others, rather than preservation of an individual's proper territory, governs all social interaction."

Unlike people living in a predominantly individualistic society, people in a collectivistic society are more or less expected not to choose either of the politeness strategies themselves as defined in Brown and Levinson (1987) except when they secure power over the other party or their relationship is based on psychologically close solidarity. Instead, the individuals are required to intuitively and habitually know the social conventional (Ide 1989) form of language to be used in a particular situation where each of their own places has been fixed (Ide 2006: 186). Politeness functions "independently of the current goal a speaker intends to achieve" (Ide 1989: 196). Two types of complementary aspects of politeness (O'Driscoll 1996; Van De Walle 1993; Geyer 2008) are presented: "[S]trategic or volitional or interactional politeness," and "discernment³ or social indexing⁴ or automatic politeness" (Hill et al. 1986; Ide 2006; Ide et al. 1986; Kasper 1990; Geyer 2008). Geyer (2008: 25) states the two concepts of politeness as "strategic or volitional politeness" being strategic conflict avoidance, and "discernment or social index politeness" being "the linguistic expression of 'social warrants'" (Ide 1989: 196), recognised by the speaker. Geyer (2008: 27) further argues that both aspects of politeness have been observed in Japan and the West, but that some

collectivism, interdependence, superordination-subordination, empathy, sentimentality, introspection and self-denial." Wierzbicka (2003: 75-81) presents the Japanese concept of *enryo* ('reserve') against the English concept of *self-assertion*, and points out that "Japanese culture values interdependence more highly than autonomy."

² Nakane (2005: 30-49) analyses that *ba* ('place') or *waku* ('frame'), (e.g. work place, school), is indispensable in maintaining collectivism in Japan as it distinguishes in-group from out-group members. Kataoka (1997: 378-381) depicts that the idea of one's own place is essential to Japanese people which is always confirmed by the vertical relationship between oneself and the other party to exchange conversation within that limited sphere.

³ Discernment (*wakimae* in Japanese) means "conforming to the expected norm," and having "almost automatic observation of socially agreed-upon rules" (Hill et al. 1986: 348).

⁴ Social index is identical with social norms, which is defined as "a standard of behaviour shared by social group, commonly understood by its members as authoritative or obligatory for them" (Anderson 2000: 17).

studies (Hill et al. 1986; Ide 1982; Ide et al. 1986) suggest that politeness in Western societies be skewed towards strategic politeness; whereas politeness in Japan is predominantly discernment. “Strategic or volitional politeness” (Hill et al. 1986; Ide 2006; Ide et al. 1986; Kasper 1990; Geyer 2008) has a high “degree of freedom of linguistic optionality” (Geyer 2008: 26), and provides the speaker with a “considerably more active choice from a relatively wider range of possibilities” (Hill et al. 1986: 348). Japan, on the other hand, mainly demonstrates “discernment or social indexing politeness” (Hill et al. 1986; Ide 2006; Ide et al. 1986; Kasper 1990; Geyer 2008), which mostly gives obligatory selection (Geyer 2008: 26).

The discussion in this paper builds on the theory of “discernment or social indexing politeness” established by Hill et al. (1986), Ide (2006), and Ide et al. (1986). The concept of “power” and “distance” (Brown & Levinson 1987) is used and specified to provide the spheres of seniority system and in- and out-groups, the two factors presumed to determine the choice of Japanese vocatives.

Under discernment politeness, people would address their superiors with the forms that keep them far from the listeners and do not directly “touch” the other parties; whereas the subordinates are most likely to be addressed by the terms that get the addressers closer to them and allow the bosses to directly identify the listeners’ individuality. These two types of address forms are named here as “Polite Forms” and “Familiar Forms,”⁵ which respectively designate the honorific, “distant or secondary” (Braun 1988: 8) terms, and the direct, “simple or intimate” (ibid.) terms.

This article analyses recent Japanese films primarily focusing on business relations, and examines how both of the address forms above are distributed and characterised in work-related situations. Also, some cases where people intentionally use an unexpected form of address (LN+*-san*) are discussed in order to look into the reasons for the addresser’s selecting that particular term. These outcomes are related to the Japanese concept of the “interdependent self” (Morisaki & Gudykunst 1994; Spencer-Oatey & Franklin 2009), and the “other- and mutual-face” (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel 2002). The definition of address forms is discussed in Chapter 2, the method of analysis in Chapter 3, the distribution of vocatives in Chapter 4, the deviant usage of a vocative in Chapter 5, the determinants to choose vocatives in Chapter 6, the Japanese “self” and “face” in Chapter 7, followed by conclusive remarks in Chapter 8.

2. Definition of address forms

The definition of address forms is discussed regarding the term “vocative,” and two types of Japanese forms of address are presented in this chapter.

2.1. “Vocative” and its functions

Braun (1988: 7) clarifies address forms by concentrating on three word classes: (1) pronouns, (2) verbs, and (3) nouns. The nominal address forms have been argued to have two main functions of address and reference. Thomas (1995: 154) uses the “term of address” to indicate “the form used when talking *to* someone” while the “term of reference” is defined as “the form used when talking *about* someone,” which correspond to Braun’s (1988: 11) “free form of address” and “bound form of address.” Leeds-Hurwitz (1980: 2) shares a similar contrast of terms of address against terms of reference. Suzuki (2010: 146) defines the address form as “the generic term used to refer to a listener,” and divides it into two groups to attract the listener’s attention: Words to appeal to the other party’s feelings, and pronominal words to function as the subject or object of a sentence. The “term of address” (Thomas 1995: 154) is designated

⁵ These two types correspond to the pair of “V-like modes of address” and “T-like modes of address” (Clyne et al. 2009).

as a “vocative” by some other linguists. Levinson (1983: 70-71) defines vocatives, “one for use in address” against “the other for use in reference,” as “noun phrases that refer to the addressee, but are not syntactically or semantically incorporated as the arguments of a predicate; they are rather set apart prosodically from the body of a sentence that may accompany them.” Axelson (2007) employs Levinson’s definition in her study on vocatives. Quirk et al. (1985: 773) describes a vocative as “an optional element, usually a noun denoting the one or more persons to whom the sentence is addressed.” Leech (1999: 107) distinguishes “vocatives” from “terms of address” (or “forms of address”), and defines a “vocative” as “a particular kind of address term: A nominal constituent loosely integrated with the rest of the utterance,” and a “term of address” as “a device used to refer to the addressee(s) of an utterance.” This paper uses the term of vocative⁶ as one of the two categories of address forms; address and reference, and studies nominal “free” address forms “‘outside’ the sentence construction; preceding, succeeding, or inserted into the sentence” (Braun 1988: 11).

Zwicky (1974: 787) gives two functions of vocatives as calls and addresses. “Calls are designed to catch the addressee’s attention, addresses to maintain or emphasize the contact between speaker and addressee.” Quirk et al. (1985: 773) shows similar categories of vocatives. “It is either a CALL, drawing the attention of the person or persons addressed, singling them out from others in hearing, or an ADDRESS, expressing the speaker’s relationship or attitude to the person or persons addressed.” Wales (2001: 405-406) adds to the above two a third function of inviting TURN-TAKING. Oda (2010: 47) presents detailed functions of address by dividing them further, depending on whether they strengthen or weaken the relationship.

This paper adopts “call and address” (Zwicky 1974; Quirk et al. 1985; Wales 2001) above as the main functions of vocatives, but does not particularly single out each of them as it is not the objective here. Vocatives are analysed to have functions of “getting someone’s attention, identifying someone as an addressee, and maintaining and reinforcing social relationships” (Biber et al. 1999: 1112; Leech 1999: 116).⁷

2.2. Types of vocatives

Various choices⁸ of English nominal address categories have been made available so far, out of which Quirk et al.’s (1985: 773-775), Braun’s (1988: 9-10) and Leech’s (1999: 110) types are shown below as examples to prepare the standardised Japanese groups.

Quirk et al.’s types:

- a. Name (FN/LN/FNLN/TFN/TLN/FNv)
- b. Term for family relationship
- c. Title of respect (e.g. *sir, madam, your Honor, my Lord*)
- d. Marker of status (e.g. *Mr. President, doctor*)
- e. Term for occupation (e.g. *waiter, driver*)
- f. Epithet (e.g. *darling, love, bastard, idiot*)
- g. General nouns (e.g. *son*)
- h. The personal pronoun (*you*)
- i. Nominal clause (e.g. *Whoever broke the vase*)

Braun’s types:

1. Names

⁶ The term “vocative” here, therefore, distinguishes itself from the one “inside” the construction for “pronominal use” (Suzuki 2010: 146-147).

⁷ Axelson (2007: 101) states that “vocatives identify participant roles and modulate politeness and positioning within the discourse.”

⁸ McConnell-Ginet (2006: 78) has surnames only (e.g. *Robinson*), nicknames (e.g. *Teddy Bear*), and swear words (e.g. *bastard*). Wales (2001: 7) also gives surnames (e.g. *Blair*) and insults (e.g. *bitch*).

2. Kinship terms
3. Mr / Mrs forms
4. Titles achieved by appointment (e.g. *doctor, mayor*), or inherited (e.g. *Count, Duke*)
5. Abstract nouns (e.g. *Your Excellency, Your Honor*)
6. Occupational terms (e.g. *waiter, chauffeur*)
7. Words for certain types of relationship (e.g. *friend, colleague*)
8. Terms of endearment
9. Some forms of address defining addressees as father, brother, wife, or daughter of someone else

Leech's types:

- A. Endearments (e.g. *daring, love*)
- B. Family terms (e.g. *mum, dad*)
- C. Familiarisers (e.g. *guys, buddy* (AmE), *mate* (BrE))
- D. Familiarised first names (e.g. *Jackie, Tom*)
- E. First names in full (e.g. *Jennifer, Thomas*)
- F. Title and surname (e.g. *Mrs Johns, Mr Graham*)
- G. Honorifics (e.g. *sir, madam*)
- H. Others (e.g. *boy, you, Uncle Joe*)

In business situations, First names (a / 1 / E), Title & surname (a / 3 / F), Endearments (f / 8 / A), Familiarisers (g / 7 / C), Familiarised first names (a / 1 / D), Honorifics (c / 5 / G), and Words for certain types of relationship (g / 7 / H) are supposed to be subject to examination. The polite forms include Title & surname and Honorifics as both are regarded as terms indicating a more indirect, formal and reserved relationship between the addresser and the addressee. First names, Endearments, Familiarisers, and, in most cases, Others belong to the familiar forms since they express the addresser's feeling of having a direct, informal and personal relation to the addressee. Kitayama (2010) points out in studying business scenes in films that British people show reciprocal usage of "familiar" address forms of first names and familiarisers, while in America people have a dominant power structure in formal business situations in which they choose nonreciprocal terms of "polite" forms to their bosses, and "familiar" forms to their colleagues and subordinates.

Japanese vocative usage of address forms is characterised by Position titles and Company names that should be added to the variety above, and various politeness levels of suffixes and the second personal nouns to be graded. Some of the typical Japanese address forms are shown below to take a general view of preceding studies on them.

Ide (1982: 358-359)

- (1) Personal pronouns
- (2) Names (LN, FN) with titles
- (3) Professional ranks

Peng (1982: 77)

- (1) Surname and honorific title (e.g. *-san, -sama, -sensei*)
- (2) First names and honorific title (*-san*) or familiarized title (e.g. *-chan, -bô*)
- (3) Full names and honorific title
- (4) Nicknames and familiarized title (e.g. *-chan, -bô*)
- (5) Surnames
- (6) First names
- (7) Full names
- (8) Nicknames

Kinsui (1991: 100)

- (1) Names and nicknames
- (2) Status or position terms
- (3) Terms of occupation or role
- (4) Family terms
- (5) Age-related words⁹ (e.g. *boku* ‘I’ to a little boy, *nē-san* ‘elder sister’ to a young woman, *oba-san* ‘aunt’ to a middle-aged woman, *oku-san* ‘madam’)
- (6) Pronouns

Kanai (2002b: 83-91)

- (1) Explicit (linguistically indicating the listener)
 - (i) Deictic
 - a) Direct terms (the second personal pronouns: e.g. *anata*, *kimi*, *o-mae* ‘you’)
 - b) Indirect terms (demonstrative words: e.g. *sochira* ‘the person there’)
 - (ii) Descriptive
 - a) Direct terms (proper nouns: e.g. *Yamada-san* ‘Mr./Ms. Yamada’)
 - b) Indirect terms (common nouns: e.g. *kachō* ‘section chief’)
- (2) Implicit (not linguistically indicating the listener)

Yui (2007: 21)

- (1) Personal nouns (e.g. *anata*, *kimi* ‘you’)
- (2) Terms of family, position, occupation (e.g. *o-tō-san* ‘father,’ *sensei* ‘teacher,’ *senpai* ‘senior,’ *shachō* ‘president,’ *o-hana-ya-san* ‘florist’)
- (3) Proper nouns (e.g. *Suzuki-san* ‘Mr./Ms. Suzuki,’ *Hanako-chan* ‘Little Hanako’)

Okamoto (2010: 16)

- (1) Personal nouns
- (2) Surnames, first names
- (3) Family terms
- (4) Position titles

Going through a variety of the address forms above, it is adequate to propose the following terms to define each of the two forms of vocatives, polite and familiar, which are used in Japanese business situations.

