Collaborative Use of Honorifics in Japanese Interaction: An Example of a Breaching Experiment

Makiko TAKEKURO

1．Introduction

Japanese honorifics have been described based on relatively fixed properties of social context（e.g. formality of the speech situation, interlocutors' hierarchicalrelation in age and status, the lack of interlocutors' familiarity, or *soto* 'outgroup' relations as opposed to *uchi* 'ingroup' relations）（Harada 1976; Hinds 1978; Ide 1989; Shibatani 1990; Sukle 1994）or speakers' linguistic ideologies（Okamoto 1997, 2002; Pizziconi 2003）. However, these currently available accounts of Japanese honorific use are problematic to explain dynamic and dialogic processes of interaction, in which co-present participants momentarily respond to and adjust their speech in the course of interaction.

In this paper, I examine the extent to which the use of honorifics depends on the participation framework between speakers, addressees, and bystanders. I analyze the data of a "breaching experiment"（Garfinkel 1967）, designed to break unstated social rules as a way of studying them. I illustrate that being on the same "footing"（Goffman 1979, 1981）with interlocutors can override properties of age, status and the familiarity among interlocutors and that the presence of other coordi-

nates such as bystanders and overhearers plays a significant role in the speaker's and addressee's use of honorifics.

My goals are twofold: 1) to explore the extent to which the use of honorifics depends on modes of co-engagement among participants such as speakers, addressees, bystanders, and overhearers; and 2) to demonstrate how human beings use linguistic resources to connect to others and are influenced by others' linguistic cues in interaction. Although I am discussing meanings of Japanese honorifics in interactive contexts, my concern is not limited to the ways in which speakers of Japanese use honorifics. My central concern here is to see what human beings attempt to achieve interactionally through the use of linguistic resources such as honorifics.

2. Previous accounts of plain and polite forms

The literature on Japanese honorifics is extensive and many specific proposals have been put forth. In this section, I present a brief overview of sociolinguistic accounts of plain and polite forms in Japanese and highlight the theoretical framework used in this paper.

Japanese honorifics consist of two major categories, "addressee honorifics" and "referent honorifics," which grammatically encode the deference to the addressee and the referent, respectively (Comrie 1976). In native Japanese terminology, addressee honorifics are called "polite forms (*teinei-go* or *kei-tai*)", as opposed to "plain forms (*jou-tai*)" that do not grammatically encode the speaker's deference to the addressee. Referent honorifics are subdivided to what are called "subject honorifics" and "non-subject (object) honorifics" in American scholarship (Comrie 1976; Shibatani 1990; Matsumoto 1997), or "respectful forms

(*sonkei-go*)" and "humble forms (*kenjō-go*)" in native Japanese terminology. Respectful forms conventionally elevate the status of the referent in the argument of subject, while humble forms conventionally lower the status of the referent in the subject position, which is usually the speaker or the speaker's ingroup member.[1]

In Japanese, plain and polite forms form the fundamental part of predicate elements, as any argument in predicate elements has either plain or polite form.

(1 a) *watashi wa   gakusei   da*   (plain form)

　　　1 st   TOP   student   COP[2]

(1 b) *watashi wa   gakusei   desu*   (polite form)

　　　1 st   TOP   student   COP.POL

(1 c) *watashi wa   gakusei   degozaimasu*   (super-polite form)

　　　1 st   TOP   student   COP.SUPER.POL

(2 a) *sensei   ga   yomu*   (plain form)

　　　teacher   SUB   read

(2 b) *sensei   ga   yomi-masu*   (polite form)

　　　teacher   SUB   read-COP.POL

Sentences (a) have either the plain form of copula *da,* as in (1 a), or the verb stem in present tense, as in (2 a). Sentences (b) include -*desu* ending that appears as suppletive forms of copula, as in (1b), or -*masu* ending that appears as verbal suffixes, as in (2 b). *Gozaimasu* in (1 c) is a super-polite suppletive form of copula. As the morphology of verbs intersects with verbal morphology and syntax, both plain and polite forms intersect with tense and negation.

One stream of research has treated polite and plain forms as speech-level markers; polite forms being formal or polite speech-level markers, and plain forms being informal or non-polite speech-level markers (cf. Martin 1964; Harada 1976; Neustupny 1978; Ide 1982). Many scholars have explained conditions for the use of polite and plain forms on the basis of certain contextual properties such as a speaker-addressee axis (e.g. social status in age or rank, the degree of familiarity, and membership in *uchi* ('ingroup') and *soto* ('outgroup')) and the degree of formality of the speech situation (Minami 1987; Mizutani and Mizutani 1987; Shibata 1988; Tsujimura 1992; Kikuchi 1994).[3] Polite forms are said to be used: (a) when the speaker and addressee are in a formal situation; (b) when the speaker is expected to express deference to an addressee who is older or higher in status; and/or (c) when the speaker and addressee are unfamiliar with each other. On the contrary, plain forms are said to be used: (a) when the speaker and addressee are in an informal situation; (b) when the speaker and addressee are more or less of equal status; and/or (c) when the speaker and addressee are familiar with each other.

