Politeness Rules in Japan and the United States*

Naoto Ogawa
University of Oklahoma

William B. Gudykunst
California State University, Fullerton

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine politeness rules in ingroup and outgroup relationships in Japan and the U.S. Based on a preliminary study and a literature review, 105 potential politeness rules were isolated. In the main study, responses to the rules were submitted to a culture free factor analysis. Seventy-three rules that loaded on the first unrotated factor appear to be politeness rules used in Japan and the U.S. Culture influenced 23 rules (12 US>J, 11 J>US). Seventeen rules appear to be common rules in Japan and the U.S. Ingroup-outgroup relationship influenced only two rules. Independent self-construals influenced 19 rules, interdependent self-construals influenced 21 rules, and both self-construals influenced 11 rules.

Politeness is important in the study of communication because being polite allows individuals to minimize the friction between them when they interact (Okabe, 1990). Janny and Arndt (1992) suggest that there are two types of politeness (i.e., tact and social politeness). Tact refers to interpersonal strategies for maintaining face, and social politeness refers to the rules that are used for smoothly organized interaction. Ting-Toomey (1994) defines face as "a claimed sense of self-respect in an interactive situation" (p. 1). The initial discussions of face (e.g., Goffman, 1955, 1967; Ho, 1976; Hu, 1944) did not link face to politeness (Watts, Ide, & Ehlich, 1992); however, since Brown and Levinson (1978), linguistic politeness has been associated with face.

Politeness exists in all cultures, but there are cultural differences in the ways individuals are polite (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Two cultures that appear to have different rules for politeness are Japan and the U.S. (e.g., Cupach & Imahori, 1993; Imahori & Cupach, 1994; Matsumoto, 1988). Differences in one aspect of

politeness (i.e., face) in Japan and the U.S. have been linked to cultural individualism-collectivism (e.g., Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). Therefore, cultural individualism-collectivism should explain cultural differences and similarities in the endorsement of rules for politeness in Japan and the U.S.

Japan typically is classified as a collectivistic culture, and the U.S. typically is classified as an individualistic culture (Hofstede, 1980). People in individualistic cultures emphasize individuals' goals over the ingroup's (e.g., groups that are important to individuals) goals, and people in collectivistic cultures emphasize the ingroup's goals over individuals' goals (Triandis, 1995). People in collectivistic cultures draw a clearer distinction between ingroups and outgroups than people in individualistic cultures (Triandis, 1995). Given the cultural differences regarding ingroups and outgroups, it might be expected that rules for politeness might differ for ingroup and outgroup members in Japan, but not in the U.S.

People in individualistic cultures tend to use low-context communication, and people in collectivistic cultures tend to use high-context communication (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988). Low-context communication is based on direct verbal messages, and high-context communication is based on indirect verbal messages and nonverbal messages (Hall, 1976). Therefore, people in individualistic cultures would be expected to demonstrate politeness using low-context communication, and people in collectivistic cultures would be expected to demonstrate politeness using high-context communication.

Cultural individualism-collectivism has a direct influence on cultural rules (Triandis, 1995). However, the influence of cultural individualism-collectivism on communication is mediated by the individualistic and collectivistic tendencies (e.g., self-construals, whether the self is viewed as independent of or interdependent with others; Markus & Kitayama, 1991) of the members of a culture (Gudykunst *et al*., 1996). Therefore, the ways members of a culture perceive politeness rules also should be influenced by their self-construals.

The purpose of the present study is to examine rules for politeness in ingroup and outgroup relationships in Japan (a collectivistic culture) and the U.S. (an individualistic culture). Since face (i.e., tact) also is associated with politeness, whether or not there are rules for managing face in interactions also will be considered.

Cultural Differences in Politeness Rules

Okabe (1990) suggests that politeness involves rules for the ways humans interact. Politeness minimizes the friction that happens among people. Hill *et al*. (1986) argue that politeness is "one of the constraints on human interaction, whose purpose is to consider others' feelings, establish levels of mutual comfort, and promote rapport" (p. 349). Matsumoto (1988) contends that "people in a culture choose strategies of politeness according to the cultural expectation and

requirement" (p. 423). What is needed is a way to explain the similarities and differences in cultural expectations for politeness. Many writers argue that individualism-collectivism is linked to cultural differences in managing face (e.g., Imahori & Cupach, 1994; Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). Given that managing face and politeness are related closely, it appears that individualism-collectivism should influence cultural differences in the politeness rules used across cultures.[1]

The influence of cultural individualism-collectivism on communication is mediated by self-construals, personality orientation, and individual values at the individual level (Gudykunst *et al*., 1996). Self-construals (i.e., the tendency to view the self as independent of others or interdependent with others; Markus & Kitayama, 1991) appears to be the best predictor of communication at the individual level (Gudykunst *et al*., 1996). Therefore, individuals' self-construals should influence perceptions of politeness rules in Japan and the U.S.

Individualism-Collectivism

Hofstede (1991) argues that "individualism pertains to societies in which the ties between individuals are loose. . . . Collectivism as its opposite pertains to societies in which people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive ingroups" (p. 51). Triandis (1988) suggests that members of collectivistic cultures draw a clear distinction between members of ingroups and outgroups. Ingroups are "groups of individuals about whose welfare a person is concerned, with whom that person is willing to cooperate without demanding equitable returns, and separation from whom leads to anxiety" (Triandis, 1988, p. 75). Individuals are expected to maintain harmony in ingroups in collectivistic cultures (Triandis, 1995).

Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988) argue that members of individualistic cultures tend to use low-context communication, and members of collectivistic cultures tend to use high-context communication. Low-context communication involves deriving meaning from the explicit message (Hall, 1976). In contrast, high-context communication involves deriving meaning from the context and what the person has internalized as a member of the culture. Low-context communication tends to be direct and explicit, and high-context communication tends to be indirect and ambiguous.