Polite Forms:

- (1) Position title¹⁰ (e.g. *kachō* ‘section chief’)
- (2) Surname and position title (e.g. *Yamada-kachō* ‘Mr. Yamada, section chief’)
- (3) Surname and polite suffix (e.g. *Yamada-san*, *Yamada-sama* ‘Mr. Yamada’)
- (4) Company name and polite suffix (e.g. *Sony-san*)
- (5) Honorifics (e.g. *sensei*¹¹ ‘teacher,’ *o-kyaku-sama* ‘my dear customer’)
- (6) Function/role¹² (e.g. *bosū* ‘chief’)
- (7) Others including a term addressing a senior in age (e.g. *senpai*¹³ ‘senior’)

⁹ Age-related words are explicitly categorised as vocatives by Kinsui (1991: 100) here. These are used typically to address out-group people who the addressers are not familiar with. It shows that age difference is the first factor to consider in addressing people under the Japanese system.

¹⁰ Position titles here can be rephrased with “descriptive indirect terms” (Kanai 2002b: 83-91).

¹¹ *Sensei* is a noun to politely address a school or university teacher, but it has an extended usage of identifying somebody to be respected, such as a politician, medical doctor, lawyer, architect, and artist. *Kanji* (‘Chinese characters’) for *sensei* means ‘born ahead,’ which presents the Japanese notion of seniority.

¹² A vocative with Function/role (e.g. *bosū* ‘chief’) in this paper is used to address a person who assumes a certain role at a gathering among companies. It is not a nickname that is given to a particular person, as any other person assuming that role is indirectly addressed by the word. It is not the one with position title either, which is bestowed within a company.

Familiar Forms:

- (1) Surname and familiar suffix (e.g. *Yamada-kun*¹⁴ ‘Mr. Yamada’)
- (2) Surname (e.g. *Yamada*)
- (3) First name¹⁵ and polite suffix (e.g. *Mari-san* ‘Mari’)
- (4) First name and familiar suffix (e.g. *Yoshio-kun* ‘Yoshio’, *Mari-chan* ‘Little Mari’)
- (5) First name (e.g. *Yoshio, Mari*)
- (6) Personal noun (e.g. *anata, kimi, omae* ‘you’)¹⁶
- (7) Others including nicknames (e.g. *shinjin* ‘new recruit,’ *oyaji* ‘old man,’ *minna* ‘all,’ *futari* ‘you two’)

2.3. Rationale of the terms of “Polite Forms” and “Familiar Forms”

The binary distinction of “Polite Forms” and “Familiar Forms” is made here to analyse the tendency of which politeness level prevails to address a person of higher or lower position. There are several categories of linguistic strategies that have been put forward before: Negative vs. positive politeness (Brown & Levinson 1987), distance vs. involvement (Tannen 1986), autonomy vs. connection (Green 1992), self-determination vs. acceptance (Janney & Arndt 1992), independence vs. involvement (Scollon et al. 2012), distance vs. expressiveness (Andersen et al. 2002), indirectness vs. directness (House 2003), and restraint vs. expressiveness (Spencer-Oatey & Franklin 2009). All these strategies contain and correspond to the use of family names+titles and that of given names/nicknames, respectively. In Scollon et al. (2012: 54-55), three face systems, Deference, Solidarity and Hierarchy, are discussed in relation to how to choose a vocative based on a specific level of power (P) and distance (D).¹⁷ Under the Deference face system (-P, +D), the participants in a conversation use LN+title (e.g. “Professor Wong” and “Professor Hamada”). The Solidarity face system (-P, -D) finds the participants addressing each other by their first names, and the Hierarchical face system (+P, +/-D) shows asymmetrical use of face strategies, in which the “higher” or the person of super-ordinate position adopts an involvement face strategy, and speaks to the addressee by his/her given name without a title (e.g. “Bill”). The “lower” or a subordinate addresses his/her boss by surname+title (“Mr. Hutchins”), using an independence strategy (ibid.).

In naming Japanese vocatives, the priority should be given to the Japanese cultural aspect that being polite is typically implicit or linguistically indirect. In this

¹³ *Senpai* (‘senior’) is typically employed to affectionately address a senior student in school/college activities. It is categorised under the polite forms as it is still an indirect way of addressing a person, and is non-reciprocally used upwards with the familiar forms (e.g. last name) downwards.

¹⁴ Takanashi (2011: 241) argues that the “full last names followed by *kun* (‘Mr./Ms.’) is a formal address term that contrasts with the casual one, usually a nickname, which is the form usually used by ... friends; ... *Oka-chan* (the shortened form of ... last name followed by *chan*, the casual and affectionate version of *kun*), ...” -*Kun* with full names is used formally, for example, in the diet, but it does not necessarily show the speaker’s polite attitude (Coulmas 1992: 299). -*Kun* cannot be used upwards.

¹⁵ First name here is identical with the name given to an individual. In Japanese, family name is put first before given name.

¹⁶ *Anata* (‘you’) group is categorised here as the second personal noun to differentiate it from the English equivalent of the personal pronoun that is not replaced by any other word to appear within a sentence structure in accordance with gender and number it should indicate (Takubo 1997/2007: 14). “Personal nouns” in this article can be rephrased with “personal deictics” or “direct deictic terms” against “indirect deictic terms” of demonstratives as given in Kanai (2002b: 83-91).

¹⁷ -P: symmetrical, ... the participants see themselves as being in equal social position.

+P: asymmetrical, ... the participants see themselves as being in unequal social position.

+D: distant, ... each uses independence strategies speaking to the other.

-D: close, ... the participants both use politeness strategies of involvement.

(Scollon et al. 2012: 54-55)

sense, the concept of being polite used here for “Polite Forms” differs from that in Brown and Levinson’s (1987) “politeness theory,” in which people can be polite to satisfy either the “positive or negative face” of others.¹⁸ The term of “Familiar Forms” is given against “Polite Forms” in this article as it can reflect the degree of distance between people in *uchi* (‘in-group’) and *soto* (‘out-group’),¹⁹ without too much emphasis on mutual solidarity. Kanai (2002b) divides vocatives into three groups, out of which direct terms and indirect terms are roughly identical to “Familiar Forms” and “Polite Forms” used here. The terms of “familiar” and “polite” are adopted as they present more cultural connotation argued above than those of “direct” and “indirect.”

In most cases, it is not a matter of an individual addresser choosing a certain vocative to suit his/her linguistic strategy, but a socially designated norm that makes the addresser use a well-accepted term. “Polite Forms” and “Familiar Forms” reflect Japanese social, and not necessarily individual, perception of the meaning of each word, “polite” and “familiar,” and represent the respective characteristics; “polite” being indirect, detached and individually less identified; “familiar” being direct, close and individually identified.

Interjections, sounds or words used to address someone such as *Oi* (‘Hey’), *Nê* (‘Say’), *Anô* (‘Well’), *Chotto* (‘Excuse me.’) are not what are defined as nouns of address. Also, they do not specify the listeners in a strict sense of meaning. This is why they are excluded from the analysis in the current study.

2.3.1. Position titles

Typical Japanese position titles are the ones that show occupationally classified posts, which typically include *kakarichô* (‘sub-section chief’), *kachô* (‘section chief’), *buchô* (‘department manager’), *jômu* (‘managing director’), *senmu* (‘senior managing director’), *fuku-shachô* (‘vice-president’), *shachô* (‘president’), and *kaichô* (‘chairperson’). These titles form a part of the “definite description” (Yui 2007) together with the family terms, which indicate the specific person, just like proper nouns, and regardless of whether or not they are used as what assumes a listener’s role in a conversation (Takubo 2007: 19). It is not the speaker who names the listener unlike in the case of the second personal nouns; hence, the description can be exempted from deixis, resulting in the possible usage of the terms to one’s superiors or to people one is hardly acquainted with (*ibid.*).

¹⁸ Ide et al.’s (1992) research of American and Japanese speakers proves that Americans found the word “politeness” connoting the meaning of “friendliness,” but no Japanese related being polite with being friendly.

¹⁹ The *uchi* (‘in-group’) and *soto* (‘out-group’) notion in Japanese society presents a situation where a boss is referred to, as an in-group member close to the addresser, by the flat LN by a subordinate, when the speaker is talking to an out-group member. In the other case where the addresser is talking to the addressee’s family member, who is even closer to the addressee, the speaker is expected to choose an indirect polite address form to refer to his/her boss. The polite prefix *o-* is added to *denwa* (‘telephone’) in (1) and (3).

- (1) *Shachô wa o-denwa-chû desu.* (Subordinate talking to an in-group member)
‘President is on the other line.’
- (2) *Yamada wa denwa-chû desu.* (Subordinate talking to an out-group member)
‘Yamada, (President), is on the other line.’
- (3) *Shachô wa o-denwa-chû desu.* (Subordinate talking to the president’s wife)
‘President is on the other line.’

Japanese honorifics and “terms of reference” (Leeds-Hurwitz 1980; Thomas 1995), not “terms of address” (*ibid.*) or vocatives being discussed here, bear a relative element to change their forms according to a group the hearer belongs to.

2.3.2. Company names

Company names with the polite suffix *-san* are often used in Japanese business situations to address a person working for a company other than one's own, especially when the addresser is not closely acquainted with the addressee or in the case that the addressee is representing his/her company at a meeting or presentation.

2.3.3. Suffixes²⁰

While English titles are added preceding the names to indicate a formal address form, Japanese has varying suffixes to express the speaker's politeness level shown to the listener. These can be used with a surname or first name, typical ones of which are *-sama* (the most formal and polite), *-san* (polite and generally used), *-kun* (basically used to one's male colleagues or subordinates), and *-chan* (usually with a child's name, but sometimes used to address junior family members or childhood friends (Nakane 1998: 27), or to address colleagues or subordinates in a very casual, joking and affectionate way) in the order of formality and politeness. *-Sama* and *-san* can also be used with the terms of family members senior to one, usually with *o-* added as polite prefix (e.g. *o-kâ-sama*, *o-kâ-san* 'mother'), and with common nouns including occupational terms (e.g. *kangoshi-san* 'nurse,' *untenshu-san* 'driver').

2.3.4. Second personal nouns

It is a general practice in the Japanese language not to add the addressee's name at the end of one's speech (Yamagishi 1995) to maintain social relationships. "Good morning, Mariko [FN]." can be translated into Japanese as "*Ohayô,*" and not necessarily "*Ohayô, Mariko,*"²¹ which sounds rather foreign. Also, the first and the second personal nouns do not usually appear in a conversation. The subject of a sentence is understood by its structure and the use of honorific expressions. *Watashi wa* ('I' as topic) and *anata wa* ('you' as topic) are missing in both (4) and (5) below, but it causes no trouble in communication as (4b) has a question marker *ka*, and (5b) uses *osshaimashita*, the respect form of *iimashita* ('said').

- | | |
|---|---|
| (4a) <i>Ikimasu.</i> 'I'm going.' | (4b) <i>Ikimasu ka.</i> '(Are you) going?' |
| (5a) <i>Sô iimashita yo.</i> '(I) said so.' | (5b) <i>Sô osshaimashita yo.</i> '(You) said so.' |

Addressing a person senior to one by names, especially first names and the second personal nouns, tends to be avoided in view of politeness (Takubo 2007; Suzuki 2010) as they identify the listener deictically, and their usage is regarded as rude and inappropriate. An interview survey conducted in 1999 (Ôhama et al. 2001: 345-346) shows that Japanese native speakers used only 1.5% (Han 2006) of the second personal nouns in 2,088 dialogues, which means they hardly used them except in some cases of comparison, topic introduction, clarification and emphasis. Kajiwara (2004: 56) studies how much the second personal noun *anata* ('you') is accepted as the form of address among young Japanese native speakers aged 20-31, and concludes that the age difference between the speaker and the listener is crucial in measuring the addressee's

²⁰ A suffix *-dono* sounds somehow old-fashioned now as it has been used since the *Samurai* warrior's age, over nine centuries ago (ja.wikipedia.org 2012), and is typically employed in writing to address people. *Kanji* ('Chinese character') for *-dono* means one's lord (*tono*). Another suffix *-bô* is added in an affectionate way to a young boy's familiarised name.