Ide's (1989) account of Japanese honorific usage has been the most influential but at the same time, rather controversial, as well. She explains Japanese honorific usage (including the use of polite and plain forms) based on the notion of *wakimae* ('discernment') that is "oriented mainly toward the wants to acknowledge the ascribed positions or roles of the participants as well as to accommodate to the prescribed norms of the formality of particular settings" (231). I call this account a "social-norm" based account, because, in Ide's sense, *wakimae* is knowing the social norms that are shared among people and it is

part of *wakimae* that speakers of Japanese use polite forms in social contexts as mentioned above.

In describing polite and plain forms as speech-level markers or in terms of certain contextual properties or *wakimae,* these studies tend to focus on direct and exclusive correspondences between linguistic form and contextual variables. There entails the (mis) conception that certain social situations causally determine the use of polite and plain forms in Japanese or that the use of linguistic form directly reflects social situations. So these accounts fail to provide an explanation for interlocutors' behavior under real conditions, for instance, one speaker's mixed use of polite and plain forms in a single utterance or the speaker's creativity in using language to alter interpersonal relationships and achieve special effects such as irony, sarcasm, or humor.

In order to account for irregular and unexpected uses of honorifics, some scholars approach Japanese honorific use from an individual speaker's perspective (Okamoto 1995, 1997, 2002; Pizziconi 2003). I call this a "speaker-centric" account, because they argue that the individual speaker ultimately determines the choice of linguistic form (Okamoto 2002: 102). In their view, variation among speakers and "deviant" uses of honorifics that they observed in their studies are due to each speaker's different ideas about what the most appropriate choice of linguistic form should be in a given situation. They claim that the choice of linguistic form depends on an individual speaker's "attitudes towards language use" and "linguistic ideologies" (Okamoto 1997: 809; Okamoto 2002: 102; Pizziconi 2003: 1499). Hence, different individuals use honorifics differently (Okamoto 2002: 102). By making the individual speaker the ultimate decision maker of honorific usage, the speaker-

centric account was attempting to overcome the problems of individual variation and non-normative uses of honorifics that the social-norm based account could not explain.

It seems to me, however, that the speaker-centric account relocates the operational center of honorific usage in the individual speaker's psychology, instead of the fixed properties of context or the social norm in the other account. The speaker-centric account seems to obscure the fact that the speaker is only one part of a social relationship. It underestimates social relations of participation in communications. To claim that the speaker makes the ultimate decision for honorific usage is to say that social and interactive contexts revolve fundamentally around the individual speaker. They take little consideration of a participation framework that includes not only the speaker but also the addressee as well as other coordinates such as referents, bystanders, and overhearers. The use of language including honorifics must apply to the entire participation framework, not just to the speaking subject alone.

Recent sociolinguistic studies on Japanese honorifics suggest that the use of polite forms does not always index the formality of the speech situation or the addressee's higher status. They show that the speaker uses polite and plain forms in order to express their momentary feelings (Ikuta 1983) and that multiple meanings of linguistic form arise out of situated social contexts (Maynard 1993; Okamoto 1995, 1997; Cook 1996, 1999). For example, Cook (1999) examines the mixed use of polite and plain forms in a television interview program and a neighborhood quarrel and finds differences in indexical meanings of these forms in the two contexts. In a television interview program, polite

forms signal the display of the speaker's acting in role on stage, while plain forms mark the interviewer's assessment of interlocutors' utterances. In a neighborhood quarrel, polite forms index the speaker's deference to the addressee or recognition of a status difference from the addressee, while plain forms index an absence of such addressee-deference. Thus, the use of linguistic form does not directly correspond to one meaning or fixed properties of context but it indexes multiple meanings that are created in interactive contexts (Maynard 1993; Smith 1992; Okamoto 1995, 1997; Wetzel 1994; Cook 1996, 1999; Matsumoto 2002; Sunaoshi 2004).

In the present paper, I use their claim as a point of departure and attempt to further the argument in the following ways. The present study first and foremost considers a participation framework (Goffman 1981) as a foundation of interaction where the act of language use occurs and where not only the speaker but also the addressee as well as other coordinates such as referents, bystanders, and overhearers coexist. Furthermore, the present study takes a 'socio-centric' (Hanks 1990) approach, by applying the unit of analysis to an interactional whole. This paper illustrates participants' collaborative efforts of using linguistic form, by suggesting that utterances are dialogically constructed in Bakhtin's sense (Bakhtin 1981) and that the act of using linguistic form is grounded on the relation between interlocutors. In other words, this study casts doubt on an egocentric view or what I termed a 'speaker-centric' view of language use that the individual speaker ultimately determines the choice of linguistic form in the pragmatics of Japanese (Okamoto 1995, 1997, 2002; Pizziconi 2002). The speaker is just one part in a social relation, and the use of linguistic

form is achieved by the relation, not the individual.[4]

The present study examines one speech situation in which context does not strictly require the speaker to use polite forms. The data and native speakers' metalinguistic commentaries suggest that the speaker's decision is insufficient for deciding speech forms. The speaker and addressee enter into relationships with other coordinates such as bystanders and overhearers who remain silent and construct themselves so as to negotiate their use of speech forms.

