American English, Japanese, and Directness: More Than Stereotypes[1]

Kenneth R. Rose
Hong Kong Baptist University

There is a good deal of literature on American English and Japanese which can be used to support the rather stereotypical notion that the former is characterized by explicitness and directness, the latter by vagueness and indirectness. Although stereotypes such as these are often based at least partly on facts, they are generally oversimplifications of complex phenomena which, upon closer scrutiny, begin to reveal their inherent complexities. This paper provides a review of some of the literature on interaction in American English and Japanese supporting the stereotype. It also discusses some recent studies of language use by Americans and Japanese which suggest that the stereotypes need further elaboration. It is argued that more research is needed to go beyond prevailing stereotypes in describing and accounting for language use in both English and Japanese.

　アメリカ英語と日本語に関して、前者は明確で直接的であり、後者は曖昧で間接的であるという、かなりステレオタイプ的な概念を支持する研究は数多くある。このようなステレオタイプは、少なくとも部分的には事実に基づいていることも多いが、一般的にいって、複雑な現象の単純化されたものであり、注意深く検討すればその複雑な様相が姿を現わすものである。この論文は、アメリカ英語と日本語のインターアクションに関するステレオタイプを支持する先行研究を批評し、このステレオタイプにはさらに精密な記述が必要であることを示唆するアメリカ人と日本人の言語使用についての最近の研究を論じる。英語と日本語の言語使用を記述し説明する際に、広く受け入れられているステレオタイプを超えるためには、さらなる研究が必要である。

Norms for language use vary widely from one group to another, and numerous attempts have been made to characterize such differences across languages and cultures. Along these lines, as L. Miller (1994, p. 37) points out, "there are widely held and accepted characterizations of Americans as always forthright, direct and clear, and Japanese as always indirect, non-verbal and ambiguous."[2] Such global claims reveal the need for more in-depth study because they are, in fact, little more than stereotypes. While it is the nature of stereotypes to represent at least some aspects of reality, it is clear that more compre-

hensive accounts of language use are to be preferred. This is not to say that such accounts will fail to further support the stereotypes—in fact, they more than likely will offer at least some additional support. More importantly, though, they will also go beyond the stereotypes to un-cover the richness and complexity inherent in language use. This paper begins with a selective review of the literature on interaction in Japa-nese and American English which offers support for the dichotomy of hearer- versus speaker-based interaction proposed by Lakoff (1985). There is also a small but growing body of work on these languages which reflects the more complex nature of language use in context. Some of this work is presented after the discussion of hearer- and speaker-based interaction. Finally, some evidence from requests in American English and Japanese is presented which demonstrates that Americans can in fact be quite indirect, just as Japanese can be direct. Ultimately, though, much more detailed work is needed to begin to uncover the complex interrelationship of language and culture in Japanese and American English.

Support for the Stereotypes

Robin Lakoff (1985) has pointed out that since discourse is a coop-erative venture, it follows that the responsibility for determining mean-ing must be divided in some way among the participants. Lakoff notes that there are at least two ways this can be done: the responsibility can be that of the speaker or that of the hearer. In speaker-based interac-tion, clarity and explicitness are paramount, and miscommunication is the speaker's fault. In hearer-based interaction, imprecision and ambi-guity are valued, and miscommunication is the hearer's fault. Lakoff maintains that American English would be placed on the speaker-based end of the continuum, while Japanese would be situated on the hearer-based end. While it may have some appeal, one drawback of a di-chotomy of this type is the possibility of overlooking or at least minimizing directness and indirectness within a single cultural context. Nonethe-less, the distinction between directness and explicitness on the part of the speaker, and sensitivity and intuition on the part of the hearer, is repeated often in discussions of Japanese and American English.

