ETIQUETTE IN INTERCULTURAL SITUATIONS:

A JAPANESE BUSINESS LUNCHEON

Helen E. Marriott

Monash University

INTRODUCTION

The internationalization of business in the contemporary world has resulted in a tremendous increase in the amount of contact between business personnel from different cultures. To date, only a negligible amount of research has focussed upon this vital area of intercultural contact. This paper is specifically concerned with contact between Japanese and Australian businessmen but no doubt many of the findings are of relevance to speakers of other varieties of English. An early study on communication problems in Australian-Japanese business relations (Murie 1976) revealed that there was indeed a range of problems which characterized these business contact situations.

One of the most important issues in intercultural contact, including business situations, is that of etiquette or politeness (Neustupny 1968, 1986). While various publications (e.g. Rowlands 1985) provide guidelines for business personnel on polite behavior, rigorous and systematic investigations of cross-cultural as well as of intercultural politeness strategies (cf. Sakamoto & Naotsuka 1982) are rare. Even though Brown and Levinson's (1987) thorough treatment of politeness strategies has significantly enhanced our understanding of the breadth of politeness phenomena, much more analytic work is still needed in order to interpret the behavior of participants in actual intercultural situations.

Interpersonal or face-to-face contact is paramount in the business domain. Apart from business situations such as "meetings", "courtesy calls", "conferences", and "negotiations", an extremely important situation is one which involves a meal:

either a business luncheon or a business dinner. This paper will examine the interaction which occurs at a business luncheon. The examination concerns not a native, Japanese business luncheon, that is, one where all the participants are Japanese, but a contact or intercultural situation involving foreign participants, apart from the Japanese.

In the English literature, Befu's (1974) research on meal situations stands alone, providing as it does, some important insights into the norms which are characteristic of Japanese internal situations. While the particular focus of this paper is upon etiquette or politeness, approached from a sociolinguistic perspective, the principal objective is to analyze the norms (or rules) applied by both the Japanese and the Australian participants in the intercultural situation. Such an approach is motivated by the necessity to investigate the processes which are found in situations of intercultural contact, and accordingly, an analysis of actual behavior is undertaken. Since the base language used is English, (the Australian variety of English), the Australians are described as the native speakers, and conversely, the Japanese as the non-native participants. Needless to say, this examination of the application of norms is also concerned with the violation of appropriate norms.

Past studies falling under the rubric of second language acquisition, interlanguage, transference or the like have not uncommonly been characterized by the assumption that non-native participants move in the direction of the target cultural system. At the same time, it has been generally assumed that native participants continue to apply native norms. My study, however, does not provide confirmation of the above two suppositions. On the contrary, it reveals that the intercultural contact situation is a highly complex one. As the result of an in-depth analysis of interaction between Japanese and Australian participants in business situations - meetings, courtesy calls, negotiations, conferences and business luncheons - four main processes have been identified: the application of English norms, the application of Japanese norms, interculture, pidginization, or a combination of any of these (Neustupny 1982, 1985b, 1986, 1987; Marriott 1988a, 1988b). These processes are used in the generation of a participant's behavior, and also in his evaluation of the behavior of other interactants as well as of his own.

Transference and Interference

Although it is reasonable to assume that English norms of interaction would predominate in Australian-Japanese contact situations, the following analysis will demonstrate that this process alone does not account for the generation of all behavior, either for the non-native or even for the native participant. Indeed, the Japanese cultural system is an important source, particularly for the Japanese participant, since, apart from linguistic transfer, there is strong evidence of

communicative and cultural transfer. Both the terms transference and interference are used in this paper following the usage whereby positive or neutral transfer is referred to as transference, while negative transfer is labelled as interference (Richards, Platt and Weber 1985: 160). To a lesser extent, the Japanese cultural system is also the source of norms for the Australian participant who may borrow from that system.

Interculture

As my examination concerns broad social intercultural competence, which, of necessity, includes linguistic and communicative competence, I employ the term "interculture" rather than "interlanguage" to refer to the interim rule systems which characterize the behavior of participants in intercultural situations (Corder 1967, 1971; Nemser 1971; Selinker 1972). This term is chosen because it clearly covers verbal as well as non-verbal behavior. Under the early studies of interlanguage it was, of course, only linguistic behavior which was studied; Neustupny (1982: 63; 1986) was the first to note the applicability of this concept of interlanguage to non-verbal behavior. Although there exists terminological confusion over interlanguage which is used in two ways, I follow the narrower definition which refers to the learner's linguistic approximative rule system, rather than the broader interpretation which embraces all the processes characterizing a learner's behavior. In my version the term interculture has been coined to cover the approximate rules pertaining to communicative and sociocultural behavior, and as such, the concept is inclusive of interlanguage. Recent work on Australian-Japanese contact situations reveals that interculture represents a major process in interaction (Neustupny 1982: 62, 1986: 49, 1987: 203; Marriott 1988a: 19; 1988b). Interculture, however, does not only characterize the behavior of the Japanese participant, but also that of the Australian interactant.

Pidginization

The fourth main process identified in the contact situation is pidginization: that is, the simplification or reduction of linguistic, communicative or sociocultural rules. The notion is similarly used in explication of the behavior of either the foreign (that is, the Japanese) or the native (Australian) participant; the process may operate upon norms of the base system or the non-base system, or even on the interculture rules. Under this process, an interactant typically returns to a pre-adult stage and follows behavior which, as the result of the lack of application of appropriate norms, characteristically represents extreme simplification.