3. Garfinkel's breaching experiment and methodology

Goffman's work on American society illustrates that the articulation of norms, beliefs, and values is often possible only through the observation of violations such as gaffes and misfirings (Goffman 1967). For Goffman, the extreme cases are of interest, because of the light they shed on the normal ones. This Goffman's approach is not new to linguists. Linguists often analyze examples that are ungrammatical or not well-formed and compare them with grammatical and well-formed ones, in order to formulate rules that generate the grammaticality of a given language.

Garfinkel (1967) elaborated Goffman's approach to study extreme cases. He pioneered the methodology of a "breaching experiment," designed to break unstated social rules as a way of studying them. In order to uncover people's expectations or phenomenon that is "seen but unnoticed" (Garfinkel 1967: 36), ethnomenthodologists break rules or act as though they do not understand basic rules of social life so they can observe people's responses. For example, Garfinkel's students performed breaching experiments, by refusing to know what a bus driv-

er or their family members were saying and they demanded explanations and explanations of explanations. As a result, they brought ordinary conversations to an abrupt halt, got into a fight, and felt depressed by themselves. Their breaching experiments revealed that ordinary people follow unspoken social rules without conscious efforts and that knowing such rules are crucial in making our everyday interaction successful and comfortable.

In the research I summarize in this paper, I conducted a kind of a breaching experiment at a karaoke bar in Berkeley and tested people's expectations and the limits of tolerance toward the breaking of expectations about speech forms. A waitress at the bar and I were attending a Chinese class five days a week. The waitress was five years younger than me. We were not close friends, but when we met elsewhere, we talked to each other in plain forms. At the bar, I used plain forms with her. My purpose was to find out what is and is not usual, expected, and permissible in using such speech forms.

There is a methodological issue of conducting a breaching experiment. A critic might object that by using myself as one of the subjects and manipulating my linguistic choices consciously, I was creating an unreal situation and losing objectivity. The ideal way to test people's expectations and the limits of tolerance toward the breaking of expectations is to find a naturally-occurring event in which expectations are broken. However, it is never possible to predict when such an event happens. When it happens, I may not be present or may not carry a tape-recorder to record the event. Manipulating my own linguistic choices was the only way to observe participants' behaviors in an unexpected situation.

By conducting this experiment, I attempted to determine if the previous accounts of honorifics are valid in actual interactions. The interaction at the bar had taken place at a casual environment, the waitress and I were classmates and familiar with each other, and I was five years older than she was. According to the social-norm based account, it was a situation where I could use plain forms, because of the casual environment at the bar, the level of familiarity between us, and my age. But it was also a situation where polite forms would not be unusual, because of interaction as public discourse at a service-encounter. According to the speaker-centric account, I could decide to use plain forms to the waitress, again because of the casual environment at the bar, the level of familiarity between us, and my age. In other words, I was not strictly expected to use polite forms. Thus, it was a situation in which I could, with equal propriety, use either plain or polite forms.

In what follows, I examine whether a speaker in this context can in fact use any form of speech she wishes, and what or whether particular real-world aspects of interaction require the use of specific speech forms.

4. The setting and participants in the experiment

One evening in October 2003, I went to the karaoke bar with my close friends, Nobuko, 28, and Takayuki, 29. At the time of the recording, Nobuko and I were living in Berkeley, while Takayuki, who used to live there, was visiting. We had been to the bar together on several previous occasions; and therefore this bar was a natural place for us to have dinner and for me to observe participants' reactions.

The waitress and I were the primary ratified speaking participants. Nobuko and Takayuki were also ratified participants, although they were mostly silent when I was talking to the waitress. Customers and other employees were "unratified participants" (Goffman 1981:131–132), who were present at the bar but were not expected to be part of the communicative event that was happening at our table. While the interaction took place, two other customers were having dinner near our table. We and they could hear each other's conversations, even though it was not entirely audible. In the kitchen at the back of the bar, two people were working. When we entered the bar, these employees recognized and greeted us from the kitchen by bowing, but they could not hear our conversation. While recording the conversation, I did not have my MD-player visible.

5. Data analysis

In this section, I examine our interactions in chronological order. In representing my conversations with the waitress, I provide the conversational data in both Japanese and English. For the sake of saving space, in representing my conversations with Nobuko and Takayuki, I give only English translation of our conversation. My purpose is not to analyze Nobuko's and Takayuki's speech but to make use of their reactions and metalinguistic statements.[5]

When we entered the bar, Nobuko and Takayuki noticed that the waitress and I acknowledged each other as acquaintances. Nobuko, Takayuki, and I sat at the table and talked for a while before the waitress came.

（3）The waitress came to our table with water.