²¹ According to Maynard (2001: 685-688), vocatives occur in Japanese discourse "at, but not limited to, the sentence-initial position." Loveday (1986: 15) finds that first names are generally used in Japanese between "equal intimates."

feeling when he/she is addressed by the word. *Anata* can be used without any problem to a younger person who has received a favour from the speaker. The addressee of the same age is likely to feel uncomfortable, and a senior person definitely finds it unacceptable to be addressed by *anata* (ibid.).

The Japanese language, with its strong consciousness of vertical structure and avoidance of direct expressions (Arakawa 2008), has developed a large number of personal nouns, most of which were short-lived or interchangeable between the first and the second person. Their history is not as old as that of pronouns of the Indo-European languages. Some of the words currently used only date back to the Meiji Era, just over 100 years ago (Suzuki 2010: 140-141). The concept of personal pronouns was first applied to the Japanese language with the introduction of western grammar structure (Kinsui 1991: 98). Words expressing a location or a direction have come to be used for personal nouns (e.g. *anata* ‘over there’, *omae* ‘in front of someone honourable [meaning of *kanji* ‘Chinese character’]’),²² and nouns originally with polite meanings (e.g. *kimi* ‘Highness’, *kisama* ‘honourable person [meaning of *kanji*]’) have assumed the meaning of the personal deictics. The formation of all these personal nouns originated in a suggestive and euphemistic manner to indirectly address a person in a remote area (ibid.). Most of them have gradually downgraded the level of politeness to the degree that they are not suitable for use in addressing one’s seniors.

3. Method of analysis

The method of collecting samples with its rationale is discussed below. Three elements introduced by Brown and Levinson (1987), “power,” “distance,” and “ranking of imposition,” are discussed to provide bases for specifying the cultural categories of the seniority system and *uchi* and *soto* (‘in- and out-group’).

3.1. Sample collection

Twenty Japanese films and TV dramas have been selected for analysis which give, as their main themes, the business relations within and outside a large traditional corporation located in or around Tokyo. The rationales of films and dramas being chosen as the proper sources for collecting samples are they; (1) provide a flow of dialogues with their background information, (2) show each participant’s personality, (3) present a variety of conversation and situation samples similar to the ones available in actual life, (4) basically consist of dialogues, which makes intensive data collection easier, (5) bear no relation to any predetermined purpose of a particular research with hypothetical situations or predesigned questions, and (6) are relatively easy to obtain (Kitayama 2004: 74). Therefore, they are regarded as effective and appropriate enough to be used as samples for analysis and discussion in this study.

The vocatives pertinent to this study have been sorted out one by one by the author as they appear in a scene. The time of the stories in the films are set in the 1980’s, 1990’s and 2000’s, the most recent three decades.

3.2. Definition of “power,” “distance,” and “ranking of imposition”

The business relationship in this article is examined based on Brown and Levinson’s (1987: 74) “sociological variables of the relative ‘power’ (P), the ‘social distance’ (D) of S (Speaker) and H (Hearer), and the ‘absolute ranking of imposition’ (R) in the particular culture.” Each of the variables is defined to present the concept of seniority

²² Sometimes people are referred to, but not addressed, by the place they live or work; e.g. *Tōkyō* (e.g. ‘directors at the head office in Tokyo’), *Setagaya* (e.g. ‘parents living in Setagaya, a district’).

system and *uchi* and *soto* ('in- and out-group'), which are supposed to determine the choice of a vocative in various relationships in and out of a company.

3.2.1. "Power"

Brown and Levinson (ibid.: 79) claim that "stable social valuations, whether of individuals or of roles, are only one element that enters into the assessment of P," and that "other situational sources of power may contribute to or adjust or entirely override such stable social variations." Situational factors are assumed "to enter into the values for P, D and R, so that the values assessed hold only for S and H in a particular context, ..." (ibid.). They waive the absolutely fixed notion of "power." However, this article studies the use of vocatives in a static status structure of corporate environment as a whole, which requires the absolute and long-lasting aspect of "power" exercised by bosses to subordinates or customers to vendors (S's P over H, contrary to Brown and Levinson's (1987: 250) P). The change of roles or ranks of individuals only leads to the different vocatives used among them as the result of the reversed "power" acquired. Situational factors may only influence the choice of vocatives in the cases where the addressers stand out of the stable "power" structure for some reason or other.

3.2.2. "Distance"

"Distance" is also presented by Brown and Levinson (1987) in relationship to a particular context, and as changeable according to a situation. In an individualistic society, a boss can be very close to his/her subordinate in certain situations, and addressed by his/her first name instead of his/her last name+title or honorifics. This is most unlikely to happen in collectivism, where an individual situation does not usually become an element to alter the customary way of addressing people.

Spencer-Oatey (1996: 7) lists the following six components of "distance."

1. Social similarity/difference (e.g. Brown and Gilman 1972 [1960])
2. Frequency of contact (e.g. Slugoski and Turnbull 1988)
3. Length of acquaintance (e.g. Slugoski and Turnbull 1988)
4. Familiarity or how well people know each other (e.g. Holmes 1990)
5. Sense of like-mindedness (e.g. Brown and Gilman 1972 [1960])
6. Positive/negative affect (e.g. Baxter 1984)

The main components conforming to the Japanese *uchi* ('in-group') and *soto* ('out-group') structure are 2. frequency of contact, 3. length of acquaintance, and 4. familiarity. People working for the same company have frequent contact with each other in their daily operations. Length of acquaintance and familiarity depend on the degree of association among individual members. These notions of social "distance" should be supplemented by a more fundamental, psychological²³ "distance," which is crucial to a discussion of Japanese "distance." The in-group requires strengthening its sense of oneness that tightly connects the members. Regardless of its individual member's different degree of mutual familiarity, the in-group members are expected to share the same value judgement and maintain emotional solidarity, which distinguishes them from the outsiders (Aoki 2009: 91). Out-group people also have a varied relationship with in-group members according to the frequency and depth of personal or business contact, but they are the people who stand outside of the common perception shared by

²³ Slugoski (1985) states that "familiarity (=social distance) has to be distinguished from affect (=psychological distance)" (cited in Kasper 1997: 383).

insiders.

This article assumes that in-group members have daily mutual contact for a certain period of time resulting in their having the same value judgement in common. It also assumes that out-group members are regarded as people staying distant from the speaker in that they do not belong to the same company, nor do they regularly work together for it. Whether or not in- or out-group individuals know each other for a long time or personally feel close is not primarily questioned in collecting data. These elements are to be made clear and discussed as the use of vocatives becomes deviated from or contradictory to that of customarily expected terms.

3.2.3. “Ranking of imposition”

“The ranking of imposition can be contextually inverted” (Brown & Levinson 1987: 79). This article does not discuss each of the different weights of imposition as its aim is to present a tendency of the vocative use as a whole. When a person is addressed by a vocative different from the one of a socially accepted usage, the “ranking of imposition” is brought forward to analyse the reasons for the addresser’s choice of the particular term.

4. Distribution of vocatives

The following variety of forms are used to address people of different status in *uchi* (‘in-group’) and *soto* (‘out-group’). Familiar forms are marked in italics.

4.1. Vocatives between in-group members

Table 1 shows the frequency of each vocative used in three directions, from bosses to subordinates, subordinates to bosses, and colleagues to colleagues within a company.

Table 1: Vocatives between in-group members (Familiar forms in italics)

Boss→Subordinate (299 cases)		Subordinate→Boss (355 cases)		Colleague→Colleague (127 cases)	
<i>LN + “-kun”</i>	135 (45.2%)	Position title	264 (74.4%)	<i>LN</i>	52 (40.9%)
<i>LN</i>	64 (21.4%)	<i>LN + “-san”</i>	63 (17.7%)	<i>LN + “-san”</i>	29 (22.8%)
<i>LN + “-san”</i>	32 (10.7%)	<i>LN + Position title</i>	21 (5.9%)	<i>“Omae” [You]</i>	19 (15.0%)
<i>“Omae” [You]</i>	16 (5.4%)	<i>Position title+“-san”</i>	2 (0.6%)	<i>LN + “-kun”</i>	13 (10.2%)
<i>“Minna” [All]</i>	7 (2.3%)	<i>LN</i>	1 (0.3%)	<i>LN + Position title</i>	4 (3.1%)
<i>“Kimi” [You]</i>	7 (2.3%)	<i>“Oyaji-san” [Old man]</i>	1 (0.3%)	<i>Position title</i>	3 (2.3%)
<i>“Kisama” [You]</i>	7 (2.3%)	<i>FN + “-san”</i>	1 (0.3%)	<i>“Kisama” [You]</i>	3 (2.3%)
<i>LN + Position title</i>	5 (1.7%)	<i>“Senpai” [Senior]</i>	1 (0.3%)	<i>“Omae-san” [You]</i>	1 (0.8%)
<i>Position title</i>	5 (1.7%)	<i>“Oyaji” [Old man]</i>	1 (0.3%)	<i>“Shinjin” [New recruit]</i>	1 (0.8%)
<i>FN</i>	5 (1.7%)			<i>“Anta” [You]</i>	1 (0.8%)
<i>“Mina-san” [All]</i>	3 (1.0%)			<i>“Senpai” [Senior]</i>	1 (0.8%)
<i>FN + “-chan”</i>	3 (1.0%)				
<i>“Anata” [You]</i>	2 (0.7%)				
<i>FN + “-san”</i>	2 (0.7%)				
<i>“Kimi-tachi” [You]</i>	1 (0.3%)				
<i>“Futari” [You two]</i>	1 (0.3%)				
<i>“Anta” [You]</i>	1 (0.3%)				
<i>Nickname</i>	1 (0.3%)				
<i>FN + “-kun”</i>	1 (0.3%)				
<i>FFN + “-chan”</i>	1 (0.3%)				

Table 1 above shows that the nonreciprocal use of vocatives is evident between bosses and subordinates with familiar forms downwards (84.9%; Boss→Subordinate, italics), and polite forms upwards (98.9%; Subordinate→Boss, non-italics). Colleagues use more of the familiar forms (70.9%; Colleague→Colleague, italics). First names are hardly used even among colleagues; whereas, last names or position titles are dominant in all three categories. Addressing someone by the second personal nouns (*anata*, *anta* [less polite], *kimi* [mostly used by men to address a colleague or a junior], *kimi-tachi* [*kimi*, plural], *omae* [less polite and used to address an equal or a close junior], *kisama* [blunt, typically used in anger or contempt]) is not very common, though it occurs downwards (11.3%) and between equals (18.9%). Mostly, it sounds too direct and rude, so that the subordinate does not use them to address or refer to his/her superior (*Gendai Nihon-go Kenkyūkai* 1999: 130; *Gendai Nihon-go Kenkyūkai* 2004: 113).²⁴

Suzuki (2010: 151-156) states that the primary rule of how to use the address forms in a family can almost be applied to the situations outside the domestic area. Seniors are not expected to be addressed by their names, but instead by position or role terms such as *kachō* ('section chief'), *sensei* ('teacher'), etc. Their names can only be used with position or role terms attached to last names like *Yamada-kachō* ('Mr. Yamada, section chief') or *Yamada-sensei* ('Mr. Yamada, my teacher').

4.1.1. Boss to subordinate

Bosses use subordinates' last names with (45.2%) or without (21.4%) *-kun*. *Yamada-kun* sounds milder and more gentlemanly than the flat *Yamada*, but the latter can be said to express the addresser's close feeling towards the addressee. This is why the group of last names only (40.9%) is most commonly used among colleagues. The distance of their relationship can be measured by whether they add the suffix *-kun* (10.2%) or not. Zwicky (1974: 789) states that "...vocative LN is used by superiors to inferiors (in school and military situations, for instance) or by colleagues (schoolboys, teammates) among themselves, while referential LN is neutral or respectful; ...". In Japanese business situations, where people are not usually addressed by their first names, but rather by their last names, the flat last name does not bear the same impolite or disrespectful meaning as one with the English equivalent, though the last name usage is certainly limited to a boss addressing his/her subordinates or between colleagues.²⁵

Several studies (Suzuki 1982: 32; Takubo 2007: 29; Okamoto 2010: 59) argue that bosses usually address subordinates by their names, and not by their position titles. However, there are a few cases of Position title (1.7%) or LN+position title (1.7%) found in this paper. According to Takubo (2007: 29), these terms are not as polite as the ones used to address superiors because they happen to be used to address a junior person with the title, and only function as the words specifying the addressee at a certain point of communication.