Cultural individualism-collectivism influences the relative emphasis politeness rules in a culture place on low-context communication (e.g., being direct, assertive) or high-context communication (e.g., avoiding being too verbal, avoiding direct confrontations). For example, politeness rules that emphasize harmony with others should have more regulatory force (i.e., the degree to which the rules guide behavior) in collectivistic cultures than in individualistic cultures. Cultural individualism-collectivism also influences the relative emphasis politeness rules in a culture place on being polite to members of outgroups and ingroups. To illustrate, politeness rules in collectivistic cultures should emphasize considering others' feelings and

establishing rapport with members of the ingroup more than politeness rules in individualistic cultures. Politeness rules in collectivistic cultures also should emphasize establishing distance from outgroup members more than politeness rules in individualistic cultures.

Self-construals

The independent construal of self views the self as unique and independent (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). To have an independent self-construal "requires construing oneself as an individual whose behavior is organized and made meaningful primarily by reference to one's own internal repertoire of thoughts, feelings, and actions, rather than by reference to the thoughts, feelings, and actions of others" (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, p. 226). In contrast, the interdependent construal of self "entails seeing oneself as part of an encompassing social relationship and recognizing that one's behavior is determined, contingent on, and, to a large extent organized by what the actor [or actress] perceives to be the thoughts, feelings, and actions of others in the relationship" (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, p. 227). People in individualistic cultures emphasize the independent self-construal, and people in collectivistic cultures emphasize the interdependent self-construal (e.g., Gudykunst *et al*., 1996; Singelis & Brown, 1995).

People who emphasize independent self-construals tend to use low-context communication (Gudykunst *et al*., 1996) and tend to hold self-oriented attitudes (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). People who emphasize interdependent self-construals tend to use high-context communication (Gudykunst *et al*., 1996) and tend to hold other-oriented attitudes (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). The more individuals emphasize the independent self-construal, the more they should perceive politeness rules that involve low-context communication and self-oriented attitudes to have regulatory force. The more individuals emphasize the interdependent self-construal, the more they should perceive politeness rules that involve high-context communication and other-oriented attitudes to have regulatory force.

Politeness Rules in Japan and the United States[2]

Social politeness refers to the rules for smooth interaction (Janny & Arndt, 1992). Shimanoff (1980) defines a rule as "a followable prescription that indicates what behavior is obligated, preferred, or prohibited in certain contexts" (p. 57). Rules tell people what behavior is required, how they should or should not behave, and how they can or cannot behave in certain contexts. People can refer to rules to behave appropriately in certain situations. For example, "if one is addressing a status superior, then one should address them by title plus last name" (Shimanoff, 1980, p. 69). Rules are applied in particular situations and particular relationships (Argyle & Henderson, 1985).

Language usage plays a large role in Japanese politeness. *Keigo* (i.e.,

honorifics) is a major strategy to demonstrate politeness in Japan. Akasu and Asao (1993) explain that "*keigo* typically is used to show deference to the listener, to some third party, or to some referent related to him/her. That means that the person to whom the *keigo* is directed must be someone worthy in some way of that difference" (p. 97). Thus, the use of *keigo* is associated with Japan's vertically structured society (Nakane, 1970).

Hill *et al*. (1986) suggest that Japanese use *wakimae* (discernment) when they are polite in public. *Wakimae* is based on rules for "appropriate behavior people must observe to be considered polite in society" (Maynard, 1997, p. 57). *Wakimae* is emphasized when communicating with members of outgroups in Japan. Japanese draw a clear distinction between members of ingroups and outgroups (e.g., Gudykunst & Nishida, 1994; Triandis, 1988). Japanese differentiate intimate ingroups from non-intimate ingroups (e.g., ingroup members who are not known), and strangers (i.e., outgroup members) (Nakane, 1974). Japanese feel closer to members of intimate ingroups than to members of non-intimate ingroups. As a result, using *wakimae* to create social distance between speakers and listeners generally is avoided in intimate ingroup relationships in Japan (Maynard, 1997). If Japanese use *wakimae* with intimate members of the ingroup, they will not feel close to each other.

Maynard (1997) suggests that U.S. Americans "make an effort to diminish social deference," and Japanese "make an effort to recognize deference and follow the *wakimae* conventions by choosing differentiating expressions" (p. 58). U.S. Americans prefer to emphasize intimacy based on equality when they are polite, and Japanese like to emphasize distance based on inequality when they are polite. Neustupny (1987) suggests that Japanese communication with members of ingroups tends to be informal and involves a minimum use of *keigo* (honorifics), and communication with members of outgroups tends to be formal and involves the use of *keigo*. Thus, Japanese probably use informal rules for social politeness in intimate ingroup relationships and use formal rules for social politeness associated with *wakimae* in non-intimate ingroup and outgroup relationships.

The reasons why Japanese tend to be formal and use *wakimae* in non-intimate ingroups and outgroups and informal in intimate ingroups can be explained by *amae* (dependence). Maynard (1997) points out that there is *amae* in ingroup relationships in Japan. Amae is "the noun form of *amaeru*, an intransitive verb which means 'to depend and presume upon another's benevolence.' . . . [It involves] helplessness and the desire to be loved" (Doi, 1973, p. 22). Doi (1973) points out that *amae* involves a "trustful dependence" that nothing bad will happen if one person is dependent on other people who have good feelings for him or her. *Amae* is not restricted to the relationship between a mother and a child, but it is pervasive in various kinds of relationships (e.g., doctors/patients, teachers/students, and superiors/ subordinates) in Japan (Doi, 1973; Yamada, 1997). Japanese can be

informal and minimize the use of *keigo* in ingroup relationships because there is *amae*.

To summarize, it appears that there should be differences in politeness rules in ingroup and outgroup relationships in collectivistic cultures like Japan, but not in individualistic cultures like the U.S. However, these differences may only apply to culture-specific rules and not rules that are shared across the cultures because the nature of the ingroups in culture specific. Previous studies of differences in communication in individualistic and collectivistic cultures (e.g., Gudykunst *et al*., 1996; Kim, 1994) also suggest that politeness rules in individualistic cultures like the U.S. should be based on a self-orientation and low-context communication, whereas politeness rules in collectivistic cultures like Japan should be based on other-oriented attitudes and high-context communication.