1	Waitress:	*ano go-chūmon wa o-kimari desu ka*?
		well HONP-order TOP HONP-decide COP:POL Q
		'Well, have you already decided（your）orders?'
2		*o-nomimono wa?*
		HONP-drink TOP
		'Any drink?'
3	Makiko:	*o-mizu de ī yo*
		HONP-water with good SFP
		'Water is fine.'
4		*o-mizu kuda a chōdai*
		HONP-water （please）oh give: IMP
		'Pl（ease), oh, give（us）water.'
5		*menū wa（0.4）mada kangaeteru kara ato de ne*
		menu TOP still think: PROG so later TEMP SFP
		'About menu,（0.4）(we're) still deciding, so, later.'
6	Waitress:	*a hai*
		well yes
		'Well, yes.'

In（3）, the waitress used the honorific prefix and the polite form, whereas I did not use polite forms at all.[6] If I had used speech forms of honorification, I would have added the polite form of the copula *desu* in line 3 between *ī* and *yo,* and used *kudasai* ('please: POL') instead of *chōdai* ('give: IMP') in line 4, and *onegai shimasu* ('I'd like to ask …') between *de* and *ne* in line 5. In the middle of line 4, I said *kuda,* the initial part of the polite form of the word *kudasai* ('please').

Saying *kudasai* was so automatic to me that I needed to make an extra effort to stop saying *kudasai* in the middle of the utterance and to say *chōdai* ('give: IMP') in a plain form.

After the waitress left, there were five seconds of silence at our table. Then Nobuko started talking, as in (4).

（4） 7   Nobuko: (0.5) Incredible, (0.3) Maki.

8   Makiko: What?

9   Nobuko: Don't say *chōdai*. Say *kudasai* or *onegai-shimasu*.

10   Makiko: Why?

11   Nobuko: After all she has to work. You (M)[7] are not her close friend.

12   Makiko: Yeah.

13   Takayuki: She was frozen. It's awkward for both of you (M & the waitress) to meet here.

14   Nobuko: That's right. Aren't you (M) writing your dissertation on honorifics?

15   Makiko: So?

16   Takayuki: So, speak with *desu* or *masu*!

17   Makiko: Okay.

18   Nobuko: Are you (M) really writing a dissertation on honorifics, Maki?

19   Takayuki: She (M) thinks about honorifics too much and gets confused. Or, this can be a new language among young people in Japan.

20   Nobuko: That's impossible.

21   Makiko: Okay, but tell me more.

22 Nobuko: You (M) don't understand the correct ways of using honorifics.

23 Makiko: What are the correct ways of using honorifics?

24 Takayuki: Ordering without honorifics means you are an obnoxious customer.

25 Makiko: But I'm a customer, a few years older than her, and I know her.

26 Takayuki: But you (M) aren't a middle-aged man. "Miss, give us water" is no good.

27 Makiko: Oh, the waitress is coming back. Can I order the usual dishes?

28 Nobuko: Use *desu* or *masu*. Well, I'll order, I'm worried about Maki.

In (4), Nobuko and Takayuki criticized the way I talked to the waitress in (3). They explicitly said that I should not say *cho:dai* ('give (me)') but *onegai-shimasu* ('(I) would like to ask (you)…') in the polite form, because the waitress and I were not close friends. In line 16, Takayuki told me to use *desu* or *masu,* namely, polite forms, as Nobuko told me the same in line 28. When Nobuko and Takayuki referred to honorifics (*keigo*) here, they only meant polite forms, and did not mean to include respectful and humble forms.

According to Takayuki in line 24, I should use polite forms to the waitress because 'speaking or ordering without honorifics means an obnoxious customer' (*keigo nashi de chuumon suru nante erabutteru kyaku jan*). In order to figure out why they thought I needed to use polite forms to the waitress, I tried to explain in line 25 that I was a cus-

tomer, older than the waitress, and personally acquainted with her. Then, Takayuki implied that only obnoxious middle-aged men would order without polite forms. In （4）, Nobuko and Takayuki explained that it is inappropriate for anyone to order in plain forms at a service encounter. Because I used plain forms to the waitress in （3）, Nobuko and Takayuki thought that I did not know the correct ways of using honorifics (*tadashii keigo no tsukai kata*), as they joked in lines 14, 18, and 22. Nobuko urged me to use *desu* and *masu* (polite forms) in line 28, when the waitress came back to our table.

In my second interaction with the waitress, I again deliberately talked to her in plain forms.

（5） 29 Makiko: *a chottō ano ne nasu no miso dengaku*
oh well well SFP eggplant GEN bean paste daubed
'Well, baked eggplants daubed with soy bean sauce,'

30 *saba no miso-ni ato wa*
mackerel GEN boiled with soy bean paste rest TOP
'Mackerel with soy bean paste, and …'

31 Nobuko: *tori no karāge to daikon sarada to*
chicken GEN fried and daikon salad and
'Deep fried chicken, daikon salad, and'

32 *okonomiyaki mikkusu no ika to butaniku de*
Japanese pizza mix GEN squid and pork INSTR
'Japanese pizza with squid and pork.'