²⁴ *Omae* ('you') is regarded as a men's word (*Gendai Nihon-go Kenkyūkai* 2004: 104) to address someone who the speaker can criticise and command, confident of sharing friendly feelings with the listener (ibid.: 116). Some husbands use *omae* to address their wives, but others who prefer to be more polite address their wives by *kimi* ('you'). The same *kanji* ('Chinese character') is used for *kimi* and *-kun*. Saito (1999) writes that *anata* cannot be used to one's superiors in a family regardless of how close the relationship may be. Superiors are addressed by the polite terms of their roles such as *o-jī-san* ('grandfather'), *o-tō-san* ('father'), *oji-san* ('uncle'), etc. even when they appear within a sentence structure. The terms of roles themselves (*sofu* 'grandfather', *chichi* 'father', *oji* 'uncle', etc.) cannot be used by juniors because polite prefixes and/or suffixes are not attached to these words (Takubo 2007: 29). The exceptional usage of *anata/anta* in a family is found as many wives call their husbands by that personal noun. *Anta* ('you') is an abbreviated form of *anata* ('you'), and is used in a much more informal and blunt way than *anata*. Young couples tend to address each other by first names.

²⁵ Last name only is a common vocative used from a superior to his/her subordinate in an extremely disciplined organisation such as the army or the police.

Kachô used by a superior to address a junior can be regarded as deviating from the rule for position terms of address In family terms, the base viewpoint is set at the youngest member Position titles should adequately follow the single system of address viewed from the bottom to the top. (ibid.: 28)²⁶

This discussion can invite arguments because the position titles are much more frequently used in business situations to address a junior than the role terms in a family or status terms in the academic world. A boss can use the position title, instead of LN+-*kun* or LN, to maintain a distance and formally address his /her subordinates²⁷ especially when someone else is around. The following are some examples of vocatives used from a senior to a junior in each of the three social areas.

- (6) *Yamada-kun* (or *Kachô* [position title]), *chotto kite*.
'Come here, Mr. Yamada (or section chief).'
- (7) *Yoshio* [first name] (not *otôto* [role term] 'younger brother'), *chotto kite*.
'Come here, Yoshio.'
- (8) *Sensei* (not *kôshi* [status term] 'lecturer') *chotto kite*.
'Come here, teacher.'

Regarding first name vocatives, they are used with (2.3%; Boss→Subordinate, FN+-*chan*, -*san*, -*kun* and FFN+-*chan*) or without suffixes (1.7%) to address a young female staff member (8 cases), a young male junior (3 cases), and a long acquainted subordinate (1 case). These present a senior addresser's intimate and informal attitude towards a junior addressee.

4.1.2. Subordinate to boss

This study proves that position titles with (5.9%) or without last names (74.4%) are predominantly used when a subordinate talks to his/her boss. There are some cases found where a junior addresses his/her senior by the addressee's last name with -*san* attached to it (17.7%). Whether or not the last name with -*san* (e.g. *Yamada-san*) is acceptable or in common use in addressing one's boss has been discussed in various preceding studies. *Gendai Nihon-go Kenkyûkai* (2004: 104) observes that the form of last names with -*san* is most commonly used in the office, followed by last names+ position titles (e.g. *Yamada-kachô*), or position titles only (e.g. *kachô*). Okamoto (2010: 59-60) cites some surveys (*Kokuritsu Koku-go Kenkyûsho* 1982; Yoneda 1990) which make last names with -*san* quite acceptable. Yoneda (ibid.: 22) discusses that *buchô* ('department manager') can only be addressed by last name with -*san* by his/her immediate subordinate, while *kachô* ('section chief') and a person of lower rank (e.g. *shunin* 'team leader') can most frequently be called by last names with -*san* by their juniors. Okamoto (2010: 59) even introduces a movement of using -*san* in an office that was broadcast by NHK²⁸ in 1995, but at the same time, he refers to a negative opinion (Watanabe 1998) about such a movement. Okamoto (2010: 59-60) himself gives priority to position titles used in offices, and describes that the second personal nouns or names are not appropriate²⁹ for business use. He further points out that the "-*san* movement" can only be possible in the office where the rule of choosing address forms is not as strictly set as in the case of the family. Arakawa (2008) argues that the change in social environment has weakened the notion of respect towards the senior, which results in

²⁶ Summed up and translated by the author.

²⁷ Ide (1982: 359) notes that "when rank titles are used by subordinate persons in reference to superiors, deference is expressed, but in the reverse situation only formality is involved."

²⁸ NHK: *Nippon Hôshô Kyôkai* ('Japanese Broadcasting Corporation')

²⁹ Refer to 2.3.4. *Second personal nouns* and 5.2. *LN+-san from subordinate to boss* for the discussion of their lack of suitability for use in business situations.

addressing one's boss directly by last name with *-san*.

This study finds the tendency to avoid one's bosses' last names with *-san* (17.7% in Table 1), and to choose the indirect, polite form with position titles (Kanai 2002a) (80.9% in Table 1; Subordinate→Boss, Position title, LN+position title and Position title+“*-san*”) that prevails in business situations.

4.1.3. Statistical results

The data of in-group vocatives were statistically treated and proved valid as follows.

Table 2: Data of in-group vocatives (Refer to Table 1; Familiar forms in italics.)

Addresser→Addressee	Polite forms	Familiar forms	Total
Boss→Subordinate	45 (15.1%)	254 (84.9%)	299
Subordinate→Boss	351 (98.9%)	4 (1.1%)	355
Colleague→Colleague	37 (29.1%)	90 (70.9%)	127
Total	433	348	781

$$\chi^2_{(2)} = 503.44, p < .01$$

Koizumi (2001: 11) explains that subordinates give their bosses a social status by position titles; whereas, subordinates tend to be individualised when they are addressed by their own names. The degree of respect rises with the status-oriented vocatives being used, and the feeling of disrespect becomes evident as the individual types of vocatives are chosen (*ibid.*). However, it must be argued here that this contrast does not necessarily reflect the addressers' real intent regarding respect and disrespect. It is customary, under usual business situations, that a subordinate addresses his/her boss by the polite form, and a boss addresses his/her subordinate by the familiar form. Whether or not the addresser really respects or harbours disrespect for the addressee is another matter as the addresser does not choose the particular vocative based on his/her individual linguistic strategy. At least it serves to present a socially designated way of address as well as expected form of behaviour on the part of the speakers. The choice of a vocative is not left to an addresser as individual as usually found in the case of an egalitarian society.

4.2. Vocatives between out-group members

Table 3 below shows vocatives used between out-group members in three directions.

Table 3: Vocatives between out-group members (Familiar forms in italics)

Customer→Vendor (34 cases)		Vendor→Customer (34 cases)		People of equal status ³⁰ (62 cases)	
LN + “ <i>-san</i> ”	12 (35.3%)	Position title	15 (44.1%)	Company name + “ <i>-san</i> ”	26 (41.9%)
Position title	7 (20.6%)	LN + “ <i>-san</i> ”	13 (38.2%)	LN + “ <i>-san</i> ”	14 (22.6%)
Company name+“ <i>-san</i> ”	4 (11.8%)	“ <i>Anta</i> ” [You]	2 (5.9%)	Function/role	9 (14.5%)
“ <i>Anta</i> ” [You]	4 (11.8%)	“ <i>Kono yarô</i> ” [Bastard]	2 (5.7%)	Position title	8 (13.9%)
Company name	2 (5.9%)	“ <i>Anata</i> ” [You]	1 (2.9%)	LN + Position title	2 (3.2%)
LN	2 (5.9%)	“ <i>Mina-sama-gata</i> ” [You]	1 (2.9%)	LN	2 (3.2%)
LN + “ <i>-kun</i> ”	1 (3.1%)			“ <i>Anata</i> ” [You]	1 (1.6%)
LN + “ <i>-han</i> ” ³¹	1 (3.1%)				
“ <i>Kisama</i> ” [You]	1 (3.1%)				

³⁰ people with equal level of job position, working for a different company, who gather to have an industrial meeting or pursue a cooperative task among companies

³¹ *-Han*, a suffix attached to a name, is a *Kansai* [the western part of the main island] dialect, especially used among merchants of the older generation and people of traditional service industries.

Polite forms, both last names with *-san* and position titles, are dominant in all of the three categories: Customer to Vendor (LN+*-san*: 35.3%, Position title: 20.6%), Vendor to Customer (Position title: 44.1%, LN+*-san*: 38.2%), and among People of equal status (LN+*-san*: 22.6%, Position title and LN + position title: 17.1%). The addresser tends to psychologically keep the out-group addressee at a distance and address him/her by indirect detached vocatives, which include the listener's company name with *-san*, 11.8% from Customer to Vendor, and 41.9% among People of equal status.³² First names are not observed even in a friendly relationship. The polite vocatives are used reciprocally in all three directions. The customer calls the vendor primarily by the latter's last name with *-san*, and the vendor is expected to more often address the customer by the addressee's position title. The rule for the in-group applies here for the out-group as well. A position title does not identify a particular individual; hence, sounding more indirect and polite.

The data of out-group vocatives were statistically treated and proved valid as follows.

Table 4: Data of out-group vocatives (Refer to Table 3; Familiar forms in italics.)

Addresser→Addressee	Polite form	Familiar form	Total
Customer→Vendor	24 (70.6%)	10 (29.4%)	34
Vendor→Customer	29 (85.3%)	5 (14.7%)	34
People of equal status	59 (95.2%)	3 (4.8%)	62
Total	112	18	130

$$\chi^2_{(2)} = 10.54, p < .01$$

4.3. Comparative analysis of in-group and out-group vocatives

The significant difference lying in choosing a vocative for an in-group and an out-group addressee is the frequency of using familiar forms, which is obviously evident in the in-group. The boss uses familiar forms (84.9%; italics) including the first and the second choice of LN+*kun* (45.2%) and the flat LN (21.4%) totalling 66.6% (Table 1) when addressing the subordinate. The customer behaves more politely when speaking to the vendor by forms of LN+*-san* (35.3%) and position title (20.6%), which reaches 55.9% (Table 3). The upward use of terms in both in-group and out-group does not differ with position title and LN+*-san* in that order; however, in-group members are more bound to choose the vocatives with position title (80.9% in Table 1; Subordinate→Boss, Position title, LN+position title and Position title+*-san*) than the vendor using the terms with position title (44.1% in Table 3) when addressing the customer. Some vendors may hesitate with reserve to employ position titles, which are bestowed within the customer's company. Using them may reveal the vendor's willingness to be a part of the "in-group," a team member of the customer's organisation. The alternative LN+*-san* sounds less polite, but it is still one of the two choices the vendor makes to address the customer. In either case, more samples are required to pursue this discussion further.

Familiar forms are much more dominant, 70.9% (Table 1; Colleague→Colleague, italics) including LN only (40.9%), among colleagues working for the same company than those between out-group people of equal status, 4.8% (Table 3; People of equal status, italics) with the flat LN (3.2%) included.

The analysis here shows the tendency toward the use of polite forms to address people who the addresser feels stand apart from him/her, typically bosses and out-group members, whilst someone that the speaker feels close to, namely, in-group subordinates and colleagues, is addressed with familiar forms. Holmes (1995: 13-15) states that "...in

³² An honorific term of reference, *onsha* ('your company'), is available to be used between out-group people. It is not used as a vocative, and has not been analysed in this study.

many contexts, as social distance increases so does negative politeness By contrast, reduced social distance or high solidarity tends to result in the use of more positive politeness devices.” The Japanese strategy of its vocative use discussed here proves that, although bosses or customers have static “power” over subordinates or vendors, “power” dominantly influences the choice of vocatives only among *uchi* (‘in-group’) members regardless of the degree of “distance” they maintain from each other. “Distance” prevails in communication with *soto* (‘out-group’) people when the customers show the higher rate of employing polite vocatives in spite of the “power” still existent between them. *Soto* (‘out-group’) as a whole remains distant, whether or not an individual has a close relationship with an out-group partner.

The data of in- and out-group vocatives were statistically treated and proved valid as follows. Also, the argument above is summed up with each of the P and D relations.

Table 5. Data of in- and out-group use of vocatives (Refer to Tables 2 and 4.)

Addresser→Addressee			Polite Form	Familiar Form	Total
In-group	Boss→Subordinate	(+P, -D)	45 (15.1%)	254 (84.9%)	299
	Subordinate→Boss	(+P, -D)	351 (98.9%)	4 (1.1%)	355
	Colleague→Colleague	(-P, -D)	37 (29.1%)	90 (70.9%)	127
Out-group	Customer→Vendor	(+P, +D)	24 (70.6%)	10 (29.4%)	34
	Vendor→Customer	(+P, +D)	29 (85.3%)	5 (14.7%)	34
	People of equal status	(-P, +D)	59 (95.2%)	3 (4.8%)	62
Total			545 (59.8%)	366 (40.2%)	911

+P: asymmetrical, -P: symmetrical, +D: distant, -D: close (Scollon et al. 2012)
 $\chi^2_{(5)} = 570.24, p < .01$

5. Deviant usage of a vocative

Yui (2007: 24) points out that the different vocatives used to the same addressee indicate the relationship with him/her has been changed or reviewed. Kitayama (2010: 10-11) provides some examples of unexpected choice of address forms, and the reasons behind the deviation.