Research Questions

The general purpose of this study is to examine politeness in ingroup and outgroup relationships in Japan and the U.S. The specific purpose of this study is to answer three research questions: (1) How are Japanese and U.S. American rules for politeness similar and different? (2) How does the person with whom Japanese and U.S. Americans are communicating (i.e., ingroup member vs. outgroup member) influence the rules for politeness? and (3) How do self-construals influence perceptions of rules for politeness?

Methods

Before politeness rules in Japan and the U.S. can be compared, the rules in the two cultures must be isolated. Therefore, the present study is divided into two parts. First, a preliminary study was conducted to isolate the politeness rules used in the two cultures. Second, a derived etic set of politeness rules was developed based on the preliminary study and review of previous research. These rules were used to examine politeness in Japan and the U.S. in the main study.

The Preliminary Study

Respondents. Data were collected from 176 respondents.[3] Eighty-four (29 males, 55 females) respondents from a moderate sized western university on the West Coast in the U.S., and 92 (23 males, 69 females) respondents from two moderate sized Japanese universities participated. The average age of the U.S. sample was 21.63, and the average age of the Japanese sample was 20.39.

Questionnaires. The open-ended questionnaire included items about the rules for politeness with either strangers or close friends of the same-sex and age as themselves. The relationships were chosen to examine ingroup (i.e., close friends) and outgroup (i.e., strangers) relationships in Japan and the U.S.

The questionnaires were composed of two parts. In the first part of the

questionnaires, respondents were asked to describe the rules for politeness, to describe behavior when others are polite, and when others are impolite. The second part of the questionnaire asked respondents to indicate why they are polite and their feelings when others are impolite.

The questionnaire was developed in English, and translated into Japanese. The translation was verified by bilingual speakers with discussion.[4]

Results. The most frequent answers used were given by 20 or more respondents, and the least frequent answers used were given by four or more respondents. Many of the responses to the preliminary questionnaire were not in the form of rules. However, rules could be extracted from the responses that were given. For example, the rule "greet others at the beginning of the conversation" was isolated from Japanese and U.S. American answers to the question regarding polite behavior (e.g., "greet me at the beginning of the conversation").

Based on the results of the preliminary study, 38 derived etic rules for social politeness in Japan and the U.S. were isolated.[5] Fifty-five rules for social politeness were extracted from previous studies of communication rules (e.g., Argyle & Henderson, 1985; Berger & Bradac, 1982; Brown & Levinson, 1978; Grice, 1975; Kim, 1994; Naotsuka *et al*., 1981; Neustupny, 1987; Nishida, 1989; Okabe, 1983). In addition, 12 rules for managing face/tact were isolated from previous studies of face (e.g., Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). This resulted in 105 rules being generated for the main study (see Table 1).

The Main Study

Respondents. Respondents for the main study included 482 college students: 273 (98 males, 174 females, and one who did not indicate his/her sex) from a moderate sized university in the western U.S., and 209 (101 males, 106 females, and two who did not indicate their sex) from a moderate sized university in Japan. The U.S. American sample consisted of 115 European Americans, 63 Latino Americans, 47 Asian Americans, six African Americans, three Native Americans, 35 others (e.g., Middle Eastern, mix between European American and Latino American, mix between European American and African American), and four who did not indicate their ethnicity. All U.S. American respondents were citizens of the U.S. The Japanese sample consisted of all Japanese nationals. The average age of Japanese sample was 19.91 (SD=1.22), and the average age of the U.S. American sample was 22.59 (SD=6.03).

The Questionnaire. One version of the questionnaire focused on rules for social politeness and tact when communicating with strangers (outgroup members). The other version of the questionnaire focused on rules for social politeness and tact when communicating with close friends (ingroup members). The two versions of the questionnaire were the same except for the target person. The two versions were distributed randomly to respondents (U.S. ingroup N=132, U.S. outgroup N=141,

Japan ingroup N=92, Japan outgroup N=117). Once the questionnaire was developed in English, it was translated into Japanese. The translation was verified by bilingual speakers with discussion.

Measurement of Politeness Rules. The 105 rules (see Table 1) were listed in a random order on the questionnaire. Respondents answered questions about interaction with others of the same-sex and age as themselves. Respondents answered each item using a seven point scale (1=this behavior is definitely not required to be polite, 7=this behavior is definitely required to be polite). The higher the score, the more "regulatory force" the respondents perceived that the rule has in their culture.

Ingroup-Outgroup Manipulation Check. Since similarities and differences in the use of rules for politeness in ingroup and outgroup relationships (i.e., close friends and strangers) were examined, it was necessary to check differences in the perceptions of the relationships about which the respondents were thinking when they answered questions on the questionnaire. Thus, one question was added to the questionnaire as a manipulation check: "To what extent are the close friends (strangers) you were thinking about when answering the questions in this section members of your ingroups? An ingroup is a group of which you are a member that is important to you and you are concerned with the welfare of the members." Respondents answered the question using a seven point scale (1=definitely not ingroup members, 7=definitely ingroup members).

There were significant differences between ingroup and outgroup relationships for the Japanese respondents ($F[1, 197]=54.83$, $p<.0001$) and for the U.S. American respondents ($F[1, 190]=29.64$, $p<.0001$). The close friends' mean was higher than the strangers' mean in the Japan sample (close friends=5.02, SD=1.57; strangers=3.28, SD=1.70) and in the U.S. sample (close friends=5.36, SD=1.37; strangers=4.21, SD=1.54).