33 Makiko: *ato gohan mo*
and rice too
'And rice, too.'

34   *a   honjitsu no   menū wa   nani?*

             oh today   GEN menu TOP what

             'Oh, what is today's menu?'

35 Waitress: *asoko ni   kaitearu mono ni nari   masu kedo*

             there LOC write   thing   become POL but

             'Today's menu is what is written there, though.'

36 Nobuko: *e jā   agedashi dōfu onegai   shimasu*

             oh then deep fried tofu HONP-ask do: POL

             'Oh, then, deep fried tofu, please.'

37 Waitress: ((writing the order)) *ijō   desu   ka?*

                                     above COP:POL Q

                                     'Is that all?'

38 Makiko: *un   ijō =*

              yeah above

              'Yeah, (that's) all.'

39 Nobuko: *= hai suimasen onegai   shimasu*

              yes sorry:POL HONP-ask do:POL

              'Yes, sorry, please.'

              ((the waitress was leaving our table))

40   *mō   maki-chan mittomonai kara yamete sugoi shitsurei*

             well Maki-DIM shameful   so   stop   very rude

             'Well, Maki, (it's) embarrassing, so stop (it).   It's very

             rude.'

In ordering food in lines 29 through 32, Nobuko and I omitted predi-
cates. In giving a list of food to order, customers often omit predi-
cates, so Nobuko's speech and my speech in these lines contain no cop-

ula in either polite or plain forms but it was not problematic. What
was problematic was that I omitted a predicate, meaning that I did
not use *desu*, the polite form of the copula in line 34, in asking about
the special menu. I ended my utterance without *desu* and the ques-
tion particle *ka*. In response to my question, the waitress used the po-
lite form *masu* in line 35. Nobuko immediately took her turn in line
36, as if she prevented me from interacting with the waitress. She
used *onegai shimasu* in the polite form. Lines 37 and 38 further show
the contrast between the waitress's speech and my speech. The wait-
ress used the polite form in line 37, whereas I did not use the polite
form *desu* in line 38. In line 39, Nobuko latched to my speech, apologiz-
ing and saying *onegai shimasu* again. Here, one of the customers at an-
other table also looked back and saw us. In the small space, he must
have heard my interaction with the waitress. In line 40, Nobuko continu-
ed her speech and criticized me for being rude in a loud voice.

Nobuko's speech in line 40 served to do the face-work (Goffman
1981) in several ways. First, Nobuko tried to protect the waitress who
talked to me in polite forms but was answered by me in plain forms.
Nobuko meant that the waitress did everything right, while saying
that it was my rudeness to talk to her in plain forms. In line 40, Nobuko's
voice was loud, because she was obviously making her speech reach
the waitress' ears, or speaking for the waitress' benefit. Second, Nobuko
showed that she knew how to behave and how to use honorifics,
unlike her friend. Nobuko criticized me to the waitress's face, so that
the waitress would know that at least Nobuko was a reasonable
human being. Thus, her direct criticism of me in the presence of the
waitress was saving the waitress's face and her own face as a co-

present participant as well as a friend of mine. This suggests that one speaker's action can have repercussions in the rest of the participants' actions and evaluations of the entire party.

In (6), after the waitress left, Nobuko and Takayuki talked about reasons why polite forms were necessary in my interaction with the waitress.

(6) 41　Takayuki: Is this an experiment? What happens if we are rude?

　　42　Nobuko:　We (N&T) feel embarrassed, if you (M) don't speak properly. Terrible.

　　43　Takayuki: I must say it's quite unbearable.

　　44　Nobuko:　Yes, I had to apologize. Talk to her as you (M) talk to professors.

　　45　Takayuki: That's unnecessary. Talking to professors is different from this.

　　46　Nobuko:　Why do we have to teach the linguist how to use honorifics? If we were typical Japanese, everyone would remain silent and later would say you're terrible. Because you (M) are with us, we can warn you!

　　47　Takayuki: I think we are experimental hamsters. She (M) does it on purpose. Look, she (M) is giggling! Experimental physicists do experiments in the laboratory, string theorists calculate in the office, so we are harmless researchers. These humanities guys do dangerous things out there!

　　48　Makiko:　Yes, people at this bar may report to the Human Subjects that there is a suspicious Japanese woman bully-

ing the vulnerable population!

49 Takayuki: See, she (M) admitted.

50 Makiko: No, no, no, no. I'm genuinely wondering. But so what?

51 Takayuki: For example, teachers are older, they are teachers, so we respect them although I didn't. Use honorifics to respectable people.