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

The data upon which the study is based is of two types: video-tape recordings of two business luncheons (as well as of other business situations) and many interviews with Australian and Japanese businessmen, both in Australia and Japan. Of significance is the use of the video-tape recorder, for it permitted the accumulation of data of naturally occurring interaction. The two business luncheons which are labelled BE3 (BE for business encounter) and BE6 took place in a Japanese restaurant in Melbourne in December 1984. In each situation there were two Australian and two Japanese businessmen. (A capital letter [either "A" or "J"] is used to represent the speech community of the participants; a small "a" or "b" refers to differences in status - "a" being the superordinate, and "b" the subordinate.) Some background details are provided in Table 1 (see next page). The Australian company (ComA3) in BE3 is a prominent accounting corporation which provides services, particularly advice upon taxation affairs, to ComJ3, a large Japanese trading corporation. On this occasion, the Australians had extended the business luncheon invitation to the Japanese. Although the four members of the encounter are acquainted with each other, the relationship between A3b (the subordinate Australian) and J3b (the subordinate Japanese) is somewhat more intimate than any other dyadic combination: they are directly involved in mutual business tasks and previously have participated together in three business luncheons.

The Japanese corporation of ComJ6 in BE6 is similarly a large trading organization. Interaction between ComJ6 and ComA6, a large multi-national company, is quite intense with ComJ6 performing a liaison role between the Melbourne ComA6 and various corporations located in Japan. J6a interacts frequently with A6a and A6b, routinely at the respective offices of the Australians. They initiate business luncheons several times a year between themselves, where the role of host generally rotates. BE6 is the occasion for J6a, as host of the business luncheon, to introduce a newly arrived subordinate, J6b, to the representative personnel of ComA6, with whom J6b will thereafter have regular interaction. The context of BE6 consequently represents one of intercorporate network consolidation, together with network initiation. That of BE3 is also typical of network reinforcement: members of the Australian accounting corporation seek to re-affirm their relationship with the Japanese trading corporation.

As noted above, these business luncheons were recorded on video-tape. The recording equipment was assembled prior to the commencement of each business encounter and the full sequence, including preliminary conduct such as entry to the room, through to the end of the encounter was recorded. The same Japanese restaurant provided the venue for both business luncheons, and further, the same private room was available. This consisted of an independent double room

Table 1

FEATURES OF THE BUSINESS LUNCHEONS

No. of encounter	Companies		Individuals	Status (& Age)	Length of appointment in Australia	Educational level
BE3 5/12/84	ComA3 (host)	(Aust)	A3a A3b	partner (38) manager (31)		university university
	ComJ3	(Jap)	J3a J3b	manager (45) manager (31)	8 years 3 years	university university
BE6 18/12/84	ComJ6 (host)	(Jap)	J6a J6b	senior manager (36) manager (34)	1.5 years 1 month	university university
	ComA6	(Aust)	A61 A6b	director (52) manager (38)		college college

containing two low tables and a tatami mat floor. Recording equipment was arranged on one low table, with the camera tripod standing on top. The rationale presented to the companies which permitted the video-recording of the encounters was a broad and general one: I specified that my interest lay in the verbal and non-verbal communication between Australian and Japanese business personnel. At no stage was my specialized concern with politeness phenomena divulged.

Although some allowance may be necessary for interference or "noise" due to the recording equipment, I wish to claim that the data is "natural" (or as natural as possible). Considerable reduction of interference is possible in a context such as this: each of the encounters is long, approximately two hours in duration, and moreover, in the multi-activity setting, the interactants are engaged in a variety of eating and drinking activities in addition to participation in conversation. These factors may result in the consciousness of the interactants of the non-ratified participants (the operators of the video-equipment) and accompanying instruments being considerably weakened if not

even lost (Kendon 1979: 76). One huge advantage of using sophisticated video-technology is that the flow of behavior

may be reinspected in slow motion, permitting microscopic frame-by-frame analysis, and a transcript can subsequently be produced. Since some extracts from the transcripts are contained in this paper an explanation about two of the main notations is in order: non-verbal components and other explanatory commentary are enclosed in single parentheses; items enclosed within double parentheses are in doubt.

MAIN FINDINGS

A business luncheon can be divided into a number of principal interactive segments or stages, each of which contains further sub-segments. The segments of the two business luncheons, which form the basis of the data, are as follows:

1. invitation (planning and transmission);
2. opening (arrival, greetings/introductions and seating);
3. discourse;
4. selection (of beverages and meal items);
5. consumption activities (drinking and eating); and
6. closing (appreciation, closing salutations and departure).

Although these segments occur in consecutive order, that of "discourse" appears superimposed on the other segments.

Some of the main findings are presented for each of these segments. A more detailed study is available elsewhere (Marriott, 1988a).

Invitation Segment

Obviously the Japanese businessmen in Australia acquire new Australian norms. For instance, the initiation of, and participation in lengthy business luncheons, together with the systematic issuance of invitations in advance characterizes the behavior of the Japanese participants of BE6. Likewise, the Japanese in BE3 are involved in a business luncheon similarly lasting two hours in length. My reported data reveals that in Japan, on the contrary, evening dinner functions are greatly preferred over lunchtime meal engagements, and that not infrequently, an invitation will be issued just prior to the event. Such "instantaneous" invitations are not positively evaluated by the majority of Australian informants in an Australian context. With regard to the invitation

segment for BE3 and BE6, however, there is no evidence of the application of such Japanese norms, and neither is there any indication of the presence of interculture.

On the other hand, a significant case of pidginization exists in the selection by the Australian hosts of BE3 of a Japanese restaurant as the luncheon venue. Due to lack of previous experience at Japanese restaurants, neither A3a nor A3b could implement the set of sociocultural rules necessary in such a culturally-specific setting: they lacked the competence, for example, to arrange the seating order, to initiate and coordinate the selection of beverages and meal items, or to communicate with the waitress. Thus, their selection of this type of restaurant did not take the important factor of cultural competence into consideration.