One area in which the stereotypical Japanese penchant for indirect-ness is said to be exemplified is that of Japanese proverbs. Condon (1984) cites two which offer support for the Japanese tendency towards indirect speech (or no speech at all): "Speech is silver, but silence in golden" and "Hollow drums make the most noise." Lebra (1987) men-

tions several more proverbs with similar content: *Kuchi ni mitsu ari, hara ni ken ari* (Honey in the mouth, dagger in the belly), *Bigen shin narazu* (Beautiful speech lacks sincerity), and *Iwanu ga hana* (Better to leave things unsaid). She also points out that in Japan, trustworthy people are characterized as *kuchi ga katai* (hard-mouthed), and even politicians are not expected to exhibit eloquent speech. She maintains that hesitant speech, or preferably silence, is seen as a sign of humility, politeness, and empathy. Barnlund (1989, p. 115) makes a similar observation in stating that in Japan "admired people are, for the most part, distinguished by their modest demeanor, lack of eloquence, and their public modesty." And according to Loveday (1982, p. 3), the "articulation of thoughts and feelings in Japanese is often taken as an unmistakable sign that the speaker is neither profound nor sincere." While these proverbs may indeed reflect ideal norms which are not always representative of actual language use, they do present an image of the reputed Japanese distrust of the verbal.

Along similar lines, Doi (1974, p. 20) maintains that "for the Japanese, verbal communication is something that accompanies non-verbal communication and not the other way around." Lebra (1987, p. 343) notes that if "cultures can be differentiated along [a] noise-silence continuum . . . there are many indications that Japanese culture tilts towards silence." It should be noted that Doi and Lebra are writing from a psychological rather than a linguistic perspective. Similarly, the Japanese author Miyoshi has written that

> perhaps more important than any other factor in this problem of language and style is the Japanese dislike of the verbal. It might be said that the culture is primarily visual, not verbal, in orientation, and social decorum provides that reticence, not eloquence, is rewarded. (cited in Holden, 1983, p. 165)

Miyoshi's rationale for making such a statement is not made clear, but it seems that his view is not too far from that of some linguists. For example, Yamada (1994, p. 20) maintains that "the Japanese are skeptical about the value of talk, and, contrastively, idealize silence."

Ueda (1974) provides an interesting example of reputed indirectness in Japanese refusals. She maintains that there are at least 16 ways to avoid saying 'no' in Japanese. These include being silent, asking a counter question, changing the subject, walking away, lying, criticizing, delaying the answer, and apologizing. Thus, rather than say 'no' directly, she claims that Japanese speakers prefer to utilize any number of strategies of indirect refusal with the belief that the hearer will perceive their intention and act

accordingly. Of course, it is likely that 'no' can be said in more than one way in any language. In a questionnaire study of refusals made by Japanese and Americans, Beebe, Takahashi and Uliss-Weltz (1990) found that Japanese subjects tended to apologize, offer alternatives, and give more vague excuses than English speakers (see also Takahashi and Beebe 1987). However, such practices were found among the Americans as well, albeit less frequently, which indicates that such behavior is not the exclusive domain of the Japanese. That is, members of both groups exhibit similar behavior, but to varying degrees. This is an indication that the issue is not all or nothing, but is better perceived as one of degree.

In the framework of contrastive rhetoric, Hinds (1987) has proposed a dichotomy analogous to Lakoff's: speaker/writer responsibility. As a basis for applying the notion of hearer-based interaction to written texts, Hinds begins with a description of spoken interaction in which he maintains that in English "the person primarily responsible for effective communication is the speaker, while in . . . Japanese, the person primarily responsible for effective communication is the listener" (p. 143). Yoshikawa is also cited as stating that

> what is often verbally expressed [in Japanese] and what is actually intended are two different things. What is verbally expressed is probably important enough to maintain friendship, and it is generally called *tatemae* which means simply 'in principle' but what is not verbalized counts most—*honne* which means 'true mind.' Although it is not expressed verbally, you are supposed to know it by *kan*—'intuition.' (cited in Hinds, 1987, p. 144)

Hinds seems to imply, then, that the Japanese hearer/reader is primarily responsible for effective communication, and as Yoshikawa sees it, it is the obligation of the Japanese listener to use *kan* (intuition) to determine the meaning of discourse. Similarly, Okabe (1983) notes that in American rhetoric "the speaker is the transmitter of information, ideas, and opinions, while the audience is a receiver of those messages . . . [but] the rhetoric of Japan is remarkable for its emphasis on the importance of the perceiver" (p. 36), implying that certain types of discourse organization are characteristic of Japanese, as others are characteristic of English. Hinds points out, though, that his distinction between reader- and writer-responsibility refers to tendencies rather than rules, that is, he is not claiming that either language will not evidence both. However, rather than simply highlight what seem to be rather common characteristics of a given language, more emphasis should be placed on the fact that every language and culture evidences a broad range of discourse organization patterns in both speech and writing.