Individualism-Collectivism Manipulation Check. This study is based on the assumption that Japanese have collectivistic tendencies and U.S. Americans have individualistic tendencies. To examine the respondents' individualistic and collectivistic tendencies, independent and interdependent self-construals were used. Items loading .50 or greater on Gudykunst *et al.*'s (1996) measures of independent and interdependent self-construals were used. Respondents answered the items using a seven point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree). Six of Gudykunst *et al.*'s (1996) items were used to assess independent construal of self: (1) Personal identity is very important to me, (2) I enjoy being unique and different from others, (3) I prefer to be self-reliant rather than depend on others, (4) I take responsibility for my own actions, (5) It is important for me to act as an independent person, and (6) I should decide my future on my own. The reliability (alpha) of the independent self-construal scale was .66 in the Japan sample and .80 in the U.S. sample. Six of Gudykunst *et al.*'s (1996) items were used to examine

interdependent construal of self: (1) I maintain harmony in the groups of which I am a member, (2) I will sacrifice my self interests for the benefit of my group, (3) I stick with my group even through difficulties, (4) I respect decisions made by my group, (5) I respect the majority's wishes in groups of which I am a member, and (6) It is important to consult close friends and get their ideas before making a decision. The reliability (alpha) of the interdependent self-construal scale was .72 in the Japan sample and .71 in the U.S. sample.

Bartlett's test of sphericity indicated that multivariate analysis was warranted (15.72, 2 df, $p < .0001$). The multivatiate main effect for culture was significant (Wilks' Lambda= .94, $F[2, 478]=16.51$, $p<.0001$). The univariate main effect for culture on independent self-construal was significant ($F[1, 450]=10.79$, $p<.001$). The univariate main effect for culture on interdependent self-construal also was significant ($F[1, 450]=26.90$, $p<.0001$). The means for both the independent and the interdependent self-construal were higher in the U.S. sample (independent=5.88, SD=.93; interdependent=5.01, SD=.93) than in the Japan sample (independent=5.61, SD=.85; interdependent=4.54, SD=1.03).

Results of the Main Study

The results are presented in two steps. First, the results of the factor analysis of the rules for politeness are presented. Second, multivariate analysis of covariance is used to test cultural, relationship and individual level differences.

Factor Analysis

Responses to the 105 rules were submitted to a culture free factor analysis using standardized scores. Scores for each rule were standardized within cultures to eliminate cultural influences in the ways respondents answered the questions. To isolate the factors, a minimum primary loading of .40 was used. Seventy-three rules loaded on the first unrotated factor.[6] This suggests that there is one dimension that separates shared rules for politeness from other rules for communication. The first unrotated factor appears to contain the rules that have regulatory force for politeness in both Japan and the U.S. The rules which did not load on the first unrotated factor appear to be general rules for communication that are not associated with politeness (e.g., avoid being silent) or culture specific rules for politeness (e.g., recognize others' status).

Cultural and Relationship Level and Individual Level Differences

A multivariate analysis of covariance was used to test cultural, relationship, and individual level influences on the dependent variables. In this analysis, culture (i.e., Japan vs. the U.S.) and relationship (i.e., ingroup vs. outgroup) were treated as the independent variables and the 73 rules that emerged on the first unrotated factor were treated as the dependent variables. Self-construals were treated as the

covariates in the analysis. The Bartlett's test of sphericity indicated that multivariate analysis was warranted (13472.79, 2700 df, p< .0001). Table 1 summarizes the results.

Table 1 Summary of the Results

Rules	Politeness Rule*	Culture**	Independent Self Construal	Interdependent Self Construal
1. Answer questions others ask appropriately	yes	common	positive***	positive
2. Speak indirectly				
3. Treat others as equals				
4. Avoid hurting others' feelings				
5. Answer questions with the amount of information needed, not more or less				
6. Use polite language (e.g., "May I…?" "Please…")	yes	common		
7. Do not threaten others' public images	yes		positive	
8. Do not try to make others feel small				
9. Make eye contact	yes		positive	
10. Take turns during the conversation	yes	US>J		
11. Do not interrupt others when they speak	yes		positive	
12. Avoid giving personal opinions				
13. Be considerate toward others	yes		positive	
14. Do not touch others				
15. Speak one's mind				
16. Behave informally				
17. Greet others at the beginning of the conversation	yes	common		
18. Treat others as I want to be treated	yes	US>J		
19. Do not disagree with others				
20. Schedule a time to meet again	yes			positive
21. Show deference to others of higher status				
22. Avoid being ambiguous	yes		positive	
23. Do not impose on others	yes		positive	
24. Make the conversation smooth	yes	common		
25. Show your care about others	yes	US>J	positive	positive
26. Listen carefully when others speak	yes		positive	
27. Emphasize my social standing				
28. Do not comment on others' behavior				

29.	Wait for a break in the conversation to end it	yes			positive
30.	Protect others' self-images	yes	US>J		positive
31.	Avoid obscure language	yes		positive	
32.	Behave modestly	yes			positive
33.	Bring up topics of the conversation others are familiar with	yes			positive
34.	Do not talk only about myself	yes	common		
35.	Speak assertively	yes	US>J	positive	
36.	Enhance my self-image				
37.	Be precise when I talk	yes	J>US	positive	
38.	Greet others casually				
39.	Tell others I want to meet them again	yes			positive
40.	Protect others' credibility	yes	J>US		positive
41.	Disclose intimate information about myself				
42.	Avoid being too verbal	yes	J>US		
43.	Respect others' privacy	yes		positive	
44.	Nod head to show I am listening to others	yes	common		
45.	Protect my dignity	yes	US>J	positive	
46.	Speak in an organized fashion	yes		positive	
47.	Avoid direct confrontations	yes	J>US		
48.	Do not look away from others during the conversation	yes	common		
49.	Minimize the social distance between myself and others	yes	common		
50.	Tell the truth	yes			
51.	Disagree with others, if necessary	yes	J>US		
52.	Protect others' reputation	yes			positive
53.	Answer questions honestly	yes			
54.	Say "good-bye" at the end of the conversation	yes		positive	
55.	Compliment others	yes			positive
56.	Lie to preserve harmony with others				
57.	Avoid being silent				
58.	Indicate to others that I enjoyed the conversation	yes	common		
59.	Answer questions others ask	yes		positive	
60.	Protect my self-image				
61.	Formally greet others	yes	common	positive	positive
62.	Be supportive of others	yes			positive
63.	Show respect for others	yes	US>J	positive	positive
64.	Do not give others orders				
65.	Say what I mean	yes		positive	positive
66.	Do not embarrass others	yes	common		
67.	Ask questions about others' status				