Opening Segment

The opening of a business luncheon incorporates the components of arrival, greetings, introductions where these are included, as well as seating. No detailed analysis of the arrival behavior, including greetings, was possible for BE3 since all four businessmen entered the restaurant together. In this case of BE6, the Australians entered first and, following the arrival of the two Japanese participants, there was an exchange of greetings, and also an introduction of the Japanese businessman newly arrived in Melbourne. The data reveals evidence of some acquisition by the Japanese businessmen of English norms. Essentially, this involved the engagement in a handshake by both Japanese participants and the verbalization of English routines for greetings and introductions, both of these types of acts representing principal expressions of politeness in the English communicative system. Nevertheless, there are serious deficiencies in the production of the verbal routines by the Japanese businessmen, seemingly due to the influence of Japanese norms. The data for this sequence is reproduced below in fragment (1):

Fragment 1

1		(A6a and A6b arrive and wait in the pre-booked
2		encounter area. J6a enters the room followed J6b.)
3	J6a:	Ah A6a (FN) san very very sorry.
4		(Extending his arm, J6a moves towards A6a who
5		also advances and extends his arm)

A6a: Nice to see you.

(A6a and J6a engage in a long handshake with 5 up-and-down movements. In the meantime, J6b has progressed forward, having extended his arm after entry to the room.)

J6b: Ah so sorry, I, I'm pleased to meet you.

(J6b and A6a shake hands)

A6a: Pleased to meet you.

(After the handshake commences, J6a raises his left hand with his palm facing upwards in the direction of J6b)

J6a: J6b (English FN and SN).

A6a: J6b (English FN and SN). J6b (English FN).

(A6b moves forward from behind A6a; J6b also advances)

J6b: J6b (SN) is my name. Pleased to meet you.

(A6b and J6b shake hands)

J6b: Nice to make your acquaintance.

(pause).

In the above sequence interference is observed in the speech acts of the Japanese. For instance, in one case an apology routine is used in place of a greeting (line 3), and in

another, an apology prefaces an introductory greeting (line 11). Repetition by the Japanese businessman of his own name (line 20) subsequent to an

introduction from a third party is another communicative feature characteristically found in an introduction sequence in the Japanese system, but not in English.

Following on from the above quoted sequence is an elaborate exchange of business cards, first between A6a and J6b, and then between A6b and J6b. A detailed examination of this business card exchange reveals that the Australians have acquired from the Japanese system a number of etiquette rules relating to presentation and exchange: for example, adequate preparation of their card as soon as another interactant triggers presentation; a hand-to-hand exchange; performance of a slight bow as the exchange occurs; and giving visual attention to the received card. My analysis shows, furthermore, that one Australian businessman, A6a, has acquired a slightly fuller set of rules than the other Australian: he stores his card in a special business card wallet; after receipt of his partner's card he discusses the content of the card; and he temporarily deposits the card on the table prior to storing it in his suit at a later stage in the encounter.

Interculture is evident in this section of the data. With regard to the handshake, already noted as an important etiquette component in an English greeting or introduction, my analysis reveals that vigorous adoption of this norm has been undertaken by both the Japanese in BE6. Nonetheless, there is over-generalization whereby inappropriate timing, in the form of preparation commencing too soon (lines 8-10), marks the behavior of one participant and, in the case of the other, there is possible over-intensity of the handshake (lines 7-8). These cases indicate the presence of interculture deriving from rules which obviously have their source in the English communicative system. The actual combination of a handshake and the exchange of business cards, both central features in an introduction sequence in the respective cultural systems, represents another form of interculture in the contact situation.

Interculture, specifically interlanguage, is also found in the discourse of the Japanese businessmen. This occurs, for instance, when the speaker fails to use a reduced form of the introduction routine, "I'm pleased to meet you" (line 11) in the opening sequence; in Australian English, the pattern "Pleased to meet you", as exemplified by the Australian speaker in line 20, represents the unmarked form. Use of the pattern "is my name" (line 20) is a further example of interlanguage in the opening sequence. Application of this process of interculture is again observed in the type of reference forms used by the Japanese businessmen in the contact situation: in both cases, the Japanese speakers in BE6 had pre-selected English first names as reference forms for themselves. Avoidance of their actual Japanese first names occurs due to strong constraints upon such usage in the Japanese system, and approximative behavior in the form of selection of an English name arises. Use of the Australian's first name by one Japanese speaker (J6a) as the form of address

appears to be in accordance with the English norm. This is not so, however, since it is used in combination with the Japanese suffix "san". It can be argued, then, that such a pattern of first name plus "san" originates from both cultural systems. This is a significant finding, for it adds to a commonly held assumption that interlanguage has its source in the target cultural system represented in the contact situation. My findings reveal that an interculture form may actually be derived from either linguistic system or, as in this instance, from both sources.

The behavior of the Australians in these contact situations is also characterized by interculture. Firstly, with regard to the selection of language for use on their business cards, I propose that over-generalization by the Australians in BE6 of the need to translate the full message (including their Melbourne address) into Japanese is a type of interculture; it is a practice which displays lack of attention to variation and, in this case, inappropriate replication of a strategy applicable only to a setting in Japan. Secondly, presentation of the Japanese language side of their business card by both Australians can further be seen as exemplification of interculture: although the shared language is English, it is the Japanese written side of their card which they present.

The opening sequence contains, as well, a wide range of pidginized behavior for the Japanese participants. Firstly, with regard to the greetings and introduction interchange, a Japanese businessman (J6a) fails to greet one of the two Australians (A6b), an omission constituting a serious violation of etiquette. The same Japanese interactant also omits a verbal greeting to the Australian with whom he vigorously shakes hands. This is probably due to the fact that, as noted above, in the slot where a greeting would have been appropriate, he makes an apology (line 3). The other Japanese participant, J6b, also deviates from the Australian norm with regard to timing, for he commences an introduction of himself to the Australian too soon (line 11), not allowing J6a to first perform the introduction. In a further instance, J6b exhibits reduced behavior when undertaking an introduction of J6b to the Australian in that he fails to announce the name of the latter (line 16).