In discussing communicative style in Japanese, Clancy (1986) maintains that Japanese communication is largely based on the notion of *amae*, which refers to the dependence on and expectation of the benevolence of others. The relationship between mother and child is the prototypic relationship based on *amae*. According to Doi (1974), "the psychosis of *amae* pervades and actually creates the Japanese patterns of communication" (p. 19), that is, "what is most important for Japanese is to reassure themselves on every occasion of a mutuality based on *amae*" (p. 20). Clancy also argues that the basis of Japanese communicative style is a set of cultural values which emphasize *omoiyari* (empathy) over explicit verbal communication, and she claims that the extremely homogeneous, group-oriented society of Japan allows for such indirectness: people must be able to understand each other's thoughts and feelings without explicit verbal expression. Holden (1983) makes a similar observation in saying that "what is striking about Japanese social behavior is that the Japanese often claim to know intuitively what other Japanese are feeling" (p. 165). Lebra (1976) echoes this view in asserting that in Japanese conversation "the speaker does not complete a sentence but leaves it open-ended in such a way that the listener will take it over before the former clearly expresses his will or opinion" (p. 39). Clancy concludes by stating that:

> in Japan, the ideal interaction is not one in which the speakers express their wishes and needs adequately and listeners understand and comply, but rather one in which each party understands and anticipates the needs of the other, even before anything is said. Communication can take place without, or even in spite of, actual verbalization. The main responsibility lies with the listener, who must know what the speaker means regardless of the words that are used. (1986, p. 217)

All of this gives one the impression that the Japanese prefer not to use language at all, or that on those occasions when language is required, it is used sparingly. A second implicit claim here is that only Japanese are capable of intuiting the meaning in a discourse, or at least that they are somehow better at it than others. However, much of pragmatic theory (e.g., Gricean maxims or speech act theory) holds as its fundamental premise that all people engaged in meaningful interaction constantly intuit meaning. In fact, some would claim that it is impossible for us not to do so. It seems necessary, then, to move past the stereotypes to more complete accounts of language use in Japanese and English. Only then will we be able to determine how closely the stereotypes correspond to reality and in what ways they differ from it.

A More Complex Picture

Some of the accounts cited above seem to indicate that Japan is a place where little verbal interaction takes place, that is, verbal interaction would seem to be viewed as a last recourse only when intuition has failed to produce the desired result. And even then, such interaction would be judged as less than satisfactory. Of course, this is not completely representative of Japan or anywhere else. The reputed Japanese propensity for indirectness (and that of Americans for directness) provides at best a partial account.

Beebe and Takahashi (1989a, 1989b) point out that the stereotypical view of Japanese as indirect represents an incomplete picture of Japanese interaction. They maintain that the Japanese

> can be mercilessly direct. They can indeed be extremely indirect as well. The picture becomes clearer when we realize that the situations in which Japanese and Americans choose to be direct or indirect depend to a great extent on the relative social status of the interlocutors. (1989a, p. 104)

Using both ethnographic and questionnaire data, Beebe and Takahashi (1989a) compared the strategies for disagreement and giving embarrassing information for English speakers and advanced Japanese speakers of English. They found that "Japanese ESL speakers often do not conform to the prevalent stereotypes about their indirectness and their inexplicitness" (p. 120). In a questionnaire study of offers and requests in English, Fukushima (1990) found that "Japanese subjects were too direct in most situations, and sounded rude" (p. 317). Tanaka (1988), using role-plays to investigate politeness in English requests, found that Japanese were more direct and less polite than Australians. Since these studies deal with Japanese learners of English and not directly with interaction in Japanese, they should be treated with some caution. Unfortunately, there is little Japanese data available which addresses this issue. It should be noted, though, that the indirect speech of Japanese learners of English has been cited as evidence of a Japanese preference for indirectness (c.f. Schmidt, 1983). In two questionnaire studies of requests in Japanese and English, Rose (1992b, 1994a) found that Japanese were more direct than Americans on an open-ended discourse completion test (DCT), but switched to hinting and opting out on a multiple choice questionnaire (MCQ) containing the same request situations. Unlike studies based on L2 English produced by Japanese, these studies did look at Japanese, and they seem to indicate that things are more complex than implied by a hearer/speaker-based dichotomy.