52 Makiko: Uh-huh, then, what about using honorifics at this dingy bar?

53 Nobuko: It's rude, if you don't. You (M) are saying "this dingy bar"!

54 Makiko: You (N) are the one who said this is a dingy bar! Anyway.

55 Nobuko: Waiters must use honorifics to customers, oh, but if this was a dingy bar in Japan.

56 Makiko: Like a bar along a national highway?

57 Nobuko: Yes, yes, yes, yes, there, waiters might not use honorifics.

58 Takayuki: Then, it's difficult to analyze. But because the waitress was using *desu* and *masu,* we should also use *desu* and *masu* to avoid needless offense. (0.6) There should be customers who wouldn't use honorifics, like middle-aged men.

59 Makiko: Why don't middle-aged men have to use honorifics?

60 Nobuko: They have to use honorifics. But some middle-aged women wouldn't use them, either, but it's unacceptable.

61 Makiko: Why?

62 Takayuki: I would feel uneasy to be with a strange friend.

63 Nobuko: Yes, we feel embarrassed and sorry for waiters.

64 Makiko: Then, did you (N&T) feel sorry for the waiters here?

65 Nobuko: I really felt so, and apologized.

66 Makiko: What do you (T) think the waiters are thinking now?

67 Takayuki: In the kitchen they are now talking about a strange cus-
          tomer today.

68 Makiko: What do the waiters think about you (T), Takayuki?

69 Takayuki: A friend of a strange person. It's fairly risky. First,
          the interlocutor feels bad. And other people will la-
          bel you as a strange person.

70 Makiko: What about people sitting at the same table?

71 Nobuko: Terrible, they feel like they are committing a crime.
          So I apologized.

72 Makiko: I see.

73 Nobuko: You (M) always speak properly, so I wonder what's
          wrong today.

74 Takayuki: So this has to be an experiment.

75 Nobuko: Maybe, but you (M) have to apologize later.

In (6), Takayuki and Nobuko pointed out the importance of linguis-
tic attunement (Takekuro 2005), in particular, alignment in the use of
the same speech forms among participants. Although Takayuki and
Nobuko admitted in lines 58 and 60 that some people might not use po-
lite forms at a service encounter, it is always safer for customers to
use polite forms when a waiter or a waitress uses polite forms, as

Takayuki claimed in line 58. When all speakers use the same speech forms, there is 'no chance of offense (*kado ga tatanai*).'

Furthermore, Nobuko and Takayuki talked about my use of speech forms from the co-present participants' perspective. In lines 42, 43, 63, 65, and 71, Nobuko and Takayuki mentioned that the co-present participants would feel ashamed and embarrassed, if one of their co-present participants would not try to show their consideration to the addressee. As they felt uneasy about my interaction with the waitress, my use of speech forms had repercussions in their feelings, because the speaker and the addressee form social relationships with co-present participants. Thus, the individual speaking subject who seems to be speaking and acting alone enters into social relations with other participants such as addressees, overhearers, or bystanders. Because of their co-engagement in interaction, if one speaker fails to show communicative competence, it not only means the speaker's lack of communicative competence but also creates confusion and offence among the entire party. It also suggests that the speaker's friends who are co-present at the scene are equally incompetent in communication, as Nobuko's and Takayuki's embarrassment attested.

As an ethnographer and a native speaker, I even felt uneasy and unnatural using plain forms to a waitress who was using polite forms. It was so unnatural that Takayuki immediately suspected that I must have been conducting an experiment. By my third exchange with the waitress in (7), I felt bad about causing offence to her and the other co-participants. When the waitress came back to our table, I switched to polite forms.

（7） 76   Waitress: *o-matase*   *shimashita*

                HONP-wait:PASS do:POL:PAST

                '(We) have kept (you) waiting.'

     77   *nasu*   *no*   *dengaku* to   *daikon sarada de gozaimasu*

                eggplant GEN daubed and daikon salad COP:SUPER.POL

                'These are eggplant daubed with soy paste and daikon

                salad.'

     78   Nobuko: h*ā*i

                yes

                'Yes.'

     79   Waitress: *torizara*   *wa?*

                each plate TOP

                '(How about) plates?'

     80   Makiko: *a*   *hai onegai*   *shimasu*

                oh yes HONP-ask do:POL

                'Yes, please.'

     81   Waitress: hai

                yes

                'Yes.'

     82   Makiko: *suimasen*

                sorry:POL

                'Thank you.'

                'Yes.'

（8） The waitress left the table.

     83   Takayuki: Wow!

     84   Nobuko: Wonderful!

85   Takayuki: Wonderful!

86   Makiko: How was my speech?

87   Takayuki: It was good. I was relieved.

88   Nobuko: Me, too.

In lines 76 and 77, the waitress talked to us in polite forms. In lines 80 and 82, I talked back to her in polite forms. I showed alignment with her speech. Nobuko and Takayuki heard me speak to her in polite forms and expressed relief, as Takayuki stated in line 87.

To summarize, the conditions for the use of speech forms do not depend exclusively on the speaker-addressee relationship. Rather, the examples have suggested that speech forms are used to indicate a speaker's consideration for other participants, including the addressee. Not all interaction between two participants of different ages would create communication breakdowns like the example presented in this section. However, when speakers are in doubt, the use of polite forms may be safer.