Instances of pidginization are also evident in the behavior of the Australian businessmen. A6a fails to state his own name in the introduction frame. This is necessary in the context, since J6a, who initiates the introduction, does not perform the function. In place of this, the Australian repeats the name of his Japanese interactant in response (line 17); such repetition would not constitute normal behavior for him.

In the actual act of sitting down, loss of physical poise characterizes the four Australians of BE3 and BE6. Further, with regard to seating, the Australians in both BE3 and BE6 lose the English norm which relates to the role of host and guest in the management of this act. The Japanese participants in BE3, who are the

actual guests, assume this role by selecting the positions for their Australian "hosts". Needless to say, the seating order implemented by the Japanese participant emanates from a norm originating in the Japanese cultural system (Marriott forthcoming). The interaction is contained in fragment (2):

Fragment 2

1	J3a:	(( ))
2	A3b:	Over this side?
3	J3a:	No no you should sit here.
4		(J3a stretches out his arm and points to the far side of
5		the table. Simultaneously, J3b has his right arm
6		extended inviting A3a to also sit on the far side of the
7		table.)
8	A3a:	I sit on that side.
9		(He continues to move around the table)
10	J3a:	Yeh I think please.
11		(J3a moves down the entrance side of the table and J3b
12		takes up a position next to him).

In similar manner, at the other business luncheon A6a, the Australian guest, undertakes the function of seat allocation. The behavior of A6a and of the Japanese in BE3 can be attributed to interculture whereby, for different reasons, these participants assume new functions for themselves. The Japanese businessmen in BE6 fail to fulfil the host role by inviting their guests to sit, so A6a assumes the additional role of initiating the seating act in order to make up for such reduced behavior. But, in so doing, this Australian simultaneously loses the constraints which apply to a guest. Likewise, there

is reduced behavior on the part of the Australians in BE3 as they easily relinquish arrangement of the seating.

Discourse

Following an analysis of the conversation which took place during the two video-recorded business luncheons, a number of common discourse categories were identified: "company", "regulation" (including greetings and leave-taking, selection of meal and beverage items, issuance of orders to the waitress, and correction frames related to selection and eating activity), "consumption" (covering other eating and drinking issues), "Japanese culture", "personal experiences", and, in the case of BE3, also "economy" and "politics".

A considerable portion of the discourse content produced by the Japanese participants is due to transfer from the Japanese or to the processes of interculture or pidginization. The corollary of this is that certain topics which are preferred topics for Australian speakers do not assume predominance in the discourse of the Japanese participants. For instance, although there is some development of personalized topics by the Japanese interactants, their participation is much weaker than that of the Australians, indicating that they have not yet fully acquired this important English rule. This is due to transfer of a native Japanese pattern; personalized topics are not preferred topics between newly acquainted conversationalists and receive an evaluation of inadequacy. By contrast, there is a definite preference by Australian businessmen for topics of a personalized nature: these topics include holidays, overseas experiences, and especially family. In English, the introduction of content of this nature is a means of expressing positive politeness and, in accordance with Australian rules of interaction, it reduces distance between participants at their first encounter.

There is also evidence to indicate the possible acquisition of Japanese discourse topics by one of the Australian businessmen. I propose that such tendencies as the prolongation of dialogue focussing upon a new participant in the interacting network, together with the choice of contact topics, especially those concerning mutual acquaintances, are stronger in the Japanese communicative system. The fact that one Australian in BE6 displayed these characteristics is therefore perhaps attributable to his acquisition of Japanese conversational norms.

The largest proportion of discourse topics in the two business luncheons concerns company topics, in other words, business matters. While much variation in discourse topics can be assumed depending upon factors such as participants, purpose of the encounter and so forth, support for the generalized folk assertion that business matters are not raised in hospitality situations is not substantiated upon the basis of my data. That company topics are furthermore initiated by both the Australian and the Japanese parties suggests the acceptability of these topics to participants from both

cultural systems. It may be, however, that a greater proportion of discourse is devoted to company topics in this type of contact

situation, rather than in an internal situation. Such being the case, the quantity of this category rather than its actual nature may indicate the existence of the process of interculture.

Likewise, the greater proportion of regulation topics which concern correction of knowledge about the meal items or the manner of eating, and also those topics classified as consumption topics can be attributed to the process of interculture, for, while such topics are also characteristic of discourse in the respective cultural systems, such a high proportion as that found in my data is unexpected. I further suggest that the tendency for Japanese speakers to develop either topics relating to Japan or topics of a cross-cultural comparative nature is due to interculture. Apart from the specific category of topics classed as "Japanese culture", this theme pervades much of the discourse content of the other categories of topics. In total, then, across both encounters topics about Japan were quite conspicuous.

The process of pidginization is also evident in the discourse content of the two business luncheons. Although we could expect the hosts to supply the greater amount of topics, this does not occur in either situation. Clearly in BE3, where the Japanese businessmen almost totally assume the role of hosts, there is excessive input into the production of topics, much of which is linguistically deviant. Previous studies (Marriott 1978: 12-15; Asaoka 1987: 21-22) identified the process of pidginization in the management of topic by Japanese speakers of English, but there the problem was the minimal amount of actual participation in conversation. Here, contrary conduct is identified: input is excessive rather than meagre. In the second business luncheon, the lesser development of topics by the Japanese hosts can also be attributed to some influence of pidginization on their part. On the other hand, an evaluation of increased responsibility for the development of topics by the native speakers of English is attributed to the process of interculture. In both BE3 and BE6 the existence of pidginization of topic whereby both the Japanese and the Australians exhibit a lack of co-operation in developing some of the conversation is also evident.

Although I suggested that the relatively high proportion of regulation topics, particularly those concerned with correction relating to the Japanese meal, is indicative of interculture, the excessive correction undertaken by one Japanese participant in BE3 to repeatedly explain in full such matters as the components of the meal items and manner of eating could be attributed to pidginized behavior. Pidginization occurs since the Japanese businessman loses the normal constraints against correction of another adult and engages in over-correction.