68.	Do not criticize others				
69.	Protect others' dignity	yes			positive
70	Disclose non-intimate information about myself				
71.	Avoid misunderstandings	yes	J>US		
72.	Thank others for their time at the end of the conversation	yes			positive
73.	Sum up the conversation before it ends	yes	common		
74.	Do not be aloof	yes	J>US		
75.	Indicate I want to keep in touch at the end of the conversation	yes			positive
76.	Do not talk about personal matters				
77.	Use others' titles (e.g., Dr., Mr., and Ms.)				
78.	Protect my reputation	yes	US>J		
79.	Ask others how they have been	yes	US>J		positive
80.	Speak directly	yes	US>J	positive	
81.	Responses to what others say should be related to what they said	yes	J>US		
82.	Enhance others' self-images	yes			positive
83.	Do not use harsh tones of voice when talking to others	yes	common	positive	positive
84.	Listen when others speak	yes	J>US	positive	positive
85.	Behave formally	yes	US>J		positive
86.	Speak clearly	yes		positive	
87.	End the conversation when it is mutually agreeable	yes	common	positive	positive
88.	Speak humbly	yes			positive
89.	Respect others' personal space	yes		positive	
90.	Try to read the other person's mind				
91.	Do not use others' titles (e.g., Dr., Mr., and Ms.)				
92.	Protect my credibility	yes	J>US	positive	positive
93.	Ask others questions about themselves	yes	common		
94.	Wait until others are finished to end the conversation	yes	common	positive	positive
95.	Show interest in topics others discuss	yes			positive
96.	Use silence as a response to others' questions				
97.	Speak frankly				
98.	Emphasize others' social standing				
99.	Only one person talks at a time	yes	US>J	positive	
100.	Explain personal opinions	yes		positive	
10l.	Recognize others' social status	yes	J>US		positive
102.	Be reserved				
103.	Do not evaluate others				

104.	Show positive affect toward others	yes			positive
105.	Smile	yes	common	positive	positive

* These rules loaded on the first unrotated factor.
** The rules with "common" appear to be shared rules in Japan and the United States.
*** Positive refers to the direction of the B coefficients.

The two-way culture by relationship multivariate interaction effect was significant (Wilks' Lambda=.79, F[73, 375]=1.34, p<.05, 21% of variance explained). The multivariate main effects for culture (Wilks' Lambda=.25, F[73, 375]=15.05, p<.0001, 75% of variance explained) and relationship (Wilks' Lambda=.70, F[73, 375]=2.16, p<.0001, 30% of variance explained) also were significant.

Given that the multivariate effects were significant, the univariate tests were examined. Since 73 univariate tests were conducted, the level of significance was adjusted based on the number of tests to protect against alpha error (i.e., .05/73=.0007; the .0001 level of significance, therefore, was used for all univariate tests) (Blalock, 1979). None of the univariate effects for the culture by relationship interaction were significant.

Twenty-three rules were significantly different by culture (see Table 1).[7] Twelve means were higher in the U.S. sample than in the Japan sample (i.e., R10, R18, R25, R30, R35, R45, R63, R78, R79, R80, R85). Eleven means were higher in the Japan sample than in the U.S. sample (i.e., R37, R40, R42, R47, R51, R71, R74, R81, R84, R92, and R101).

Two rules were significantly different by relationship. Means of the two rules were higher for outgroups than ingroups: (R6) use polite language (e.g., "May I...?" "Please...") and (R37) be precise when I talk.

The covariates were examined to test the effect of self-construals on the 73 rules for politeness. The multivariate effects for independent self-construal (Wilks' Lambda=.67, F[73, 375]=2.54, p<.0001, 33% of variance explained) and interdependent self-construal (Wilks' Lambda=.65, F[73, 375]=2.75, p<.0001, 35% of variance explained) were significant.

Eleven of 73 rules were influenced by both independent and interdependent self-construals (i.e., R1, R25, R61, R63, R65, R83, R84, R87, R92, R94, and R105). All 11 rules had positive B coefficients for both self-construals. Nineteen of the 73 rules were affected only by the independent self-construal (i.e., R9, R11, R13, R22, R23, R26, R31, R35, R37, R43, R45, R46, R54, R59, R80, R86, R89, R99, and R100). All 19 rules had positive B coefficients. Twenty-one of 73 rules were influenced only by interdependent self-construal (i.e., R7, R20, R29, R30, R32, R33, R39, R40, R52, R55, R62, R69, R72, R75, R79, R82, R88, R95, R101, and R104). All 21 rules had positive B coefficients.

Discussion

The results for the factor analysis are discussed first. Following this, the findings for cultural, relationship, and individual levels are discussed.

Factor Analysis

Seventy-three of the 105 rules loaded on the first unrotated factor. These 73 rules appear to be rules for politeness in conversations. Thirty-five of the 38 rules that were isolated in the preliminary study of politeness loaded on this factor. In addition, nine of the 73 rules were from Grice (1975), eight were from Ting-Toomey and Kurogi (1998), seven were from Naotsuka *et al*. (1981), five were from Brown and Levinson (1987), three were from Argyle and Henderson (1985), three were from Kim (1994), two were from Nishida (1989), and one was from Neustupny (1987).

The 32 rules that did not load on the first unrotated factor do not appear to be politeness rules in the two cultures. Rather, some appear to be general communication rules (e.g., R12 - avoid giving personal opinion) or culture specific politeness rules (e.g., R21 - show deference to others of higher status). Rules for politeness are a subset of general rules for communication. The 32 rules may not be associated with politeness. Rather, they may be used in situations that do not require people to be polite. For example, people generally speak indirectly in Japan (R2) and people avoid being silent in the U.S. (R57), but these behaviors are not necessarily required to be polite. Some of the rules that did not load on the first unrotated factor appear to be culture specific politeness rules. To illustrate, avoid hurting others' feelings (R4), show deference to others of higher status (R21), and lie to preserve harmony with others (R56) appear to be culture specific rules in Japan. Culture specific rules in the U.S. probably include rules such as answer questions with the amount of information needed, not more or less (R5) and do not give others orders (R64). These rules may only be applicable in one culture and, therefore, did not load on the first unrotated factor which included rules that were used in both Japan and the U.S.