In pointing out that the indirectness of the Japanese can be oversim-
plified, Condon (1984) cites a Japanese professional interpreter who
maintains that "Americans can be just as indirect as the Japanese, but
they are indirect about different things, and being indirect carries a
different meaning" (p. 43). Holden (1983) also maintains that while the
Japanese distaste for directness may be evident in their language use,
Japanese is far more explicit than English where social status relations
are concerned. That is, it seems that social relations are more clearly
marked linguistically in Japanese than in English, with a typical example
being choice of pronoun. While English affords only one first-person
singular pronoun, Japanese has a range of at least five (*watakushi,
watashi, atashi, boku, ore*), each employed according to speaker, lis-
tener, and setting. In fact as pronouns are generally omitted, expressing
social status is a criterion for choosing a particular pronoun over zero-
pronoun. It could be argued, then, that English is vague and indirect
with reference to indicating social relations linguistically, but Japanese
is explicit and direct. In addition, L. Miller (1994, p. 52) points out that
the Japanese cannot simply prefer indirectness as the unmarked form of
communication because their language contains a number of expres-
sions to indicate that speech is "more indirect than what is normally
expected or desirable." She cites the following examples: *kotoba o bokasu*
(to shade the talk, i.e., to refuse to come out and say), *tsukamidokoro
no nai* (no place to grab onto, i.e., to be vague, unclear), and *ocha o
nigosu* (make the tea muddy, i.e., to talk ambiguously).

R. Miller (1982), if not the most vocal certainly the most acerbic critic
of the prevalent stereotype, has this to say about Miyoshi's claim that
Japanese culture is primarily visual:

> Anyone who has lived in Japan for any period of time, whether he or she
> knows the language or not, will surely find all this difficult to accept.
> Miyoshi's basic assumptions will surely appear to run counter to most
> direct experience. If any single feature characterizes sociolinguistic behavior
> in modern Japan, it is the obvious pleasure and delight that Japanese at
> every level of society take in the constant and generally strident, high-
> decibel employment of their own language. (p. 86)

While R. Miller may at times overstate his case, his observations here
should ring true to anyone who has spent time in Japan. All it takes is
one visit to any of Japan's ubiquitous *nomiya* (favorite eating/drinking
spots of businessmen) or a *karaoke* bar to see (or rather hear) that
Japanese do not always tend towards silence. Both 'strident' and 'high-
decibel' aptly characterize Japanese language use in such settings.

It seems, then, that an analysis which posits a dichotomy based on degree of directness and places Japanese and Americans on opposite ends is only a beginning in describing and accounting for language use because such dichotomies downplay variation within the respective languages. As Hymes rightly points out,

> the primitive state of our knowledge of discourse is reflected in the general prevalence of dichotomies. . . . Such dichotomies do us the service of naming diversity. They do us the disservice of reducing diversity to polar opposites. (1986, p. 50)

Detailed investigation should produce data which reveals directness and indirectness in both English and Japanese, and it is likely that the contexts in which each is appropriate in the respective languages will differ. It is necessary to move away from the prevalent overgeneralizations and uncover the complexity of this variation.

Obviously, the way to proceed in addressing this issue (and other aspects of language use in Japanese or English) would be to conduct detailed studies which incorporate plenty of reliable data. Due to the difficulty of doing such a study on Japanese in my present abode (Hong Kong), I have assembled a few pieces of counter-evidence to illustrate the need for more research. It is my hope that those who are in a position to flesh out the possibilities mentioned will do so, thus addressing these questions with the depth which they deserve.