Selection Activity

According to Australian etiquette norms, at a business luncheon of the type examined here, each participant generally has the right to nominate his preferred beverage and meal items, and usually it is the function of the host to coordinate this activity. A number of deviations from the norm occur in the sequences of BE3 and BE6 which encompass the selection of beverages and meal items, especially the latter. In both luncheons the selection of meal items covers three sequences. In no instance are the Australians invited to select an item, and only in one instance (out of seven) in BE3 and four instances (out of five) in BE6 are they permitted to confirm the item pre-selected by the Japanese interactants: such turns as "Can you eat raw fish?" (J3b), and "Sashimi O.K.?" (J6a) exemplify this interaction. This lack of involvement of the Australians, then, results in a violation of their usual role in the selection activity.

Interestingly, although the meal selections undertaken by the Japanese in both business luncheons do not universally meet the approval of the Australians, in most cases the resulting responses of the latter reveal their application of native norms of politeness: there is no instance where the selection is rejected, although the relaxation of politeness norms is evidenced by an Australian, A3b, in one particular instance. When it was suggested to A3b that raw egg would accompany sukiyaki, his response is one of mere acquiescence. This interchange is found in fragment (3):

Fragment 3

1		(The waitress asks the Japanese a question about the raw egg)
2	J3a:	Can you eat raw, raw egg?
3	A3a:	Raw egg?
4	J3b:	Raw egg
5	A3a:	Yeh, that's alright.
6	J3a:	We use raw egg just as sort of [(sauce)]
7	J3b:	[(sauce)]
8	J3b:	Can you? (He points his hand at A3b)
9		(A3b's face displays reluctance. He is silent.)

10 A3a: Yes, yes, that's alright.

11 J3b: Anyway could you?

12 A3b: Yes right, I guess (speaking softly)

13 A3a: You'll enjoy it.

14 (The speech of J3a and J3b overlaps. J3a requests the

15 waitress to bring extra bowls so that the sukiyaki can

16 be eaten without egg if preferred.

17 A3a explains to A3b that the food is dipped into the raw egg.)

18 I can vouch for that.

19 A3b: I've been talked into it, so (( ))

On the basis of the above sequence, it can be argued that the Australian produces a cooperative response, even if it is highly hesitant: firstly, (a) silence is encoded (line 9); next, (b) agreement is given but it is modified with "I guess" (line 12). His facial expression, however, displays displeasure and thus strongly expresses reluctance. Finally, he attributes his agreement to persuasion from another (line 19). The Australian thus relaxes his norms of politeness which require more positive agreement in such a context, and hence he engages in pidginized behavior.

One of the most prominent features in the data is the existence of code-switching to Japanese by all Japanese participants. This code-switching is restricted, nonetheless, to the sequences encompassing the selection of beverages and meal items. Although it is possible to argue that three processes - the application of Japanese norms, and the existence of interculture and pidginization - are relevant, undoubtedly, the process of pidginization is strongest. Code-switching is a direct violation of English norms of etiquette for it acts to exclude the Australians from participation in the ensuing discourse. There are two occasions of switching in the sequences covering the selection of beverages, one in each encounter; more particularly, switching is found during the selection of the meal items where it occurs in all six sequences.

Two extracts which include code-switching are quoted for exemplification. First, in BE3, the two Australians commence a parallel conversation following the prolongation of conversation in Japanese between the two Japanese businessmen concerning the selection of meal items. This parallel conversation is found in fragment (4):

Fragment 4

1		(At this point, A3a and A3b begin a separate interchange		
2		in which they discuss the food)		
3	J3b:	(( )) shabushabu ka	A3a:	(( ))
4	J3a:	(( )) sukiyaki demo	A3a:	I've tried that before
5		ii ka.		yeah. What's the? (He
6	J3b:	(( ))		points to the center dish)
7	J3a:	(( )) namatamago no	A3a:	(( )) squid, squid
8		hoo ga		
9	J3b to WAI:	Ja ne meen wa	A3a:	Oh squid
10		sukiyaki nimaigurai.		
11		(The waitress exits)		

Such a passage as this illustrates the total exclusion of the Australians from the discourse where sukiyaki is chosen as the main dish. During this interval, the Australian dyad discuss the components of the sashimi dish which is located in the center of the table.

In similar fashion, the selection of agedoofu in BE6 is made in Japanese, without any involvement of the Australians. This is reproduced in fragment (5):

Fragment 5

1	J6b:	Sorekara ((nani ni shimasu?))

J6a: Agedoofu doo (( )) agedoofu yottsu.

(During the above interchange, A6a and A6b replace their glasses on the table and alternate their glances between the waitress, and J6a and J6b)

WAI: Agedoofu yottsu, hai.

(J6b and J6a examine the menu)

There is firm evidence showing that the Australians negatively evaluate their exclusion which is due to the code-switching found in both BE3 and BE6. One instance will be quoted here for illustrative purposes. BE3 contains a long sequence covering the selection of three meal items where four instances of code-switching are visible. During these switches, A3b, who either consciously or unconsciously marks the code-switching as highly inadequate, pursues two types of actions. Firstly, he becomes involved in alternative activities such as examination of the label of the bottle near him, indicating his disengagement from the dialogue from which he is excluded. Secondly, he reenters the discourse after each of three sets of switches to the Japanese code, thus simultaneously terminating the code-switch. The turns he uses in these instances are as follows: "What is the bowl we have in front of us already?", "Are we looking at what, main course now?" and, "You've ordered have you?". In a setting where he could exercise his own native cultural competence, A3b could expect to play a major role in the selection of the meal. However, he is denied this in the context of BE3. From the perspective of Australian rules of politeness, the exclusion of the Australians from the selection process is highly impolite.

Consumption Activities

In both business luncheons, following the selection of beverages, the drinking phase is opened by the Japanese participants by means of a "toast". Although shared cross-culturally, the placement of the "toast" at the commencement seems more rigorously applied in the Japanese system. Since Japanese businessmen in both business luncheons take the lead in implementing this act, it can be seen as a case of transference.