It has been discussed that in Japanese business situations the boss customarily addresses the subordinate by the addressee’s last name with or without *-kun*, while the subordinate is expected to address the boss by the latter’s position title. However, there are cases where LN+*-san* is used in both directions (10.7% downwards and 17.7% upwards in Table 1), which needs to be noted here to study the significance of that particular form of address.

Social norms require discernment politeness in which the subordinates automatically choose position titles to their bosses, but are addressed by them by last names with or without a familiar suffix. On the other hand, this paper finds that LN+*-san* is intentionally used in most cases, which reflects an atypically employed linguistic strategy by an individual addresser. This assessment is based upon the analysis below of various situations in which LN+*-san* is used.

- (1) Bosses change vocatives from LN+*-san* to LN or LN+*-kun* with the lapse of time (e.g. Nagai, senior managing director, to Takenaka, vice-department manager, in *Kinyū Fushoku Rettō: Saisei* (‘Islands of Financial Corruption: Revival’); Inoue, department manager, to Tabata, staff, in *Senshi no Shikaku* (‘Qualifications for Warriors’).
- (2) A subordinate can feel uncomfortable to be called by LN+*-san* (e.g. Kagaya, division director, to Ōkubo, vice-division manager, in *Hi wa Mata Noboru* (‘The Sun Rises Again’)).

- (3) Some subordinates constantly employ LN+-*san* when they hold intimate feelings towards their bosses, but only on condition that they are personally very close, or that the bosses are much younger or usually not high in rank (e.g. Kitano, vice-department manager, to Hisayama, counseling director, in *Kinyû Fushoku Rettô: Jubaku* ('Islands of Financial Corruption: Shackles'); Shima, section chief, to Nakazawa, department manager, in *Kachô Shima Kôzaku 2: Honkon no Yûwaku* ('Kosaku Shima, Section Chief 2: Temptation in Hong Kong'). A female office staff member tends to address her immediate young boss of lower position by LN+-*san* (7 out of 7 samples) in *Kinyû Fushoku Rettô: Jubaku* ('Islands of Financial Corruption: Shackles'); *Kimi-tachi ni Asu wa Nai* ('No Future for All of You'); *Regatta: Kokusai Kinyû Sensô* ('Regatta: International Financial War'); *Sasen* ('Relegation'); *Shûdan Sasen* ('Collective Relegation'). This can be caused by her standing and work consciousness in the office where she is "outside" of the seniority system for career building.
- (4) There are cases where a subordinate suddenly changes the vocative from position title to LN+-*san* to address his boss (e.g. Yokoshima, senior managing director, to Nonoyama, chairman, in *Kabutochô* ([a town name]); Shinoda, division director, to Yokoyama, vice-president, in *Shûdan Sasen* ('Collective Relegation'). The subordinate is determined to employ LN+-*san* to express his intense feeling of anger and contempt, instead of the boss' position title used otherwise. Ikeda, a young bank employee in *Kimi-tachi ni Asu wa Nai* ('No Future for All of You'), sticks to the social norm and refers to his boss, *kachô* ('section chief'), even when he blames the boss for his foul play.

Kachô wa kono shigoto o yarubeki ningen ja arimasen. Bankâ to shite shikkaku desu. Sassa to yamete-kudasai.

'You as section chief are not the right person to pursue this work. You are not qualified to be a banker. Quit your job now.'

The factors of LN+-*san* chosen are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Factors of LN+-*san* chosen (Refer to Table 1.)

Boss→Subordinate (32 cases)		Subordinate→Boss (63 cases)		Colleague→Colleague (29 cases)	
Older subordinate	9	Boss of lower rank	36	Distant relationship	25
Boss newly transferred	8	Close relationship	17	Older colleague	4
Female subordinate	6	Emotional outrage	5		
Distant relationship	7	Female boss	3		
Subordinate newly employed	2	Young boss	2		

5.1. LN+-*san* from boss to subordinate³³

In *Hi wa Mata Noboru* ('The Sun Rises Again'), Kagaya, *Jigyô-honbuchô*, ('division director'), addresses his immediate subordinate, Ôkubo, *Jichô*, ('vice-division manager') by *Ôkubo-san*. Kagaya, a high school graduate, has recently been transferred from the head office to the video division, where Ôkubo, a much younger elite employee with a university degree, has been working for quite a long time, and is fully conversant with the financial standings of the division. Ôkubo hesitates to be addressed by his

³³ The analysis here in *Hi wa Mata Noboru* ('The Sun Rises Again') and *Senshi no Shikaku* ('Qualifications for Warriors') has been cited and translated from Kitayama (2010: 10).

name with the polite suffix *-san*, and asks Kagaya to stop addressing him in that way.

Anô, Jigyô-honbuchô, Ôkubo-san to iu no o sukoshi yamete-kuremasen ka.

‘Uh, Division Director, could you possibly stop addressing me *Ôkubo-san*?’

Upon his request, Kagaya tries to use *Ôkubo-kun* to address his subordinate. Kagaya even yells at him, “*Ôkubo, yaru n da yo.*” (‘We’ve got to do it, *Ôkubo.*’), using the blunt form without any suffix when *Ôkubo* shows a weak attitude towards producing a VHS video. However, the vocative shortly goes back to the polite *Ôkubo-san* as Kagaya requests that *Ôkubo* forge a financial report favourable to their division that should be submitted to the directors. The other juniors are also addressed with *-san* attached to their names; *Hattori-san*, *Sugisawa-san*, etc. A young subordinate is soon to be addressed by *-kun*, *Nitta-kun*, in the same way as in the case of *Eguchi-kun*, a young staff member who used to work under Kagaya at the head office.

The factors that make Kagaya address his men by *-san* come from his modest and friendly personality of not being bossy, as well as his consideration of or respect for, in the case of *Ôkubo*, his academic and occupational background, and, age in the case of the older subordinates.

In *Senshi no Shikaku* (‘Qualifications for Warriors’), Inoue, *Buchô* (‘department manager’), addresses a female middle-aged employee, a dismissal notice candidate, by *Tabata-san*. He has not been acquainted with her before the interview. He changes the vocative to *Tabata-kun* after realising how capable and irreplaceable she is in doing her job. The addressee’s age, sex, and lack of acquaintance are the main elements that can be taken into consideration here when Inoue chooses LN+*-san* to address his subordinate when they meet for the first time. He uses LN+*-kun* to address his male and young female subordinates who regularly work under him.

The shift of the form from *-san* to *-kun*, and from *-kun* to the flat surname indicates the boss’s changing mood towards the subordinate. In the eyes of the boss, their distance is reduced, the relationship is getting closer, and the feeling of solidarity is strengthened.

In *Shûdan Sasen* (‘Collective Relegation’), Shinoda, *Honbuchô* (‘division director’), aged 50, addresses Hanazawa, *Buchô* (‘department manager’), his older 55-year-old subordinate, by *Hanazawa-san* even when Shinoda blames Hanazawa for his crime of setting fire to the newly-built houses for sale.

Hanazawa-san, anta, nani, yatteru n da.

‘Mr. Hanazawa, what on earth have you done?’

Here again, age is the key factor in choosing the mitigated form of LN+*-san* that is not usually expected to be used to address a subordinate.

5.2. LN+*-san* from subordinate to boss³⁴

In some cases a subordinate constantly addresses his/her boss by *-san* when the addresser feels close towards the addressee due to their intimate private relationship or to the reverse age difference with a much younger boss. The example of the former case is *Hisayama-san* instead of *Sôdanyaku* (‘counselling director’) used by Kitano, *Jichô* (‘vice-department manager’), in *Kinyû Fushoku Rettô: Jubaku* (‘Islands of Financial Corruption: Shackles’). That of the latter case is *Kyôsuke (FN)-san* instead of *Torishimariyaku* (‘director’) from the founding family, used by a subordinate to *Kyôsuke* in *Shasô* (‘Company Funeral’). Also, young bosses of lower rank can be addressed by LN+*-san* by juniors as discussed in 5. **Deviant usage of a vocative.** However, in other cases, LN-*-san* tends to be chosen abruptly, instead of position title,

³⁴ The discussion in *Kabutochô* (‘Kabutocho’) and *Shûdan Sasen* (‘Collective Relegation’) appears in Kitayama (2010: 10-11).

when a subordinate has lost respect for or trust in his/her superior, which even results in his/her harbouring strong anger and contempt.

In *Kabutochô* ('Kabutocho' [the central area of stock exchange in Tokyo]), Yokoshima, *Senmu, Eigyô-honbuchô* ('senior managing director, sales division director'), retorted against Nonoyama, *Kaichô* ('chairman').

*Nonoyama-san, kongo, anata no shiji o aogu tsumori wa arimasen yo. Anata wa mô go-jibun no egoizumu o tôsu koto shika kangaete-inai.*³⁵
'Mr. Nonoyama, I will not follow your instructions any longer. You only want to have everything your own way.'

Yokoshima has always addressed Nonoyama by *Kaichô* ('chairman'), but now, he ignores the conventional norm of using the position title to his boss when Nonoyama saddles him with the responsibility for losing a factional conflict.

Koryâ, kimi no sekinin da yo. Kimi ga yokei-na teian o suru kara.
'You are to blame. You shouldn't have made such an unnecessary proposal.'

-*San* also appears in *Shûdan Sasen* ('Collective Relegation'), when Shinoda, *Honbuchô* ('division director'), got enraged with the opposing Yokoyama, *Fuku-shachô* ('vice-president').

Yokoyama-san, zôshûwai yôgi de kokuso dekiru n desu yo.
'Mr. Yokoyama, I could sue you for bribery.'

In the same film, Takigawa, *Buchô* ('department manager'), addresses his older colleague, Hanazawa, by *-san*, when he has to deal with the serious situation caused by Hanazawa.

Hanazawa-san, issho ni kite-kuremasen ka. Yatcha ikenai n da yo, Hanazawa-san.
'Mr. Hanazawa, won't you come with me? You shouldn't have done that, Mr. Hanazawa.'

LN+*-san*³⁶ is the vocative that is lower than the position title in its degree of indirectness and politeness. Whether the subordinate feels intimacy or repulsion, the speaker believes that in a given situation he/she can clearly express his/her personal intention, not following social norms, to address the boss as the one psychologically closer to his/her social standing.

6. Determinants to choose vocatives

The crucial factors in determining the choice of vocatives are the seniority system ("power") and the *uchi* and *soto* ('in- and out-group') notion ("distance"), which are

³⁵ Yokoshima even uses *anata* ('you'), instead of position title, to refer to Nonoyama, which shows his determination to break off with the boss.

³⁶ There are two opposing views found regarding how to use LN+*-san* in business situations. In addition to the preceding studies given in 4.1.2. *Subordinate to boss*, Kobayashi (2004: 117) points out that LN+*-san* is the most common way to address a boss regardless of the addressee's age or sex. On the other hand, Nakazaki (2002: 12) states that a subordinate can never use LN+*-san* when addressing his/her boss. The analysis in this paper supports the tendency that LN+*-san* is much less used than position titles within a company. The cases with a boss addressed by LN+*-san* (Table 1; 17.7%, 63 out of 355 cases) are discussed in 5.2. *LN + -san from subordinate to boss* as the ones of not being a typical situation in big traditional Japanese companies. Also, LN+*-san* used by a boss addressing his/her subordinate (Table 1; 10.7%, 32 out of 299 cases) is not a customary practice in the corporate environment. Refer to 5.1. *LN+*-san* from boss to subordinate*.

deeply rooted in the collectivistic society with a long-established vertical structure and the idea of one’s own *ba* (‘place’). As discussed before in **4.1. Vocatives between in-group members**, in a Japanese family, all the members above one’s generation are regarded as seniors, and age determines whether one is senior or junior to the other (Suzuki 2010: 150-151). The youngest is the person who is addressed by his/her first name by everyone in the family. A member is allowed to address his/her seniors only by family terms such as *o-nî-san* (‘older brother’) or *o-nê-san* (‘older sister’), while to juniors he/she uses their first names to directly identify themselves.³⁷ The same rule applies to the world outside of the family.

Unlike the English notion of reciprocal usage of first name showing both solidarity and politeness (Argyle 1995: 142), Japanese politeness, bearing the meaning of indirectness, is inversely proportionate to closeness in distance between participants in conversations.

It is, therefore, common to find that people from an out-group are addressed by the polite forms much more often than those of the in-group, which is argued in **4.3 Comparative analysis of in-group and out-group vocatives**.

Table 7 below shows the frequency of polite forms chosen in three directions among in- and out-group people, for which the data in Table 5 can be referred to.