A Few Requests

Following are a few requests from American English which I have collected using what I will refer to as an 'eavesdropping' approach, but which Beebe (1994) calls notebook data. That is, they were collected in an unsystematic manner from naturally occurring language use. When I heard them, I jotted them down in a notebook as soon after the fact as possible. Such data clearly have limitations (see, e.g., Rose, 1994b).

1. Is this your stuff?
2. Is this where she got out?
3. Are you using the phone?
4. I need to see the mirror over there.

Request (1) occurred in a university copy shop. I was using one of only two available copiers and had placed my jacket and briefcase on the other. The person making this request was a male graduate student (I too was a

graduate student at the time) about my age whom I had never met. Based on the coding scheme used in the Cross Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP), a large-scale cross-linguistic study of requests and apologies (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper, 1989), this utterance would be considered a mild hint, the most indirect request strategy on a nine-point scale of directness. Upon hearing the request, I (in a characteristic Japanese manner) intuited the intention, immediately apologized, and moved my jacket and briefcase to make the copy machine available.

Request (2) occurred on an airplane. In view of those present, a man sitting in a window seat and a woman sitting in the center section of the plane agreed to switch seats (they apparently knew each other well). The woman first got out of her seat in the center of the plane and went to sit in the window seat just a few rows forward. When the man came to take his new seat, the person sitting at the end of the row did not move, at which time (2) was uttered. Again, this would be coded as a mild hint, and it produced the desired effect: the hearer intuited the speaker's intention, stood up and allowed the man to gain access to his new seat.

Request (3) occurred in an airport lobby where several pay phones were located. In this case, I was standing in front of a phone, with my back to it, waiting for a friend who was using the adjacent phone. It was clear that I was neither using the phone nor preparing to do so. A woman who appeared to be about my age approached me and uttered (3). Again, this would be coded as a mild hint by CCSARP standards, and, again, it produced the desired effect. I intuited her intent, apologized, and moved out of the way to allow her to use the phone.

Request (4) occurred on a crowded university bus. All the seats were taken, and the aisle was filled with standing passengers. The bus was so full that the driver was having difficulty seeing the side-view mirror outside the bus door. At this point, he uttered (4). This would again be coded as a mild hint, and it produced the desired effect. The people standing in front of the mirror intuited the bus driver's intent and moved so that they were no longer blocking his field of vision. What is interesting about this request is that given the higher status of the driver (due to positional authority) and the possible danger to himself and his passengers as a result of his inability to see the mirror, we might expect a more direct request. That is, if Americans favor directness and do not have the intuitive capacities of the Japanese, a hint here is not just inefficient, but also potentially dangerous. If any situation called for a more direct strategy, this one is a likely candidate. However, the request strategy preferred by the bus driver was that of hinting.

I will not attempt a lengthy discussion of these English hints. They were collected selectively and represent too small a sample for that. I will point out, though, that the interaction in each case (all involving native speakers of American English) clearly follows the so-called hearer-based pattern, which is supposed to characterize Japanese, not English. It is interesting to note, though, that in each of these cases the participants had never met. It would be worth a further look to see if this pattern holds for a larger, more systematically-collected sample. That, of course, is an empirical question. However, it is worth noting that one of the reasons often put forward for the use of indirectness in Japanese, that hinting is favored because the interlocutors know one another and therefore need not be explicit, is precisely the opposite. The bottom line, though, is clearly demonstrated—is *not* the sole domain of the Japanese.

Having shown that Americans can be indirect, it remains to illustrate directness in Japanese. Due to the unavailability of 'eavesdropping' data on Japanese requests, I will instead discuss the Japanese request data reported in Rose and Ono (1995). While there are differences between these data and the American English data discussed above, they will nevertheless serve the purpose of this paper. The data were collected in Japan using a DCT consisting of twelve request situations. The subjects were thirty-six undergraduates at a women's college in Kobe. The questionnaires were administered in Japanese, by a native speaker of Japanese. It should first be pointed out that subjects used direct requests in all twelve of the situations, with directness being the preferred strategy in four situations. It is from these four situations that I will draw some examples.