By contrast, such coordinated entry does not mark the beginning of eating activity. Rather, there is prior commencement of eating on the part of one Japanese

(J3a), and a delay by another who continues to engage in conversation (J6b). Since in the English cultural system rigorous coordination between interactants commencing to eat is required, variation in the case of several of the Japanese businessmen can be attributed to interference from Japanese norms. Different types of meal plans characterize the two cultural systems: not only is a difference in commencement possible, but in a Japanese meal interactants may progress through meal items at a different pace. On the contrary, in the case of an Australian meal one item is usually eaten before progression to the next can proceed.

One of the most contrastive features of the interaction in the two business luncheons concerns drinking activity. This involves all participants engaging in behavior derived from the Japanese cultural system in one case (BE6), while in the other (BE3), only the Japanese businessmen actively pour drinks for themselves as well as for others, following their own native norms. Obviously, the Japanese participants transfer the full set of rules from their own native system: there is, for example, consistent presentation of drinks to another, usually to the interactant seated opposite; reciprocation occurs; an interactant often uses the supplies of his recipient, in addition to his own, for presentation; beverage replenishment undertaken by the waitress is not acknowledged; the glass is held in an upright position and is commonly raised off the table; furthermore, the token gesture of receipt, which is shown by holding the glass, occurs even after pouring commences.

These Japanese drinking rules are not only applied by the Japanese participants; the Australians in BE6 also actively utilize norms which originate in the Japanese system. To a large extent, A6a and A6b have adjusted their behavior to a number of significant drinking rules which are generated from Japanese culture: reciprocal presentation as well as selective use of supplies, either one's own or those of the recipient. In addition to this influence, however, the continued application of English norms can be noted in their behavior. For instance, they tend to select their own supplies to present to their interactants, hold their glass on a slant, and verbally acknowledge presentations made by the waitress.

There is at least one feature which may also indicate the presence of interculture. Even though I have argued that the behavior of the Australians in BE6 is largely due to the application of Japanese norms, their rigorous activity in initiating the presentation of beverages far exceeds that of their Japanese counterparts. In this regard, then, their behavior could justifiably be allocated to the category of interculture as a result of over-generalization of a Japanese norm.

Unexpectedly, in my data there are also deviations by Japanese participants from normalized native behavior as a result of the conduct of the Australians who do not undertake complementary actions: for example, in BE3 there is an increase in beverage

replenishment undertaken by the Japanese participants for themselves since the Australians do not even once perform this

function. As a result, the Japanese rely upon the services of the waitress who refills their glass occasionally, and upon service to themselves in all other instances.

Various features of interest are found in the two business luncheons relating to eating activity. Paradoxically, the tendency of the Japanese businessmen, particularly in the second business luncheon, to select meal items which appeal to themselves indicates the application of their own native norms. The meal plan in BE6 consists of sashimi, tataki, kushikatsu, sukiyaki, rice, pickles and soup, while that of BE3 covers sashimi, agedoofu, squid (replacing nattoo) and morisoba. By contrast, consideration of the Australian interactants' preferences and anticipated eating difficulties would probably have lead to a different selection, which itself would have been more illustrative of interculture, and which consequently might have been more positively evaluated by the Australians.

Eating is accompanied by a considerable amount of discourse, produced by three of the four Australians, pertaining to correction of their inadequate knowledge of the meal items. Contrastively, there is a definite tendency for them not to seek correction on consumption manner, that is, the way in which they should eat the items. These two tendencies, it seems, are due to the application of Australian norms of interaction: while adults are permitted to correct their deficiencies in knowledge of the content of meal items, admission of difficulty with the manner of eating is strongly minimized. Notwithstanding, on the basis of my evidence, it appears that the two Australians in BE3, who possess negligible experience in eating Japanese meals, initiate correction of their eating deficiencies more frequently than do the Australians of BE6, who have much greater experience in eating in Japanese restaurants in Australia as well as in Japan. The application by Australians of their native norms to restrict self-correction of their inadequacies in eating can be seen as a negative feature in the situation, since the acquisition of conduct appropriate in a Japanese restaurant setting is hindered if correction does not proceed.

As a parallel to the finding that self-correction by the Australians of their eating is minimized, so too is other-correction. Three of the four Japanese avoid, in most instances, either pre-correction or post-correction of the Australian's knowledge relating to meal items and more especially, to their eating style. Nevertheless, there is one exception: A3b engages in extensive correction. I attribute his conduct to the process of pidginization, since he appears to lose the restraints which proscribe correction of another.

It seems that the relatively high amount of corrective activity found in relation to eating is due to the rise of a new interculture rule which permits more correction than occurs in an internal situation for the members of the two cultural systems represented in the situation. This interpretation is applicable to the self-

corrective activity of the Australians, and perhaps also to the abundance of other-correction undertaken by J3b.

Although the application of certain Japanese eating norms is essential in this context, all four Australians exhibit a range of deviations in this regard. In the detailed examination of one segment involving the eating of noodles, a variety of instances of pidginization are observable: both Australians fail to reposition their noodle box; they position their noodle cup inappropriately; they only raise the noodle cup slightly off the table; they suffer extraordinary difficulty in separating out a portion of noodles to eat; and, in addition, they both use their chopsticks inefficiently.

Examination of the eating activity of the Australians in both encounters provides extensive evidence of the occurrence of pidginization. It is noted, for instance, in respect to the coordination of eating activities: the Australians wave their chopsticks through the air or else hold them high up; they hold the chopsticks in one hand while using the left hand to perform some other task; one participant transfers the chopsticks to his left hand in order to use his right hand for gestural activity; and also, the same participant gestures excessively with the chopsticks in his same right hand. Apart from this, in the noodle sequence both Australians exhibit extremely poor posture, one largely refrains from conversational activity (A6b), and the other raises his noodles to an extraordinary height before lowering them into his noodle cup (A6a). All such cases are indicative of pidginization of important communicative and sociocultural rules of behavior, and illustrate violations of demeanor, as described by Goffman (1967).