Cultural Differences

Twenty-three of 73 rules that loaded on the first unrotated factor were affected by culture. Twelve means were higher in the U.S. sample than in the Japan sample. Ten of the 12 rules were associated with expectations based on cultural individualism (i.e., R10, R18, R25, R35, R45, R63, R78, R79, R80, and R99). Findings for these rules are consistent with previous research on cultural differences in communication in Japan and the U.S. (e.g., Naotsuka *et al*., 1981; Nishida, 1989), as well as more general studies of cultural individualism-collectivism (e.g., Argyle & Henderson, 1985) and theoretical explanations of face (e.g., Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998).

Two of the 12 rules that were higher in the U.S. sample than the Japan sample clearly are inconsistent with cultural individualism (i.e., R30, R85). These two rules also were affected by the interdependent self-construal. Therefore, the two rules may have been inconsistent with cultural individualism-collectivism because the U.S. sample was more interdependent than the Japan sample.

Of the 23 rules influenced by culture, 11 means were higher in the Japan sample than in the U.S. sample. Nine of the rules appear to be consistent with cultural collectivism (i.e., R40, R42, R47, R51, R71, R74, R81, R84, and R101). Findings for several of the rules (e.g., R40, R47, R101) are consistent with previous research (e.g., Naotsuka *et al*., 1981; Nishida, 1989; Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). Some of the findings (i.e., R42, R51, R71, R74, R81, and R84) where the Japanese means were higher than the U.S. American means appear, on the surface, to be inconsistent with previous research (e.g., Grice, 1975; Kim, 1994; Naotuka *et al*., 1981). However, results for these rules are not necessarily inconsistent with cultural collectivism. For example, people in collectivistic cultures are required to avoid being too verbal (R42) when communicating with others. The behaviors associated with these five rules appear to be required to maintain harmony with others in collectivistic cultures. Thus, the results for these rules appear to be consistent with cultural collectivism.

Two of the 11 rules that were higher in the Japan sample than the U.S. sample clearly are inconsistent with cultural collectivism (i.e., R37, R92). These rules had more regulatory force in Japan than the U.S., but they also were affected by the independent self-construal (R92 was influenced by both). This suggests that these rules are associated with individualism at the individual level.

Fifty of the 73 rules were not affected by culture. Some of these rules are potential common rules in Japan and the U.S. Common rules are defined here as rules that are not influenced by culture and are not influenced by only one self-construal. If both self-construals influence a rule, it can still be considered common because individualistic and collectivistic tendencies do not differentially influence the regulatory force of the rule. Of the 50 rules not influenced by culture, 17 rules appear to be common rules for politeness in Japan and the U.S. (R1, R6, R17, R24, R34, R44, R48, R49, R58, R61, R66, R73, R83, R87, R93, R94, and R105). All 17 rules appear to be viable rules for politeness in conversations in Japan and the U.S. For example, people use polite language (R6) and make the conversation smooth (R24) when they are polite to others in both cultures. Thirty-three of the 50 rules that were not affected by culture do not appear to be common rules for politeness in Japan and the U.S. Thirty-one of the 33 rules were influenced by self-construals and are discussed below.

Two of the 33 rules were not affected by culture, were not common rules, and were not affected by self-construals (i.e., R50, R53). Grice (1975) suggests that the two rules are conversational maxims in the U.S. Therefore, the two rules should be

endorsed more in the U.S. than Japan. Even though there were not significant differences between the Japan and the U.S. samples for the two rules, means for the two rules were higher in the U.S. than Japan, and both approached significance.

Overall, some of the findings are compatible with cultural individualism-collectivism and some are not. A plausible explanation for these findings is that the U.S. American respondents were more independent and more interdependent than were the Japanese respondents. This suggests that the expectations for politeness rules based on individualism should be consistent with the findings, but the expectations based on collectivism may not be consistent with the findings. That indeed was the case here. Using college students in Japan as respondents often results in samples that do not reflect the general cultural tendencies. College life in Japan is a time when students can be independent. However, it may not be just college students. Tsuda (1998) suggests that young people in Japan are more direct and open that older Japanese. Whether there is a cultural trend for Japanese to become more independent and less interdependent will only be known when the current generation of young people become older.

In drawing conclusions about the effect of cultural individualism-collectivism on perceptions of politeness rules it also must be kept in mind that this study only involved two cultures. It is impossible to draw firm conclusions regarding the effect of a dimension of cultural variability like individualism-collectivism with only two cultures (Gudykunst, in press). To draw firm conclusions, data from at least four cultures is necessary (e.g., two individualistic and two collectivistic cultures).

Relationship Differences

Two of 73 rules were significantly different by ingroup-outgroup relationships (R6, R37). Means for both of the rules are higher in outgroups than in ingroups. Virtually all of the rules were not influenced by ingroup-outgroup relationships.[8] One reason for this is that rules generally are based on situations not just relationships (Shimanoff, 1980).

Brown and Fraser (1979) suggest that situations include two broad components (i.e., the scene, the participants). The scene is associated with the setting (i.e., the location of the interaction, the time of the interaction, bystanders observing the interaction) and the purpose of the interaction (i.e., the type of activity, the subject matter). The participants include the individual participants (e.g., personality, physical appearance, ethnicity, sex) and the relationships between participants (e.g., liking, knowledge, social power, ingroup-outgroup). As a result, the ingroup-outgroup distinction involves only the relationships between participants in a situation. Since the rules for politeness generally are not affected by the ingroup-outgroup relationships in the present study, they probably are influenced by a combination of the scene and the participants.

The results of the present study indicated that ingroup-outgroup relationships

generally do not influence politeness rules. However, it should be kept in mind that the present study involved derived etic rules. If culture specific rules were examined in collectivistic cultures (e.g., Japan), ingroup-outgroup differences might be observed. For example, one of the rules that did not load on the first unrotated factor, "emphasize others' social standing," may be a politeness rule in outgroup relationship, but not in ingroup relationship in Japan. This is because members of collectivistic cultures draw a clear line between ingroup and outgroup relationships, and are interdependent with the ingroup members (Triandis, 1988).