In the first, the subjects were asked what they would say if they were studying in their room for a test they had on the following day, but were unable to concentrate because their younger brother was listening to loud music in the next room. In this situation 69.4% of the subjects chose to use a direct request. Following are two examples:

5.   *Ashita tesuto dakara heddohon de kiite.*
     I have a test tomorrow, so listen on the headphones.

6.   *Chotto urusai kara heddohon de kiite.*
     It's a little noisy—listen on the headphones.

In the second situation, direct requests were chosen by 88.9% of the subjects. In this case, the subjects were asked what they would say if while watching television they were to ask their younger sister to pass the remote control. Following are two examples:

7.   *Rimokon totte.*
      Pass the remote.

8.   *Gomen. Soko no rimokon totte.*
      Sorry. Pass that remote over there.

The third situation asked subjects what they would say to ask a friend to lend them a book by Sidney Sheldon. Direct requests were preferred by 61.1% of the subjects. Here are two examples:

9.   *Shidonii Sherudan no osusume no hon kashite.*
      Lend me a Sidney Sheldon book that you'd recommend.

10.   *Shidonii Sherudan no hon kashite hoshii. Dore ga ichiban omoshirokatta?*
      I want you to lend me a Sidney Sheldon book. Which one do you think is the most interesting?

In the last situation, which yielded 63.9% direct requests, subjects were asked what they would say if they and their friend were on a train approaching the friend's stop, had yet to finalize their plans for the following day, and so needed to talk over the phone that evening. Following are two examples:

11.   *Yoru denwa shite.*
      Call me tonight.

12.   *Machiwase-jikan wo kime-tai kara kyoo denwa choodai.*
      I want to set the time for our appointment, so call me today.

As with the English data, I will not attempt a detailed discussion or analysis of these Japanese requests. However, it is worth noting that these situations all involve cases (in CCSARP terms) in which the speaker is dominant or the interlocutors are of equal status. That is, for situations in which the hearer was of higher status, directness was not the preferred strategy (although it did occur in some cases). Also, the degree of imposition is also relatively low in each of the request situations cited above. This particular data set does not warrant any substantive generalizations, it may indicate that directness is a frequent request strategy in Japanese for requests involving a low degree of imposition which are not made to higher status hearers. This is an empirical question which represents precisely the kind of contextual variation that detailed studies ought to reveal.

While the examples cited above must be treated with caution because of possible effects of the data collection procedure (for discus-

sions on this see, e.g., Kasper and Dahl, 1991; Rose, 1992a, 1992b, 1994a, 1994b; Rose and Ono, 1995), they are sufficient to illustrate the likely possibility that there are contexts in which speakers of Japanese prefer directness over indirectness. Whether questionnaire responses are representative of face-to-face interaction is not really at issue here—it is clear that DCTs tap NS intuitions concerning what constitutes appropriate language behavior. Whether those intuitions are borne out in actual interaction is another issue.

Again, the examples cited above are obviously insufficient for making any sort of generalizations concerning indirectness in American English or directness in Japanese, and it is not my intention to do so. This paper is not intended to be a rigorous study but rather hopes to inspire such studies in the future. Nevertheless, they do illustrate a few occurrences of indirect language use by Americans and direct language use by Japanese. As such, they provide some counter-evidence to popular stereotypes and point to the need for further research. While such research would likely offer some support for the hearer/speaker-based dichotomy, no doubt it would also reveal a more complex picture of interaction in both languages.

Conclusion

The observation that Americans and Japanese exhibit different patterns in the level of directness in interaction is no doubt a valid one. No two groups should be expected to share all of the same norms for communication in all contexts. However, it is equally true that no single characterization is adequate to describe patterns of language use by any one group in every context, and that dichotomies are of limited value in comparing language use across groups. While the literature does provide evidence to support the notion that Japanese are more indirect than Americans, recent studies point to more complex accounts. This paper has offered a few counter-examples to the prevailing stereotype, but it has not offered a complete account of the similarities and differences in American and Japanese interaction. That awaits further detailed study. It should be clear, however, that such study will more than likely offer both additional support for the existing stereotypes and a more accurate picture of the complexities of language use by both groups.