Closing Segment

Only very brief reference will be made to the closing segment of the business luncheons in this paper. Although the superordinate Australian in BE6 can be seen to assume certain functions which more appropriately belong to a host, as a guest, his opening of the closing segment is in accordance with Australian norms. A6a expresses his appreciation to the Japanese hosts saying, "Thank you very much" (A6a), and together with A6b, engages in a deep bow. It is only then that the two Japanese respond by means of bowing themselves. In this scene, then, very clear employment of the Japanese pattern of bowing is observed for both Australians, and it is obvious that an Australian (A6a), not a Japanese, initiates bowing in this context. Clearly, this is an act of politeness which the Australian has borrowed from the Japanese cultural system.

Instances of verbal and non-verbal pidginization are also found in the closing segment. In BE6, one Japanese participant experiences problems in selecting conversational content which is appropriate for a closing sequence. Just as the encounter is entering the final closing segment, J6a introduces a topic which is not

only inappropriate in this context, but which he cannot develop due to linguistic encoding difficulties. In the other encounter, one Japanese (J3a) fails to encode an expression of appreciation, even though he is the actual guest. Pidginization of behavior of the Japanese participants in BE6 is also observed in the final closing interchange where they glance at each other, nod strongly, and also conspicuously look at their watches. I suggest that their avoidance of conversation in English with each other, a feature which in fact characterizes the two business luncheons, causes reduced behavior such as this to arise.

CONCLUSION

In contrast to previous studies which have concentrated upon linguistic politeness or which have been based upon data involving cross-cultural comparisons, this examination of etiquette norms in an Australian-Japanese meal situation has been based on actual data found in naturally occurring interaction. Since norms of etiquette pervade the linguistic, communicative and sociocultural behavior of all participants in a situation, the breadth of my focus was wide. In the analysis I endeavored to demonstrate that there were two basic sources of etiquette norms in an Australian-Japanese contact situation: that is, the English and the Japanese cultural systems. However, with regard to the implementation of these norms, four main processes could be identified: the application of English norms; the application of Japanese norms which was dealt with in terms of transference or interference, and also borrowing; interculture; and pidginization. These were identified in various forms and proportions throughout all the main stages of the business luncheon and, furthermore, characterized the behavior of both the Japanese and the Australian participants.

Two important points need to be emphasized. Firstly, although my analysis tended to highlight contrastive elements, it is a fact that the members of the Australian and Japanese cultural systems also share certain norms. It is because of this factor that the process of transference must, in many instances, be seen as a positive one. Secondly, on numerous occasions, identification was made of a single process which gave rise to a participant's behavior. In not a few instances, however, the existence of multiple processes occurring either simultaneously or in relation to each other was noted.

In conclusion, then, many deviations from the norm of etiquette in the English cultural system, identified in the current data for the Japanese participants were, in fact, due to the application of native Japanese norms, or to the processes of interculture or pidginization. My findings thus concur with Neustupny (1986: 49) who attributes a large proportion of deviations in the contact situation to pidginization and interculture. It is significant that my investigation also

revealed the existence of certain deviations from English norms by Australian participants in the contact situation. Similar processes were identified to account for this phenomenon: interculture, pidginization or occasional application of Japanese norms.

In some instances, where the norms of etiquette were identical in both cultures, I noted a failure by Japanese participants to transfer these, with the result of inappropriate reduction. Therefore, I have argued, the process of transfer must not be viewed only as a negative influence, as has been the tendency in past research. What this and other recent investigations of Australian-Japanese contact situations (Neustupny 1982, 1985a, 1985b, 1986, 1987; Masumi-So 1983; Asaoka 1987), revealed is that the contact situation is comprised of norms from both systems, apart from behavior which is due to the process of interculture or pidginization. This is a significant contribution to the understanding of cultural interaction, for it negates the earlier approach in which the acquisition of a "target" communicative system by the foreign learner was conceived in terms of a unidirectional trend. On the contrary, my findings clearly confirm that both parties in a contact situation, but more particularly the non-native interactants, draw heavily upon norms of the non-base system. In the case of etiquette, it is mandatory that numerous norms are, in fact, transferred across cultural systems; although the expression of some Japanese norms in Australian-Japanese contact situations represents interference, utilization of others is essential. Similarly, the continued application of English norms by Australian participants in much interaction in contact situations is necessary. Paradoxically though, I also indicated the existence of areas of behavior where a relaxation of native norms was needed in order for the Australian to acquire more appropriate behavior in this particular contextual setting: the continued avoidance of self-correction of inadequacies in eating activity, for example, was shown to produce a negative effect.

This study has drawn attention to various effects which the existence of the different processes had in the contact situation. One of these was an "imbalance" with regard to etiquette: an individual may be highly polite in some facets of his behavior, while simultaneously committing serious deviations from other politeness norms. A6, for instance, engaged in highly polite acts through the presentation of his business card and the presentation of beverages to his Japanese interactants, yet his highly inadequate manner of eating stood in stark contrast, and was very likely to contribute to failure to communicate his true personality. Likewise, the etiquette deviations in the conduct of the Japanese participants in the contact situation probably also lead to a similar failure to communicate as polite, educated adults: for example, their inability to produce appropriate

greetings, their dominance in selecting the meal items, and the considerable code-switching which they implemented represented deviations from polite conduct.

One important issue in my findings concerned the existence of variation. I pointed, on occasion, to evidence of idiosyncratic norm variation amongst members of the respective Australian and Japanese communities. I assumed that the feature of variation, which is a characteristic of individuals in the separate cultural systems, is then further increased in the contact situation where there are additional sources for the generation of norms.