Individual Differences

Nineteen rules were affected positively only by the independent self-construal, twenty-one rules were affected positively only by the interdependent self-construal, and eleven rules were influenced positively by both self-construals. Using an independent self-construal is associated with the use of low-context communication, and using an interdependent self-construal is related to the use of high-context communication (Gudykunst *et al*., 1996). Eight of the 19 rules affected by the independent self-construal appear to be associated with low-context communication (i.e., R22, R31, R35, R37, R46, R80, R86, and R99). These findings are consistent with previous research (e.g., Gudykunst *et al*., 1996).

Using an independent self-construal is associated with self-oriented attitudes, and using an interdependent self-construal is associated with other-oriented attitudes (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Two of the 19 rules affected by the independent self-construal are associated with self-oriented attitudes (i.e., R45, R100). Seventeen of the 21 rules influenced by the interdependent self-construal are related to other-oriented attitudes (i.e., R7, R29, R30, R32, R33, R40, R52, R55, R62, R69, R72, R79, R82, R88, R95, R101, and R104). Using interdependent self-construals also requires maintaining interdependence with others (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Three of the 21 rules influenced by interdependent self-construal are related to the maintaining interdependence with others (i.e., R20, R39, and R75).

On the whole, the 19 rules affected by independent self-construal appear to be related to individualistic tendencies (e.g., low-context communication, self-oriented attitudes), and the 21 rules influenced by interdependent self-construal appear to be associated with collectivistic tendencies (e.g., other-oriented attitudes, maintaining interdependence).

Twenty-two rules were not influenced by self-construals. Eleven of these 22 rules appear to be common rules in Japan and the U.S. (i.e., R1, R6, R17, R24, R34, R44, R48, R49, R58, R61, R66, R73, R83, R87, R93, R94, and R105). Also, six of the 11 rules affected by both self-construals were common rules in Japan and the U.S. (i.e., R1, R61, R83, R87, R94, and R105).

Nine of the 11 rules that were not influenced by self-construals and that were not common rules were influenced by culture (i.e., R10, R18, R42, R47, R51, R71,

R74, R78, and R81). The regulatory force of these rules appears to be influenced by culture and not self-construals.

Overall, the vast majority of the results for self-construals are compatible with expectations. Further, self-construals appear to be more consistent predictors of respondents' perceptions of the regulatory force of politeness rules than culture. Given that the study focuses on respondents' perceptions of the regulatory force of politeness rules, it is reasonable that the individual level measure of individualism-collectivism is a more consistent predictor than culture. Perceptions are influenced by culture, but they are an individual level phenomenon. If this study had examined the extent to which respondents followed politeness rules, it might be expected that culture would be a more consistent predictor than self-construals. This is a question for future research.

Conclusion

The present study suggests that a rules-oriented approach is a viable method for studying politeness. Janney and Arndt (1992) argue that social politeness involves rules for smoothly organized interaction. They also claim that tact involves interpersonal strategies for managing face. However, the present study indicates that there are rules regarding managing face, as well as rules for smoothly organized interaction. Clearly, Janney and Arndt's conceptualization needs rethinking to include rules for managing face.

The present study also indicates that there are politeness rules that differ across cultures, and there are politeness rules that are common across cultures. The rules that are common across cultures are potential "universal" politeness rules. The idea of universal rules is not new. To illustrate, Kroeger, Cheng, and Leong (1979) examined universal rules of address and Argyle and Henderson (1985) isolated universal relationship rules (see Lonner [1980] for a discussion of psychological universals). Whether or not the common rules isolated in this study are universal rules requires additional research.

Finally, the present study suggests that both the cultural and individual levels of individualism-collectivism are necessary to explain politeness rules in Japan and the U.S. Future research on politeness cannot just focus on culture, it must take the individual level into consideration.

**Authors' Note: This paper is based on the first author's MA thesis at California State University, Fullerton, directed by the second author. We want to thank Stella Ting-Toomey and Richard Wiseman for their comments and suggestions on earlier versions of this paper.*

Notes

1. Note that the number of rules and the clarity of the rules should be influenced by Hofstede's (1980) uncertainty avoidance dimension of cultural variability.
2. Research on cultural differences in managing face is related to cultural differences in politeness rules. Space limitations preclude reviewing that research here. For a recent summary of the research, see Ting-Toomey and Kurogi (1998).
3. We want to thank Rich Wiseman, Stella Ting-Toomey, Yasuhito Nakanishi, Julie Mallard, Jack Mierop, and Peter Lee for their assistance in collecting data for the two studies in the U.S. We also want to thank Tsukasa Nishida and Hiroko Nishida for their assistance in collecting data in Japan.
4. We want to thank Junko Tominaga and Mika Oguri for their assistance in translating the questionnaires used in the preliminary and main studies.
5. The specific items derived from the preliminary study are available from the first author upon request.
6. To conserve space, the tables with the statistical results are omitted. All tables are available from the first author upon request.
7. Since the U.S. sample consisted of several different ethnic groups, the effect of ethnicity within the U.S. sample was tested. Three ethnicities (i.e., European American, Latino American, Asian American) were used to test the effect because the number of respondents in the three groups were large enough to be examined (i.e., 115 European Americans, 63 Latino Americans, 47 Asian Americans). A multivariate analysis of variance was conducted to test the ethnic differences of politeness rules. The Bartllet's test of sphericity indicated that multivariate analysis was warranted (9060.72, 2700 df, $p<.0001$). The multivariate main effect for ethnicity was not significant (Wilks' Lambda=.36, $F[3, 266]=1.20$, p=ns).
8. Ingroup-outgroup relationships were analyzed within cultures and the results were similar.

References

Akasu, K., & Asao, K.
1993 Sociolinguistic factors influencing communication in Japan and the United States. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Communication in Japan and the United States* (pp. 88-121). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Argyle, M., & Henderson, M.