Kenneth R. Rose, Ph.D., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, teaches advanced undergraduate and graduate courses in applied linguistics at Hong Kong Baptist University. He has also taught in the U.S. and Japan.

Notes

1. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 19th International JALT Conference, Omiya, October 1993. Thanks to the conference participants, Sandra Fotos, and two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments.
2. As noted, R. Miller proceeds to argue against the stereotypes.

References

Barnlund, D. (1989). *Communicative styles of Japanese and Americans: Images and realities.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Beebe, L. (1994). Notebook data on power and the power of notebook data. Paper presented at the 28th Annual TESOL Convention, Baltimore, March.

Beebe, L., & Takahashi, T. (1989a). Do you have a bag? In S. Gass, C. Madden, D. Preston, & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Variation in second language acquisition, vol. 1.* Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Beebe, L., & Takahashi, T. (1989b). Sociolinguistic variation in face-threatening speech acts. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), *The dynamic interlanguage* (pp. 103-125). New York: Plenum Press.

Beebe, L., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. Scarcella, E. Andersen, & S. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55-73). New York: Newbury House.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Clancy, P. (1986). The acquisition of communicative style in Japanese. In B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 213-250). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Condon, J. (1984). *With respect to the Japanese.* Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Doi, T. (1974). Some psychological themes in Japanese human relationships. In J. Condon & M. Saito (Eds.), *Intercultural encounters with Japan: Communication—contact and conflict* (pp. 17-26). Tokyo: The Simul Press.

Fukushima, S. (1990). Offers and requests: Performance by Japanese learners of English. *World Englishes, 9,* 317-325.

Hinds, J. (1987) Reader versus writer responsibility. In U. Connor & R. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages* (pp. 141-152). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Holden, N. (1983). The Japanese language. *Multilingua, 2,* 157-166.

Hymes, D. (1986). Discourse: Scope without depth. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 57,* 49-89.

Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13,* 215-247.

Lakoff, R. (1985). The pragmatics of subordination. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society.* Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

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

Lebra, T. (1987). The cultural significance of silence in Japanese communication. *Multilingua, 6,* 343-357.

Loveday, L. (1982). Communicative interference: from Japanese to English. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 20,* 1-16.

Miller, L. (1994). Japanese and American indirectness. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 5,* 37-55.

Miller, R. (1982). *Japan's modern myth: The language and beyond.* New York: Weatherhill.

Okabe, R. (1983). Cultural assumptions of East and West. In W. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Intercultural communication theory: Current perspectives* (pp. 21-44). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Rose, K. (1992a). Speech acts and questionnaires: The effect of hearer response. *Journal of Pragmatics, 17,* 49-62.

Rose, K. (1992b) Method and scope in cross-cultural speech act research: A contrastive study of requests in Japanese and English. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Rose, K. (1994a). On the validity of DCTs in non-Western contexts. *Applied Linguistics, 15,* 1-14.

Rose, K. (1994b). Establishing research paradigms in speech act studies. 8th Annual International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning, Research Methods Parasession Panel, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, April.

Rose, K., & Ono, R. (1995). Eliciting speech act data in Japanese: The effect of questionnaire type. *Language Learning, 45,* 191-223.

Schmidt, R. (1983). Interaction, acculturation and the acquisition of communicative competence: A case study of one adult. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 137-174). New York: Newbury House.

Takahashi, T., & Beebe, L. (1987). The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English. *JALT Journal, 8,* 131-155.

Tanaka, N. (1988). Politeness: Some problems for Japanese speakers of English. *JALT Journal, 9,* 81-102.

Ueda, K. (1974). Sixteen ways to avoid saying 'no' in Japan. In J. Condon & M. Saito (Eds.), *Intercultural encounters with Japan: Communication—contact and conflict* (pp. 185-195). Tokyo: The Simul Press.

Yamada, H. (1994). Talk-distancing in Japanese meetings. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 5,* 19-36.

Yoshikawa, M. (1978). Some Japanese and American cultural characteristics. In M.H. Posser (Ed.), *The cultural dialogues: An introduction to intercultural communication* (pp. 220-230). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.