Table 7: Polite forms used in in-group and out-group (Polite forms in non-italics)

Polite forms (%)			
In-group		Out-group	
Boss to Subordinate	15.1 (45/299)	Customer to Vendor	70.6 (24/34)
Subordinate to Boss	98.9 (351/355)	Vendor to Customer	85.3 (29/34)
Between colleagues	29.1 (37/127)	Between people of equal status	95.2 (59/62)

Bosses use the familiar forms (84.9%) to address their subordinates in the same company; whereas customers usually address vendors by the polite forms (70.6%). Another notable figure regards the polite forms used among people of equal status. In-group members show 29.1% of the polite forms being used compared with 95.2% among outside partners even when they are involved in the same project and frequently meet each other.

People working for the same company are regarded as the second closest to each other, with the closest being their own family. The polite forms and respect words are not used to refer to their co-workers, including bosses, when they speak with out-group members as discussed in **2.3. Rationale of the terms of “Polite Forms” and “Familiar Forms.”** In the Japanese language, the first person (‘I’) has its position at the centre, surrounded by the in-group members in its own family, and then in its company. Outside the layers of the in-group are people of the out-groups. An adequate choice of address forms is made based on where the addresser stands against the addressee with regard to a group of various sorts they belong to.

To choose a vocative in a particular situation that is not customarily expected to be used, is based on the individual’s decision that he/she can give up “intergroup orientation,” (Spencer-Oatey 2011: 33) and pursue “interpersonal orientation”(ibid.).

7. Japanese “self” and “face”

The automatic³⁸ choices of a vocative conforming to the social norm, together with the

³⁷ Schneider & Homans (1955: 1206) present the same analysis. “Generally speaking, kinship terms are employed primarily when the person spoken to is senior in age or generation, but first names are employed between age and generation equals or when the speaker is senior in age or generation to the person addressed or referred to.”

³⁸ Brown and Levinson (1987: 85) argue that their word “strategy” implies “a rational element while covering both (a) innovative plans of action, which may still be (but need not be) *unconscious*, and

occasional atypical use of an unexpected vocative (e.g. LN+-*san*), can reflect the Japanese concept of “self” and its “face” nurtured in the society. The following discussion singles out the Japanese “self” and “face” out of various western counterparts, and to identify the fundamental source of Japanese linguistic behaviour.

7.1. “Self” in collectivism

Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness theory has been challenged by linguists who argue that it lacks a discussion of politeness from a collectivism point of view. Scollon et al. (2002: 47-48) assert that the concept of western individualistic and self-motivated “self” “may not be appropriate as the basis for studying discourse systems that have a more collectivistic view of ‘self,’ one which is more connected to membership in basic groups” Spencer-Oatey and Franklin (2009: 111) offer two fundamental principles: “[E]quity linked with individualism and to an independent construal of self, and association linked with collectivism and to an interdependent construal of self.” Morisaki and Gudykunst (1994: 59) and Gudykunst et al. (1996) present the same contrast between “independent self” associated with individualistic cultures and “interdependent self” with collectivistic cultures. Matsumoto (1988) and Ide (1989) put forward the importance of an individual as positioned within the society. Backnik (1982: 11) states that “... the deictic anchor point is Ego in societies where the individual is the basic unit of social organization In Japan, the basic social unit is not the individuals, but the primary group.” Kimura (1972: 152) argues that the western “self” is regarded as one’s own absolute attribute that permanently remains unchanged; whereas, the Japanese “self” is a relative “portion” [*bun* in Japanese] acquired through each of the relationships between oneself and others. It does not have its solid identity within itself, but appears, depending on the daily situations it shares with other people (ibid.). Hamaguchi (1982: 142) is consistent with this “relative self,” and argues that “for the Japanese ‘self’ means the portion which is distributed to him, according to the situation he is in, from the living space shared between himself and the other person with whom he had developed a mutually dependent relationship.” Kasper (1997: 381) contrasts the concept of western and Japanese “self” as the “‘Western’ ideal of a consistent self that transcends conflicting contextual demands, and the Japanese ideal of an accommodative self that optimally responds to varying contexts and purposes.”

7.2. The concept of “face”

The concept of “face” also invites varied interpretations presented by many different socio-linguists. Goffman (1967: 5) defines the term “face” “as the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact.” Brown and Levinson’s (1987: 61-62) notion of “face” has two aspects, “negative face: [T]he want of every ‘competent adult member’ that his actions be unimpeded by others,” and “positive face: [T]he want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others.” Hofstede (1994: 261) describes “face” as “a quality attributed to someone who meets the essential requirements related to his or her social position.” Scollon et al. (2012: 47-49) introduce two sides of “face,” independence and involvement, each of which corresponds to negative or deference politeness and positive or solidarity politeness respectively in the preceding sociolinguistic literature. They argue that each sides of “face” must be “projected in any communication. It is always a matter of more or less, not absolute expression of just one or the other” (ibid.). Mead (1998: 136) presents “face” as “the positive social value a person claims by his/her conduct in social relationships.” Spencer-Oatey (2005)

(b) routines ... whose original rational origin is still preserved in their construction, despite their present *automatic* application as ready-made programmes.” (my italics)

contrasts “identity face,” or a “situation-specific face,” with “respectability face,” a “pan-situational face.” Spencer-Oatey and Franklin (2009: 109-111) give “face” as “a key concept that is integral to rapport” in their “rapport management” strategy.

Some preceding research studies deal with the Japanese notion of *mentsu* (‘face’) as the main theme. Lin’s (2006) qualitative and quantitative survey conceptualises it as “a public image of an individual in relation to his/her social role to be fulfilled as expected by others.” There are two indispensable aspects to be noted here; “(1) the social role to be fulfilled to meet other people’s expectations, and (2) the image being public” (ibid.). Therefore, “face” can only appear in social situations where other people participate. The role should be executed to exactly suit their social expectations. Maintaining or losing “face” only depends on whether the fulfillment successfully satisfies what the society expects. Tao (2002: 41) collects data from various sources including questionnaire circulated to Japanese, Chinese and English informants, and compares the Japanese, Chinese and English notion of “face.” He offers three elements of the Japanese “face”; *menboku* (‘honor’ (Tao 2008: 54)), *taimen* (‘appearance’ (ibid.)) and *meiyo* (‘prestige’ (ibid.)), and argues that Japanese people are first concerned about others’ welfare, and respect others’ “face” to maintain harmony; whereas people in English culture value the individual’s free will, and protect both their own and others’ “face” against the violation of dignity. Morisaki and Gudykunst (1994: 81) offer the Japanese term *kao* (‘face’) used “to refer to social face,” and subdivide it into “the appearance one presents to others (*taimen*...) and *mentsu*, interdependent face” Jackson and Tomioka (2004: 38) explain “face” in the light of corporate environment as follows.

... attention to face can be superficially regarded as each individual’s endeavour to ‘do the right thing.’ Doing the ‘right’ thing is dependent on a person’s interpretation of context. By understanding the context, each person should know what behaviour is appropriate. What is ‘appropriate’ is determined by the expectations of the dominant ‘reference group’ — the ‘closed circle’ whose members define themselves by sharing important information.

An “adult” should be a person who is “fluent and confident in interpreting the rule and expectation of a wide range of culture-specific contexts and culture-specific reference groups within Japanese society they can be relied on to regulate their behaviour according to reference group expectations and context” (ibid.: 40). Jackson and Tomioka (ibid.: 41, 49) add that the difference between the western and Japanese perception of “face” lies in the former regarding their current company/reference group as a temporary context before “moving on,” with less adherence to “the rules,” and the latter conforming to reference group expectations over time, which enables them to build the group’s trust with their predictable behaviour. Morisaki and Gudykunst (1994: 75) rephrase the same discussion. In individualistic cultures, people are concerned with negotiating face in the immediate situation in which an encounter is taking place. In collectivistic cultures, in contrast, in-group relationships tend to be maintained throughout one’s life. Ting-Toomey and Oetzel (2002: 145-146) focus on three face loci: *Self-face* concern for one’s own image, *other-face* concern for another’s image, and *mutual-face* concern for both parties’ images. Oetzel et al.’s surveys both in 1999 and 2000 (cited in Ting-Toomey & Oetzel ibid.) found that Japanese have lower *self-face* concerns than people of German and American cultures. Ting-Toomey and Oetzel (2002: 147) state that *self-face* concern is related positively to individualism and independent self construals; whereas *other-face* and *mutual-face* concerns are related positively to collectivism and interdependent self construals.

The Japanese concept of “face” has, as its component, a long lasting concern for what other people expect and how one is reputed in the society. The Japanese “self” does not primarily stand independently of a group, interacting with it, but it belongs to and is positioned within a group from the start, trying to perform the functions given to

it and adjusting discrepancies that arise between itself and the group. Every member of society is a *bun* ('portion,' 'share,' or 'part')-holder who is interdependent as a part of the whole (Lebra 1976: 67-68). "[I]f a person maintains his or her *bun* ('portion'), he or she cannot [lose] face within the ingroup or threaten the face of another ingroup member. If a person exceeds her or his *bun*, ... she or he can [lose] face and/or threaten other member's interdependent mutual face" (Morisaki & Gudykunst 1994: 76).

This article observes these aspects of the Japanese "self" and its "face" in its discussion on addressing people. A nonreciprocal use of vocatives is shown here, which are typically chosen based on socially accepted norms. The "power" structure is stable and dominant in daily business operations within a large enterprise regardless of the degree of individual mutual "distance." Out-group members are regarded as standing apart from an addresser, for whom the concept of "distance," rather than that of "power," is a crucial factor in employing more polite vocatives. A particular situation allows an individual to use a vocative different from the one expected to be chosen. On such an occasion, the specific "ranking of imposition" (Brown & Levinson 1987), or the addresser's own intentional selection of the linguistic strategy, supersedes the socially designated linguistic norm, especially in the case of a boss using the polite form to his/her subordinate. This demonstrates the addresser's restraint in expressing a sense of familiarity toward the addressee. The idea of "face-threatening acts (FTAs)" (Brown & Levinson 1987) can properly be brought in to a situation where a subordinate addresses his/her boss in a less polite way. Whatever reason it may be, the addresser is determined not only to infringe on the addressee's "face" and do "FTAs," but also to stand against the social expectations, which may endanger his/her position in a group.

These analyses lead to the argument that Japan as discussed in this article belongs to "Dyad I with high P relations" for the *uchi* ('in-group') use of vocatives, and tends to come under "Dyad II with high D and low[er] P relations," originally allocated to Japan by Brown and Levinson (1987: 250-251), only applicable to the *soto* ('out-group') use of vocatives, although customers still have "power" over vendors with the use of polite forms in not quite the same degree.

8. Conclusion

This study has proved the dominantly nonreciprocal structure of Japanese vocatives within a company; the familiar forms of LN+*-kun* and the flat LN (66.6% in Table 1) from bosses to subordinates, and the polite forms of Position title, LN+position title and Position title+*-san* (80.9% in Table 1) from subordinates to bosses. The controversial form here is LN+*-san* which also appears in all directions; upwards, downwards, and on equal levels. Although LN+*-san* is generally accepted in Japanese society as a polite way to address others, it shows a varied degree of politeness according to the way in which the form is used. LN+*-san* from a boss to his/her subordinate or among colleagues presents the speaker's reserve or hesitation in choosing the familiar forms to address the other party; whereas that bluntly used from a subordinate to his/her boss often appears in an exceptional situation where the addresser expresses his/her negative feelings towards the addressee. In the former case, the form (LN+*-san* [polite suffix]) itself sounds much more polite than LN+*-kun* [familiar suffix] or just LN, but solidarity or a feeling of closeness is lessened. The latter case indicates the subordinate's rejection, by using LN+*-san* which is more direct and less polite than position titles, of showing his/her respect to his/her boss, which is socially impolite and usually makes the original relationship irreparable. The subordinate's strong determination is shown here, especially when Japanese people are more concerned about "other- and mutual-face" than "self-face" (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel 2002). The addressee loses his/her "face" by being addressed by the downgraded vocative. At the same time, the addresser endangers his/her "face" by using an improper vocative against social expectation and possibly being labelled as deficient in common sense. This impoliteness is an irregular deviation

from the norm so that “it can never be conventional” (Culpeper 2011: 34), but is personal. The addresser gives up observing social norms recognised by group members (Hill et al. 1986; Ide 1989; Kasper 1990), and chooses his/her individual intentional impoliteness strategy to invite “conflict or friction” (Brown & Levinson 1987; Lakoff 1973; Leech 1983). “A positive evaluation (politeness) arises when an action is congruent with the norm,” explicit rules set by each society, and “a negative evaluation (impoliteness = rudeness) when an action is to the contrary” (Fraser 1990: 220).