6. Concluding remarks

In this paper, I have used Garfinkel's method of conducting a breaching experiment and examined a situation in which the speaker appeared to have freedom to use either polite or plain forms. I interacted with the waitress's use of polite forms in plain forms, while everyone expected me to show alignment with the waitress's use of polite forms. Based on this experiment and the subjects' metalinguistic statements, I showed that the presence of other coordinates such as bystanders and overhearers plays a significant role in the speaker's and ad-

dressee's use of speech forms. I have specifically made the following two points.

First, linguistic alignment among interlocutors is a key in understanding the reason why the co-present participants felt uneasy during my interaction with the waitress. Since I did not attempt to align with the waitress linguistically, my use of plain forms to the waitress made all the participants at the scene uncomfortable. My failure to align with the waitress's speech caused offence and disgust among the party. Later when I explained to the waitress that I was doing an experiment, she confessed that she had complex feelings about my use of plain forms and wondered if she had offended me at the initial stage of our interaction. Not only the waitress but also my friends, the co-present participants, felt unbearable or uncomfortable, sorry, and guilty. Furthermore, as Nobuko and Takayuki warned me, others who might say nothing to my face could judge me as a rude person.

When one speaker's utterance contains polite forms, even though that speaker is older or socially higher than, or familiar with the interlocutor, it may be safer for the latter to use polite forms so that offense is avoided, as Takayuki suggested in the experiment. Since polite forms conventionally index the speaker's deference toward the addressee, when one speaker uses polite forms, it is safer for the other to respond with a similar show of respect. This, however, does not mean that service-providers and customers always use polite forms at a service encounter. Sukle (1994) analyzed interactions at a vegetable market in a local neighborhood. There, vendors and customers used plain forms more frequently than they used polite forms. People at the local vegetable market used plain forms to each other, in order to indi-

cate that they were tuned into the situated interaction and to augment their feeling of connectedness. Such linguistic alignment should be regarded as interactive ends that help reach interlocutors' successful communication and better interpersonal relationships.

Second, many, if not all, speeches that might be seen as the product of one speaker, are in fact the collaborative work of several participants. In the series of interactions with the waitress, it looked as if I had control over which speech forms to use, since I knew her, was a couple of years older than her, and the speech situation was informal. However, by using plain forms, I made not only the waitress but also all copresent participants feel awkward, and received silent disapproval from bystanders who were dining at another table. My choice had negative consequences -so, in a sense, I had no real choice. The actual speaker and addressee were not the only people who entered into the discursive relations and experienced the consequences of their speeches. The presence of audience and bystanders plays a significant role in the speaker's and addressee's choices of speech forms.

Honorific usage in Japanese is about participants' figuring out where to locate themselves in relation to addressees, referents, and audience and how to respond to others' honorific usage. Competent interlocutors are able to adapt to new situations, by receiving and giving signals. By incorporating Goffman's participation framework into the analysis of honorific use, results presented in this paper make clear that the use of polite or plain forms of speech produced by one individual is actually the agreement and achievement of the group engaged in interaction.

（注）

（1） To find more discussions on structural patterns and semiotic and seman-
tic properties of referent honorifics, one should look elsewhere （Harada
1976; Shibatani 1990）.

（2） The following grammatical abbreviations are used in this paper: COP＝
copula, DIM＝diminutive, GEN＝genitive, HONP＝honorific prefix, IMP＝
imperative, INSTR＝instrumental, LOC＝locative, PASS＝passive, PAST＝
past tense, POC＝polite form, SFP＝sentence final particle, SUB＝subject,
SUPER.POL＝super-polite form, TEMP＝temporal, and TOP＝topic.

（3） The terms "formality" and "formal" are used to apply not to the speaker,
addressee, referent, participants, or content of speech but to the descrip-
tion of the speech situation. Formal speech situations are mostly ceremo-
nial occasions that have opening and closing statements, public speeches,
lectures, seminars, conference talks, and classroom talks, often with plural
addressees.

（4） Here, I neither make a claim that the use of linguistic form in Japanese
is not rule-governed, nor reject the speaker's agency. But available treat-
ments are insufficient to integrate diverse facets of the phenomena includ-
ing ambiguous and atypical uses of polite and plain forms. There is there-
fore a need for a different framework that is pragmatically revealing.

（5） For the entire conversation transcribed in the Roman alphabet, word-for-
word glosses, and free translations into English, please refer to Takekuro
（2005）.

（6） I used the beautification honorific prefix *o-* in lines 3 and 4. The beauti-
fication honorific prefix is different from the honorific prefix *o-* or *go-* that
is used to refer to objects that are worthy of respect.

（7） In the parentheses, the capital letter specifies the individual referent.
The letter M stands for Makiko, S for Nobuko, and T for Takayuki. When
the second personal pronoun refers to people in general, there is no indica-
tion of the specific referent.

References

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1975 [1981]. *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. In M. Holqu-
ist, trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1976. Linguistic politeness axes: Speaker-addressee, speaker-

referent, speaker-bystander. *Pragmatics microfiche* 1.7: A3. Department of
Linguistics: University of Cambridge.