1985 The rules of relationships. In S. Duck & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Understanding personal relationships* (pp. 63-84). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Berger, C. R., & Bradac, J. J.
1982 *Language and social knowledge: Uncertainty in interpersonal relations.* London: Edward Arnold.

Blalock, H.
1979 *Social statistics* (revised second edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Brown, P., & Fraser, C.
1979 Speech as a marker of situation. In K. Scherer & H. Giles (Eds.), *Social markers in speech* (pp. 33-62). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S.
1978 Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomenon. In E. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 56-289). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
1987 *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Cupach, W. R., & Imahori, T. T.
1993 Managing social predicaments created by others: A comparison of Japanese and American facework. *Western Journal of Communication, 57*, 431-44.

Doi, T.
1973 *The anatomy of dependence*. Tokyo: Kodansha.

Goffman, E.
1955 On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. *Psychiatry, 18*, 213-31.
1967 *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Garden City,NY: Doubleday.

Grice, H.
1975 Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Vol.3. Speech acts* (pp. 107-42). New York: Academic Press.

Gudykunst, W. B.
(in press) Methodological issues in conducting theory-based cross-cultural research. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally speaking: Managing relations in talk across cultures.* London: Cassell.

Gudykunst, W. B., Matsumoto, Y., Ting-Toomey, S., Nishida, T., Kim, K. S., & Heyman, S.
1996 The influence of cultural individualism-collectivism, self-construals, and individual values on communication styles across cultures. *Human Communication Research, 22*, 510-43.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Nishida, T.
1994 *Bridging Japanese/North American differences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
1999 The influence of culture and strength of cultural identity on individual values in Japan and the United States. *Intercultural Communication Studies* IX-1. pp. 1-18

Gudykunst, W. B., & Ting-Toomey, S., with Chua, E.
1988 *Culture and interpersonal communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hall, E. T.
1976 *Beyond culture*. New York: Doubleday.

Hill, B., Ide, S., Ikuta, S., Kawasaki, A., & Ogino, T.
1986 Universals of linguistic politeness: Quantitative evidence from Japanese and American English. *Journal of Pragmatics, 10*, 347-71.

Ho, D.
1976 On the concept of face. *American Journal of Sociology, 81*, 867-84.

Hofstede, G.
1980 *Culture's consequences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage
1991 *Cultures and organizations*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Hu, H. C.
1944 The Chinese concept of "face." *American Anthropologist, 46*, 45-64.

Ide, S.
1989 Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua, 8*, 223-48.

Imahori, T. T., & Cupach, W. R.
1994 A cross-cultural comparison of the interpretation and management of face: U.S. American and Japanese responses to embarrassing predicaments. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 18*, 193-219.

Inoue, T.
1982 *Manazashi no ningen kankei* (Looking at human relationships). Tokyo: Kodansha.

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

Kim, M. S.
1994 Cross-cultural comparisons of the perceived importance of conversational constraints. *Human Communication Research, 21*, 128-51.

Kim, M. S., Sharkey, W., & Singelis, T.

1994 The relationship between individuals'self-construals and perceived importance of interactive constraints. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 18*, 117-40.

Kroeger, R., Cheng, K., & Leong, I.

1979 Are the rules of address universal? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 10*, 395-414.

Lonner, W. J.

1980 The search for psychological universals. In H. Triandis & W.Lambert (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (Vol 2, pp. 143-204). Boston: Allyn Bacon.

Markus, H., & Kitayama, S.

1991 Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224-53.

Matsumoto, Y.

1988 Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 12*, 403-26.

Maynard, S. K.

1997 *Japanese communication: Language and thought in context*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Morisaki, S., & Gudykunst, W. B.

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

Nakane, C.

1970 *Japanese society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

1974 The social system reflected in interpersonal communication. In J. Condon & M. Saito (Eds.), *Intercultural encounters with Japan* (pp. 124-31). Tokyo: Simul Press.

Naotsuka, R., Sakamoto, N., Hirose, T., Ohta, J., Maeda, S., Hara, T., & Iwasaki, K.

1981 *Mutual understanding of different cultures*. Osaka, Japan: Science Education Institute.

Neustupny, J. V.

1987 *Communicating with the Japanese*. Tokyo: Japan Times.

Nishida, H.

1989 *Jitsurei de miru nichibei komyunikeishon gyappu* (Communication gaps between Japanese and U.S. Americans). Tokyo: Taisyukan.

Okabe, R.

1983 Cultural assumptions of east and west: Japan and the United States. In W. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Intercultural communication theory* (pp. 21-44). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Okabe, R.

1990 *Sikitari eno kodawari: Reigi* (Unwillingness to discard tradition: Politeness). In G. Furuta (Ed.), *Ibunka communication keyword* (Keywords in intercultural communication) (pp. 132-3). Tokyo: Yuhikaku.

Shimanoff, S. B.
1980 *Communication rules*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Singelis, T., & Brown, W.
1995 Culture, self, and collectivist communication. *Human Communication Research, 21,* 354-89.

Stevens, J.
1986 *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ting-Toomey, S.
1994 Face and facework: An introduction. In S. Ting-Toomey (Ed.), *The challenge of facework* (pp. 1-14). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Ting-Toomey, S., & Kurogi, A.
1998 Facework competence in intercultural conflict:An updated face-negotiation theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 22,* 187-225.

Triandis, H. C.
1988 Collectivism vs. Individualism: A reconceptualization of a basic concept in cross-cultural psychology. In C. Bagley & G. Verma (Eds.), *Personality, cognition, and values: Cross-cultural perspectives of childhood and adolescence* (pp. 60-95). London: Macmillan.
1995 *Individualism & collectivism.* Boulder: Westview.

Tsuda, S.
1998 Positive politeness strategies in Japanese. *Intercultural Communication Studies, VIII*, 43-52.

Watts, R. J., Ide, S., & Ehlich, K.
1992 Introduction. In R. J. Watts, S. Ide, & K. Ehlich (Eds.), *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory and practice* (pp. 1-17). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Yamada, H.
1997 *Different games, different rules: Why Americans and Japanese misunderstand each other.* New York: Oxford University Press.