In a group-oriented static society where people are expected to know their own position in a group, and behave and speak accordingly, the relationship among the members usually remains unchanged until a situation arises to change the long-lasting way of mutual interaction. The boss-subordinate relations are a typical example of the fixed structure (Nakane 1973: 30-34) in the traditional Japanese business circle under the seniority system of “power.” Bosses are one’s superiors in all aspects of life from the day of recruitment up to that of retirement, whether during office hours or private time. The flexibility of addressing someone by different vocatives according to a change of personal distance or an everyday activity, as seen in an English culture (Scollon et al. 2012: 46), is hardly observed in the Japanese business world. However close a person psychologically becomes to the boss, he/she is expected to use the polite forms of address, and at least pretend to keep a distance from the addressee, retaining polite behaviour and showing respect. Bosses have options to employ both “strategic and discernment politeness” towards the addressee, but the polite forms intentionally chosen by them present a degree of unpredictability that originates in exceptional addresser-addressee relations. For example, the commonly accepted use of vocatives is found to deviate when one has to face an “out-group” member who he/she is not confident of comfortably dealing with. The difference of age, sex and educational background; namely, an older subordinate, a female staff member, or an elite subordinate with higher qualifications, is given in this paper as a typical element of showing the addresser’s perplexity in choosing a socially accepted vocative. They are all “in-group” members; however, to the addresser, they do not exactly belong to his own group with the same attributes, but stand outside of it with a different category of age, sex, or qualification. The “distance” factor comes to interfere, in the multiple layers of the “in-group,” with the choice of the familiar forms. The polite form of LN+*-san* is replaced by the familiar form of LN+*-kun* as the boss feels closer to his subordinate, and accepts him/her as “insider” by getting over the disparity in sex, qualification, or age, even though age difference is the most difficult factor to ignore under the Japanese seniority system. The change of vocatives from the polite to the familiar form is much less frequently observed between people in the out-group.

The “power” structure is not necessarily shown to a large extent among out-group members, even in a customer-vendor relationship. Customers tend to maintain a certain distance from their business partners, and show a much higher rate of choosing polite address forms than that acquired by bosses to address subordinates inside their own companies. Equals from different groups share the same way of addressing the other party by polite forms, which means that here again socially established distance prevails. The reciprocal use of vocatives tends to be evident among out-group people.

This paper duly observes that positive politeness of comradeship with familiar forms is dominant among close in-group members of the same status and generation. The familiar forms that are used non-reciprocally downwards reflect a power relationship. “Discernment politeness” of social reserve with polite forms is shown to address people of higher status and/or being senior in age, which usually coincide with each other in Japanese society, or out-group members. In most cases, an individual automatically uses a vocative suited to his/her relatively assigned “place” of age and status against that of the addressee. There is less flexibility or fewer options left for an addresser, as the “collectivistic self,” to personally employ a term under various situations to use his/her volitional politeness strategy.

Business relations in other categories; middle- or small-sized companies, journalists', artists', or IT business organisations, etc., are presumed to show more of the casual types of vocatives to appeal to each other's "positive face," and share a feeling of solidarity in a less formal atmosphere. Corporations with female bosses and subordinates may demonstrate a different rate of vocative use from that presented in this article, and find a higher rate of polite forms being used as they are socially expected to speak more politely than their male colleagues (Ide 1982). Also, as the corporate environment assumes an accelerating aspect of being global, the interpretations of "face" are supposed to be "shifting away from an emphasis on 'collectivist' requirements and towards increased attention to 'individualist' requirements" (Jackson & Tomioka 2004: 37). The factors one owes to his/her in-group are to be reduced in proportion to his/her expanded involvement in the outer world. The norm of vocatives may fluctuate with a large number of non-Japanese people working with Japanese nationals for the same company.

Abbreviations

FFN	familiarised first name
FN	first name, name given to an individual, which comes last in Japanese
FNLN	first name and last name
FNv	first name variant
LN	last name, surname, family name, which is put first in Japanese
TFN	title and first name
TLN	title and last name

Featured Films

Hagetaka ('Hawk'). (2007) Directed by J. Inoue, K. Horikirizono, and K. Ôtomo. Written by J. Mayama. Screenplay by H. Hayashi. NHK.

Hagetaka ('Hawk'). (2008) Directed by K. Ôtomo. Written by J. Mayama. Screenplay by H. Hayashi. Toho.

Heddo Hantâ ('Headhunter'). (1990) Directed by S. Fukuda. Written by T. Ehado. Screenplay by S. Nagahara. TBS.

Hi wa Mata Noboru ('The Sun Rises Again'). (2002) Directed by K. Sasabe. Written by M. Satô. Screenplay by T. Nishioka, and K. Sasabe. Toei.

Kabutochô ("Kabutochô" [The central area of stock exchange in Tokyo]). (1989) Directed by K. Kondô. Written by T. Ehado. Screenplay by A. Yokota. TBS.

Kachô Shima Kôzaku ('Kôzaku Shima, Section Chief'). (1992) Directed by Y. Negishi. Written by K. Hirokane. Screenplay by N. Nozawa. Toho.

Kachô Shima Kôzaku ('Kôzaku Shima, Section Chief'). (2008) Directed by T. Sugimoto. Written by K.

Hirokane. Screenplay by R. Kimizuka, and D. Kitagawa. Nihon TV.

Kachô Shima Kôzaku 2: Honkon no Yûwaku ('Kôzaku Shima, Section Chief 2: Temptation in Hong Kong'). (2008) Directed by K. Ôtsuka. Written by K. Hirokane. Screenplay by R. Kimizuka, and D. Kitagawa. Nihon TV.

Kimi-tachi ni Asu wa Nai ('No Future for All of You'). (2010) Directed by K. Okada. Written by R. Sakane. Screenplay by T. Takuma. NHK.

Kinyû Fushoku Rettô: Jubaku ('Islands of Financial Corruption: Shackles'). (1999) Directed by M. Harada. Written by R. Takasugi. Screenplay by R. Takasugi, S. Suzuki, and M. Kinoshita. Toei.

Kinyû Fushoku Rettô: Saisei ('Islands of Financial Corruption: Revival'). (2002) Directed by J. Sato. Written by R. Takasugi. Screenplay by S. Suzuki, and J. Sato. BS-i toskdoma!n.

Moyuru Toki ('Passionate Moments'). (2006) Directed by T. Hosono. Written by R. Takasugi. Screenplay by S. Suzuki. Toei.

Regatta: Kokusai Kinyû Sensô ('Regatta: International Financial War'). (1999) Directed by K. Ôtomo, and R. Takahashi. Screenplay by S. Nakakura, and M. Eguchi. NHK.

Sasen ('Relegation'). (1990) Directed by I. Takahashi. Written by T. Edoha. Screenplay by A. Yokota. TBS.

Senshi no Shikaku ('Qualifications for Warriors'). (2008) Directed by K. Ôhara. Screenplay by M. Takahashi. Fuji TV.

Shasô ('Company Funeral'). (1989) Directed by T. Masuda. Screenplay by H. Matsuda. Toei.

Shûdan Sasen ('Collective Relegation'). (1994) Directed by T. Kajima. Written by T. Ehado. Screenplay by N. Nozawa. Toei.

Shutse to Sasen ('Promotion and Relegation'). (1996) Directed by A. Sakazaki. Written by R. Takasugi. Screenplay by S. Iwama. TBS.

Sora Tobu Taiya ('Tire Flying in the Sky'). (2009) Directed by M. Aso, and H. Suzuki. Written by J. Ikeido. Screenplay by Y. Maekawa. Sony Pictures Entertainment.

Tetsu no Hone ('Iron Bone'). (2010) Directed by T. Yanagawa, Z. Matsuura, and G. Suzaki. Written by J. Ikeido. Screenplay by T. Nishioka. NHK Nagoya Broadcasting Station.

References

Andersen, P.A., M.L. Hecht, G.D. Hoobler, and M. Smallwood (2002) Nonverbal communication across cultures. In W.B. Gudykunst, and B. Mody (eds.), *Handbook of international and intercultural communication*, 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, pp. 89-106.

Anderson, E. (2000) Beyond homo economicus: New developments in theories of social norms. *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 29.2: 170-200.

Aoki, T. (1999, 2009) *“Nihon bunka-ron” no henyô: Sengo-nihon no bunka* (‘Changing image of “Japanese culture”: Post-war Japanese culture’). Tokyo: Chuokoron-shinsha.

Arakawa, N. (2008) Hito o yobu to iu gengo kôï (‘Language behaviour of addressing a person’). <http://www.res.kute.kansai-u.ac.jp/-mkato/pdf/fa50018.pdf#search> (April 5, 2011).

Argyle, M. (1994, 1995) *The psychology of social class*. London: Routledge.

Axelson, E. (2007) Vocatives: A double-edged strategy in intercultural discourse among graduate students. *Pragmatics* 17.1: 95-122.

Backnik, J.M. (1982) Deixis and self/other reference in Japanese discourse. *Sociolinguistic Working Paper* 99: 1-36. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Baxter, L.A. (1984) An investigation of compliance-gaining as politeness. *Human Communication Research* 10.3: 427-456.

Biber, D., S. Johansson, G. Leech, S. Conrad, and E. Finegan (1999) *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd.

Braun, F. (1988) *Terms of address: Problems of patterns and usage in various languages and cultures*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brown, P., and S.C. Levinson (1978, 1987) *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, R., and A. Gilman (1960, 1972) The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T.A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in language*. London: Wiley & Sons, pp. 253-276.

Clyne, M., C. Norrby, and J. Warren (2009) *Language and human relations: Styles of address in contemporary language*. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Coulmas, F. (1992) Linguistic etiquette in Japanese society. In R. Watts, S. Ide, and K. Ehlich (eds.), *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory and practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 299-323.

Culpeper, J. (2011) *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fraser, B. (1990) Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 219-236.

Gendai Nihon-go Kenkyûkai (‘The Society of Current Japanese’) (ed.) (1999) *Josei no kotoba: Shokuba-hen* (‘Women’s talk: Offices.’). Tokyo: Hitsuji Shobo.

Gendai Nihon-go Kenkyûkai (‘The Society of Current Japanese’) (ed.) (2002, 2004) *Dansei no kotoba: Shokuba-hen* (‘Men’s talk: Offices.’) Tokyo: Hitsuji Shobo.

Geyer, N. (2008) *Discourse and politeness*. London: Continuum International Publishing Company.

Goffman, E. (1967) *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Green, G. (1992) The universality of Gricean accounts of politeness: You gotta have wa. Unpublished manuscript. University of Illinois.

Gudykunst, W.B., Y. Matsumoto, S. Ting-Toomey, T. Nishida, K.S. Kim, and S. Heyman (1996) The

influence of cultural individualism-collectivism, self construals, and individual values on communication styles across cultures. *Human Communication Research* 22: 510-543.

Hamaguchi, E. (1982) *Kanjin-shugi no shakai Nihon* ('Japan, society of contextualism'). Tokyo: Toyo Keizai Shinposha.

Han, E. (2006) O-mae'tte dare?: Nihon-go no dai-ni-ninshô daimeishi/taishôshi ('Who is "you"?: Japanese second personal pronouns /nouns').
<http://www.iie.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/Center/activities/japanese/pdf/JJC2006/JC2006iraiza.pdf> (March 25, 2011).

Hill, B., S. Ide, A. Kawasaki, and T. Ogino (1986) Universals of linguistic politeness: Quantitative evidence from Japanese and American English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 10.3: 347-371.

Hofstede, G. (1991, 1994) *Culture and organisations: Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival*. London: HarperCollins.

Holmes, J. (1990) Apologies in New Zealand English. *Language in Society* 19: 155-199.

Holmes, J. (1995) *Women, men, and politeness*. London: Longman.

House, J. (2003) Misunderstanding in intercultural university encounters. In J. House, G. Kasper, and S. Ross (eds.), *Misunderstanding in social life: Discourse approaches to problematic talk*. London: Longman, pp. 22-56.

Ide, S. (1982) Japanese sociolinguistics: Politeness and women's language. *Lingua* 57.2-4: 357-385.

Ide, S. (1989) Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua* 8.2-3: 223-248.

Ide, S. (2006) *Wakimae no goyôron* ('Pragmatics of discernment'). Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.

Ide, S., B. Hill, Y. Carnes, T. Ogino, and A. Kawasaki (1992) The concept of politeness: An empirical study of American English and Japanese. In R.J. Watts, S. Ide, and K. Ehlich (eds.), *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory, and practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 281-297.

Ide, S., M. Hori, A. Kawasaki, S. Ikuta, and H. Haga (1986) Sex differences and politeness in Japanese. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 58: 25-36.

Jackson, K., and M. Tomioka (2004) *The changing face of Japanese management*. London: Routledge.