Cook, Haruko M. 1996. Japanese language socialization: Indexing the mode of
self. *Discourse Processes* 22: 171–197.

Cook, Haruko M. 1999. Situational meanings of Japanese social deixis:The
mixed use of the *masu* and plain forms. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*
8 : 87–110.

Garfinkel, Harold. 1967. *Studies in ethnomethodology.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Pren-
tice-Hall.

Goffman, Erving. 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior.* New
York: Anchor Books.

Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experi-
ence.* Northeastern University Press.

Goffman, Erving. 1979. Footing. *Semiotica* 25: 1 –29.

Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of talk.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania
Press.

Hanks, William F. 1990. *Referential practice: Language and lived space among the
Maya.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Harada, Shinichi. 1976. Honorifics. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *Syntax and se-
mantics 5 : Japanese generative grammar,* 499–561. New York: Academic
Press.

Hinds, John. 1978. Conversational structure: An investigation based on Japa-
nese interview discourse. In John Hinds and Irvin Howard (eds.), *Problems
in Japanese syntax and semantics,* 79–121. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.

Ide, Sachiko. 1982. Japanese sociolinguistics: Politeness and women's language.
Lingua 57: 357–385.

Ide, Sachiko. 1989. Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of lin-
guistic politeness. *Multilingua* 8 – 2 / 3 : 223–248.

Ikuta, Shoko. 1983. Speech level shift and conversational strategy in Japanese
discourse. *Language Sciences* 5 : 37–53.

Kikuchi, Yasuto. 1994. *Keigo* [Honorifics]. Tokyo: Koudansha.

Martin, Samuel E. 1964. Speech levels in Japan and Korea. In Dell Hymes (ed.),
Language in culture and society, 407–415. New York: Harper and Row.

Matsumoto, Yoshiko. 1989. Politeness and conversational universals: Observa-
tions from Japanese. *Multilingua* 8 – 2 / 3 : 207–221.

Matsumoto, Yoshiko. 1997. The rise and fall of Japanese nonsubject honorifics: The case of 'o-Verb-suru.' *Journal of Pragmatics* 28: 719–740.

Matsumoto, Yoshiko. 2002. Gender identity and the presentation of self in Japanese. In Sarah Benor, Mary Rose, Devyani Sharma, Julie Sweetland, and Qing Zhang（eds.）, *Gendered practices in language,* 339–352. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Maynard, Senko K. 1993. *Discourse modality: Subjectivity, emotion and voice in the Japanese language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Minami, Fujio. 1987. *Keigo* [Honorifics]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Mizutani, Osamu and Nobuko Mizutani. 1987. *How to be polite in Japanese*. Tokyo: The Japan Times.

Neustupny, J. V. 1978. *Post-structural approaches to language: Language theory in a Japanese context.* Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Okamoto, Shigeko. 1995. Situated politeness: Manipulating honorific and non-honorific expressions in Japanese conversations. *Pragmatics* 9 : 51–74.

Okamoto, Shigeko. 1997. Social context, linguistic ideology, and indexical expressions in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28: 795–817.

Okamoto, Shigeko. 2002. Ideology and social meanings: Rethinking the relationship between language, politeness, and gender. In Sarah Benor, Mary Rose, Devyani Sharma, Julie Sweetland, and Qing Zhang（eds.）, *Gendered practices in language,* 1 –23. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Pizziconi, Barbara. 2003. Re-examining politeness, face and the Japanese language. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 1471–1506.

Shibata, Takeshi. 1988. *Nihonjin no keigo* [The honorifics of the Japanese]. *Kokubungaku* 33: 6 –10.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1990. *The languages of Japan.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, Janet（Shibamoto）. 1992. Women in charge: Politeness and directives in the speech of Japanese women. *Language in Society* 21: 59–82.

Sukle, Robert J. 1994. *Uchi/soto*: Choices in directive speech acts in Japanese. In Jane M. Bachnik and Charles J. Quinn, Jr.（eds.）, *Situated meaning: Inside and outside in Japanese self, society, and language,* 113–142. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Sunaoshi, Yukako. 2004. Farm women's professional discourse in Ibaraki, Japan. In Shigeko Okamoto and Janet Shibamoto Smith（eds.）, *Japanese language,*

gender, and ideology: Cultural models and real people, 187–204. Oxford: Oxford
University Press.

Takekuro, Makiko. 2005. *Attunement in interaction: Sequential use of Japanese honorifics.* Ph.D. dissertation. The University of California, Berkeley.

Tsujimura, Toshiki. 1992. *Keigo ronkō* [Theories of keigo]. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.

Wetzel, Patricia J. 1994. A movable self: The linguistic indexing of *Uchi* and
Soto. In Jane M. Bachnik and Charles J. Quinn, Jr. (eds.), *Situated meaning: Inside and outside in Japanese self, society, and language,* 73–87. Princeton,
New Jersey: Princeton University Press.