The dynamic nature of the contact situation is, of course, partly due to the inclusion of participants who are at different stages of exposure to contact situation behavior. This study showed that, while A6a and A6b had undertaken somewhat extensive adjustment in certain areas of their behavior, A3a and A3b, whose contact with Japanese business interactants was relatively new, have yet to implement a number of adjustments to their conduct in contact situations. It was clear, for instance, that no prior pre-correction towards the Japanese pattern of beverage presentation had occurred in the case of the latter two Australians; nor did they alter their conduct during the business luncheon under examination. Consequently, their uncooperativeness would have been strongly communicated to the Japanese businessmen for whom the Japanese beverage presentation forms an integral component of the contact situation.

The evidence produced in this study repudiated several stereotypical notions. Firstly, the folk view of politeness in Australian-Japanese contact situations could not be validated on the basis of empirical investigation: the view that Japanese businessmen are "polite", and, conversely, that Australians are "impolite", was not substantiated. My findings showed that Japanese participants were responsible for many deviations from norms of etiquette which are appropriate in the contact situation. Similarly, Australian businessmen need to adjust their behavior in accordance with Japanese restaurant requirements, and also to other patterns of behavior which originate in the Japanese cultural system but which assume a place in contact situations. The exchange of business cards and appropriate participation in beverage presentations were two examples described in this paper. Secondly, on the basis of my investigation, such comments from Japanese businessmen residing temporarily in Melbourne that, "I'm used to Australian business ways", or "I'm Australianized now", must be treated with caution.

Finally, I would like to state that while this paper has focussed upon interaction during a Japanese business luncheon, the framework is equally applicable to an analysis of interaction in other types of contact situations; it offers a valuable approach to the explication of the behavior of participants in actual situations of intercultural contact. Such analysis will be useful when progressing to

the next stage of drawing up guidelines for the training of individuals who will interact in contact situations. Certainly, more attention must be devoted to an analysis of communication and interaction within the business domain.

References

Asaoka, Takako
1987 "Communication problems between Japanese and Australians at a dinner party," *Working Papers of the Japanese Studies Centre. No. 3*, Melbourne: Japanese Studies Centre.

Befu, Harumi
1974 "An ethnography of dinner entertainment in Japan," *Arctic Anthropology* 11 (supplement). 196-203.

Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson
1978 "Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena,", in *Questions and Politeness*, Esther Goody (ed.), London: Cambridge University Press. pp. 56-289.
1987 "Politeness: Some universals in language usage," in *Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 4*, Great Britain: Cambridge University Press. Reissue of 1978.

Clyne, Michael G. (ed.)
1985 *Australia, Meeting Place of Languages*, Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Corder, S.P.
1967 "The significance of learner's errors," *IRAL* 4. 161-70.
1971 "Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis," *IRAL* 9, 147-59.

Goffman, Erving
1967 *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behaviour*, USA: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company.

Kendon, Adam
1979 "Some theoretical and methodological aspects of the use of film in the study of social interaction," in *Emerging Strategies in Social Psychological Research*, G.P. Ginsburg (ed.), New York: Wiley. pp. 67-91.

Loveday, Leo
Explorations in Japanese Sociolinguistics, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Marriott, Helen E.
1978 "The acquisition of English communicative competence by Japanese

women," Masters dissertation., Melbourne: Monash University.

1984 "English discourse of Japanese women in Melbourne," *Papers of the Japanese Studies Centre. No. 12*, Melbourne: Japanese Studies Centre, 1984.

1985 "Introductions in Australian-Japanese contact situations," *Working Papers of the Japanese Studies Centre. No. 4*, Melbourne: Japanese Studies Centre.

1988a "Etiquette in Australia-Japanese business interaction: A study of a meal situation," Ph.D dissertation., Melbourne: Monash University.

1988b "Japanese business and social etiquette," *Working Papers of the Japanese Studies Centre. No. 13*, Melbourne: Japanese Studies Centre.

— "Spatial arrangements in Australian-Japanese business communication," Forthcoming.

Masumi-So, Hiromi

1983 "Loanwords in Melbourne Japanese," Masters dissertation, Melbourne: Monash University.

Meaney, Neville, Trevor Matthews and Sol Ensol

1988 *The Japanese Connection*, Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.

Minami, Fujio

1974 *Gendai Nihongo no Koozoo*, Tokyo: Taishuukan.

Mizutani, Osamu and Nobuko Mizutani

1987 *How to be Polite in Japanese*, Tokyo: Japan Times.

Morshach, Helmet

1984 *Simple Etiquette in Japan*, England: Paul Norbury.

Murie, Alice

1976 "Communication problems in Australian-Japan business relations," Honours dissertation, Melbourne: Monash University.

Nemser, William

1971 "Approximative systems of foreign language learners," *IRAL* 9. 115-23.

Neustupny, Jiri. V.

1968 "Politeness patterns in the system of communication," *Science Council of Japan Proceedings*, Vol. 3. 412-9.

1982 *Gaikokujin to no Komyunikeishon*, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

1985 "Problems in Australian-Japanese contact situations," in *Cross-Cultural Encounters: Communication and Mis-Communication*,

John Pride (ed.), Melbourne: River Seine. pp. 44-64.

1985 "Language norms in Australian-Japanese contact situations," in *Australia, Meeting Place of Languages*, Michael Clyne (ed.), Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

1986 *Foreigners and the Japanese*, Tokyo: Hokuseidoo Press.

1987 *Communication with the Japanese*, Tokyo: The Japan Times.

Richards, Jack , John Platt and H. Weber

1985 *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*, Great Britain: Longman.

Rowlands, Diane

1985 *Japanese Business Etiquette: A Practical Guide to Success with the Japanese*, USA: Warner Books.

Sakamoto, Nancy and Reiko Naotsuka

1982 *Polite Fictions: Why Japanese and Americans Seem Rude to Each Other*, Tokyo: Kinseidoo.

Selinker, Larry

1972 "Interlanguage," *IRAL*, 10. 3: 209-31.