Janney, R.W., and H. Arndt (1992) Intracultural tact versus intercultural tact. In R.J. Watts, S. Ide, and K. Ehlich (eds.), *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory and practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 21-41.

Kajiwara, M. (2004) Nihon-go ni okeru taishôshi "anata" no shiyô ryôiki ni tsuite ('On the usage area of the Japanese second personal noun "you"'). *Shinshû University International Students Center Journal* 5:47-57.

Kanai, H. (2002a) Nihon-go ni okeru 'Teikijutsu' ni yoru ni-ninshô shiji: Metonimî no kanten kara ('The second personal indication by 'definite description' in the Japanese language: In view of metonymy'). Résumé for oral presentation (the 124 conference). The Linguistic Society of Japan.

Kanai, H. (2002b) Shitsurei to iu kanten kara mita ni-nin-shô shiji no taikei ('Structure of the second personal indication seen in the view of rudeness'). *Waseda University Postgraduate Literature Course*

Journal 48.3: 83-91.

Kasper, G. (1990) Linguistic politeness: Current research issues. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14.2: 193-218.

Kasper, G. (1997) Linguistic etiquette. In F. Coulmas (ed.), *The handbook of sociolinguistics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 374-385.

Kataoka, Y. (1997) *Nihon-go no soto e* ('Out of the Japanese Language.'). Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo.

Kimura, S. (1972) *Hito to hito to no aida: Seishin-byôrigaku-teki Nihon-ron* ('Between people: Japan from mental pathology'). Tokyo: Kobundo.

Kinsui, S. (1989, 1991) *Daimeishi to ninshô* ('Pronouns and persons'). In Y. Miyaji (ed.), *Kôza Nihon-go to Nihon-go kyôiku, vol.4: Nihon-go no bunpô/buntai (Jô)* ('Japanese language and its education 4: Japanese grammar and style (I)'). Tokyo: Meiji Shoin, pp. 98-116.

Kitayama, T. (2004) A study of politeness in American films: Analysis of requests appearing in business scenes in the 1980's and 1990's. *Kinki University Department of Language Education Journal* 4.1: 65-125.

Kitayama, T. (2010) *Tatema* ('stated principle') and *Honne* ('real intent') appearing in terms of address: Analysing their usage in business scenes in American, British and Japanese films. *Kinki University Department of Language Education Journal* 6.2: 3-24.

Kobayashi, M. (2002, 2004) *Shokuba de tsukawareru "koshô"* ('Address forms used in offices'). In Gendai Nihon-go Kenkyûkai ('The Society of Current Japanese') (ed.), *Dansei no kotoba shokuba-hen* ('Men's talk: Offices'). Tokyo: Hitsuji Shobo, pp. 99-119.

Koizumi, T. (2001) *Nyûmon goyôron kenkyû: Riron to ôyô* ('Introduction to pragmatic researches: Theory and application'). Tokyo: Kenkyusha.

Kokuritsu Koku-go Kenkyûsho ('National Institute for Japanese Language') (1982) *Kokuritsu Koku-go Kenkyûsho Hôkoku 73: Kigyô no naka no keigo* ('National Institute for Japanese Language Report 73: Honorifics in companies'). Tokyo: Nihon Shobo.

Lakoff, R.T. (1973) The logic of politeness; or minding your p's and q's. In C. Corum, T.C. Smith-Stark, and A. Weiser (eds.), *Papers from the ninth regional meeting of Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 292-305.

Lebra, T.S. (1976) *Japanese patterns of behavior*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

Leech, G. (1983) *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Leech, G. (1999) The distribution and function of vocatives in American and British English conversation. In H. Hasselgård, and S. Oksefjull (eds.), *Out of corpora: Studies in honour of Stig Johansson*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 107-118.

Leeds-Hurwitz, W. (1980) The use and analysis of uncommon forms of address. *Sociolinguistic Working Paper* 8: 1-18.

Levinson, S.C. (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lin, C. (2006) *Nihon-bunka ni okeru "mentsu"*: Sono gainen to shinri-teki taijin-teki igi ('"Face" in Japanese culture: Its concept and psychological/personal significance').

<http://www.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp/postgraduate/database/2007/535.html> (February 15, 2012).

Loveday, L. (1986) *Explorations in Japanese sociolinguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

MaConnell-Ginet, S. (2003, 2006) "What's in a name?": Social labeling and gender practices. In J. Holmes, and M. Meyerhoff (eds.), *The handbook of language and gender*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 69-97.

Matsumoto, Y. (1988) Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12: 403-426.

Maynard, S.K. (2001) Expressivity in discourse: Vocatives and themes in Japanese. *Language Sciences* 23.6: 679-705.

Mead, R. (1998) *International management*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Morisaki, S., and W. Gudykunst (1994) Face in Japan and the United States. In S. Ting-Toomey (ed.), *The Challenge of facework*. Albany: State University of New York Press, pp. 47-93.

Nakane, C. (1967, 2005) *Tate shakai no ningen kankei: Tan'itsu shakai no riron* ('Human relationship in vertical society: Theory of homogeneous society'). Tokyo: Kodansha.

Nakane, C. (1970, 1973, 1998) *Japanese society*. Tokyo: Charles G. Tuttle.

Nakazaki, Y. (2002) Morau-kei komyunikêshon ni okeru "hanashite shukansei" to ninshô hairâki ('Speaker subjectivity and personal hierarchy in communication of receiving'). *Gengo to Bunka* ('Language and Culture') 15: 1-20.

NHK (1995) Kotoba terebi: ○△buchô soreto mo ○△sân! ('Language TV: Last name & position title (department manager) or last name with -sân!'). (September 3).

Oda, N. (2010) *Eigo no yobikake-go* ('English vocatives'). Osaka: Osaka Kyoiku Tosho.

O'Driscoll, J. (1996) About face: A defence and elaboration of universal dualism. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25.1: 1-32.

Oetzel, J.G., S. Ting-Toomey, and M. Chew (1999) Face and facework in conflicts with parents and siblings: A cross-cultural comparison of German, Japanese, Mexican, and U. S. Americans. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, Chicago.

Oetzel, S.G., S. Ting-Toomey, T. Matsumoto, Y. Yokochi, X. Pan, J. Takai, and R. Wilcox (2000) Face and facework in conflict: A cross-cultural comparison of China, Germany, Japan, and the United States. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, Acapulco, Mexico.

Okamoto, S. (2000, 2010) *Kotoba no shakai-shinrigaku* ('Socio-psychology of language'). Kyoto: Nakanishiya Shuppan.

Ôhama, R., C. Aramaki, and G. So (2001) Nihon-go kyôkasho ni mirareru jidôshi/ tadôshi no shiyô ni tsuite ('On the first and the second personal nouns in Japanese textbooks'). *Chûgoku/Shikoku Kyôiku Gakkai Kyôiku Kenkyû Kiyô* ('The Chugoku-Shikoku Society for the Study of Education'): *Annals of Educational Research* 47.2: 342-352.

Peng, F.C. (1982) Koshô no shakaigaku ('Sociology of address forms'). In T. Kunihiro (ed.), *Nichi-ei hikaku kôza, vol.5: Bunka to shakai* ('Comparative studies of Japanese and English language 5: Culture and society'). Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten, pp. 61-82.

Quirk, R., S. Greebaum, G. Leech, and J. Svartvik (eds.) (1985) *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Saito, K. (1999) Ni-ninshô daimeishi to keii hyôgen: Nichi-ei-go taishô kenkyû ('Politeness and the second person pronoun: A contrastive study of English and Japanese'). *Baika Joshi Daigaku Bungakubu Kiyô* 33: *Hikaku Bunka* ('Baika Literary Bulletin 33: Comparative Culture'): 1-11.

Sawyer, J.F.A. (1994) Names: religious beliefs. In R.E. Asher (ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp. 2672-2674.

Schneider, D.M., and G.C. Homans (1955) Kinship terminology and the American kinship system. *American Anthropologist* 57.6: 1194-1208.

Scollon, R., S.W. Scollon, and R.H. Jones (1995, 2001, 2012) *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (1996) Reconsidering power and distance. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26: 1-24.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (ed.) (2000, 2009, 2011) *Culturally speaking: Culture, communication and politeness theory*. London: Continuum International Publishing Company.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2005) (Im)politeness, face and perception of rapport: Unpackaging their bases and interrelationships. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1.1: 95-119.

Spencer-Oatey, H., and P. Franklin (2009) *Intercultural interaction: A multidisciplinary approach to intercultural communication*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Slugoski, B.R. (1985) Grice's theory of conversation as a social psychological model. Ph.D. dissertation. Oxford.

Slugoski, B.R., and W. Turnbull (1988) Cruel to be kind and kind to be cruel: Sarcasm, banter, and social relations. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 7: 101-121.

Suzuki, T. (1973, 2010) *Kotoba to bunka* ('Language and culture'). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Suzuki, T. (1982) Jishôshi to taishôshi no hikaku ('Comparison between the first and the second personal nouns'). In T. Kunihiro (ed.), *Nichi-ei hikaku kôza, vol.5: Bunka to shakai* ('Comparative studies of Japanese and English language 5: Culture and society'). Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten, pp. 17-60.

Takanashi, H. (2011) Complementary stylistic resonance in Japanese play framing. *Pragmatics* 21.2: 231-264.

Takiura, M. (2005) *Nihon no keigoron: Poraitonesu riron kara no saikentô* ('Japanese honorifics: Review of politeness theory'). Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.

Takiura, M. (2007) Koshô no poraitonesu: 'Hito o yobu koto' no goyôron ('Politeness of address forms: Pragmatics on 'addressing people'). *Gekkan Nihongo* ('Japanese Language Monthly') 36.12 : 32-39.

Takubo, Y. (1997, 2007) *Shiten to gengo-kôdô* ('Viewpoint and language behaviour'). Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.

Tannen, D. (1986) *That's not what I meant*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Tao, L. (2002) Nihon-go, Chûgoku-go, Eigo ni okeru teinei hyôgen no hikaku kenkyû ('A comparative

study on politeness in Japanese, Chinese and English'). <http://aspace.lib.kanazawa-u.ac.jp/dspace/> (February 15, 2012).

Tao, L. (2008) Chûgoku-go to Eigo ni okeru 'mentsu'/'face' gainen no hikaku ('A comparative study on the perception of "face" in Chinese and English'). *Gengo Bunka Ronsô* ('Kanazawa University Language and Culture') 12: 49-75.

Thomas, J. (1995) *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Ting-Toomey, S., and J.G. Oetzel (2002) Cross-cultural face concerns and conflict styles. In W.B. Gudykunst, and B. Mody (eds.), *Handbook of international and intercultural communication*, 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, pp. 143-163.

Tsukimoto, H. (2008) *Nihon-jin no nô ni shugo wa iranai* ('No subjects needed for Japanese brain'). Tokyo: Kodansha.

Van De Walle, L. (1993) *Pragmatics and classical sanskrit: A pilot study in linguistic politeness*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Yamagishi, K. (1995) *Nichi-ei gengo bunka ronkô* ('Studies on Japanese and English language and culture'). Tokyo: Kobian Shobo.

Yoneda, M. (1990) Aru shakai soshiki no naka no koshô: Fûfu no yobikata to shokuba de no yobikake ni tsuite ('Address forms in a social structure: On vocatives between married couples and those among business people'). *Nihon-go-gaku* ('Study of Japanese Language') 9.9: 19-24.

Yui, M. (2007) Nihon-go oyobi eigo ni okeru taishôshi no kinô: Poraitonesu to no kanrensei ('Functions of the second personal nouns in Japanese and English: In relation to politeness'). *Surugadai Daigaku Ronshû* ('Surugadai University Review') 33: 19-30.

Wales, K. (2001) *A Dictionary of stylistics*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Watanabe, T. (1998) Koshô to iu ronten ('Discussion on address forms'). *Nihon-go-gaku* ('Study of Japanese Language') 17.9: 4-11.

Wetzel, P.J. (1985) In-group/out-group deixis: Situational variation in the verbs of giving and receiving in Japanese. In J.P. Forgas (ed.), *Language and social situations*. New York: Springer-Verlag, pp. 141-157.

Wierzbicka, A. (2003) *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wikipedia. <http://ja.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E6%AE%BF> (April 17, 2012).

Zwicky, A.M. (1974) "Hey, what's your name!" *Chicago Linguistic Society* 10: 787-801.

TAMAKI KITAYAMA is professor at Kinki University, Osaka, Japan, specialising in sociolinguistics. She works in the area of pragmatics with a particular focus on contrastive study of English and Japanese politeness using films with business relations as their main themes. She is the author of numerous articles on the characteristics of vocatives and the functions of discourses.

Address: Division of English Education, Faculty of Business Administration, Kinki University, 3-4-1, Kowakae, Higashi-Osaka City, 577-8502, Japan. E-mail: kitayamat@kindai.ac.jp