慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ
Keio Associated Repository of Academic resouces

Title	The use of address terms in Japanese and impoliteness : focusing on the use of institutional titles
Sub Title	
Author	Kim, Angela A-Jeoung
Publisher	慶應義塾大学日本語・日本文化教育センター
Publication year	2016
Jtitle	日本語と日本語教育 No.44 (2016. 3) ,p.21- 40
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	論文
Genre	Departmental Bulletin Paper
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00189695-20160300-0021

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

慶應義塾大学　日本語・日本文化教育センター紀要
『日本語と日本語教育』44：21−40（2016.3）

The use of Address Terms in Japanese and Impoliteness: focusing on the use of institutional titles

Angela A-Jeoung KIM

1. Introduction

The aim of the current study is to examine the use of address terms in Japanese in relation to impoliteness. The study focuses on the cases of institutional titles used by speakers of a higher status to address their subordinates in the Japanese TV series *Hanzawa Naoki* (TBS). I will first analyse the examples in relation to 'non-conventionalised impoliteness: implicational impoliteness' within the framework of Culpeper (2011). In addition to implicational impoliteness which Culpeper (2011) discusses, I will also claim that the use of institutional titles in Japanese by speakers of a higher status to their subordinates can be employed to reinforce impoliteness. This is in the context where the speaker is accusing or blaming the addressee for not fulfilling the responsibility of someone who holds the addressee's institutional title. I will argue that the overt use of the institutional title in such contexts shows the speaker is trying to heighten the addressee's awareness of their institutional role and is emphasizing who is to blame. After having shown that institutional titles can be used in such a way, I will go on to show that these institutional titles can also be used with 'conventionalised impoliteness', another aspect of impoliteness proposed by Culpeper (2011). Thus, I will present that regardless of whether the context of impoliteness is conventionalised or non-conventionalised, the use of institutional titles can be used to reinforce the impoliteness.

2. Background and data

Position names or professional ranks (such as last name＋*buchoo* (division manager)) which will be referred to as institutional titles in the current study are one of the frequently used terms in Japanese when addressing someone with respect (Mizutani and Mizutani 1987: 87−88). Makino and Tsutsui (1989: 31) state that in the situation where the addressee is in a higher social position, the

speaker "has to employ the addressee's social role term when addressing him" and in fact, there is a tendency that 'last name＋institutional title' and 'institutional title alone' is used for older people in work-related situations（小林 2002: 117）[1]. Not surprisingly among the cases of '(last name)＋institutional title' found in the data, approximately 67 per cent was used by a subordinate to people of higher institutional status[2]. The use of institutional titles as an address term, however, has different implication depending on whether they are used by a subordinate to his/her superior or vice versa. Ide (1982: 359) asserts that while deference is expressed if these terms are used by subordinates to someone of a higher status, only formality is involved in the reverse situation. Instead of employing the institutional title of the subordinate, the terms used by people of a higher position in the data included the personal pronouns such as *kimi*, *anata*, and *omae*[3], 'you', last name＋*kun* (e.g. Hanzawa-*kun*), last name only (e.g. Hanzawa), and in a very limited frequency of first name only (e.g. Shinnosuke)[4]. Examples (1) and (2) below illustrate the cases of Ide's (1982) claim that only formality is involved when the institutional title is used by a higher status person to his/her subordinate.

In (1) Sadaoka, who is from the loans section of the main branch is about to interview Hanzawa[5]. The following utterance was produced as Hanzawa walked into the room. Sadaoka uses the last name followed by the institutional title *yuushi kachoo*, 'the loans section chief'.

(1) Sadaoka: ***hanzawa yuushi kachoo*** *suwatte kudasai.*
Hanzawa loans section chief seat please
"**Hanzawa *yuushi kachoo***, please take a seat"

(Episode 1, 1:24:58)

In the following example, Nakanowatari is the president of the bank in which Hanzawa is employed.

(2) Nakanowatari: *dewa kimi ni jirei o tsutaeru.*
well you to announcement of appointment Obj convey

zehitomo jurishite morai tai.
by all means accept Aux want

"Then I will announce your appointment. I hope you will accept it by all means"

Hanzawa: *hai*.
yes
"Yes"

Nakanowatari: ***hanzawa naoki jichoo***. *eigyoo kikakubu*
Hanzawa Naoki deputy manager sales planning division

buchoo *shoku toshite tookyoo sentoraru*
division manager post as Tokyo central

shooken e no shukkoo o meijiru.
securities to Lk temporary transfer Obj commend

"**Hanzawa Naoki *jichoo***, I commend you a temporary transfer to Tokyo Central Securities as a division manager post"
(Episode 10, 1:15:30～)

In example (2) above, the president of the bank is announcing Hanzawa's appointment, which is a very formal situation. In doing so, he is using the full name, Hanzawa Naoki, and an institutional title *jichoo*, 'deputy manager'. The use of institutional titles in these examples is in line with the claims above that institutional titles used by a speaker of higher position to their subordinate is for formality. There are however some other examples that contain subordinates' institutional titles which can be interpreted as more than mere formality. I will further discuss this in the analysis section.

The data used for the analysis is extracts from the 1899 usages of address/reference terms (including the first, second, and third personal pronouns employed by anyone in the series) observed in episodes 1 to 10 of *Hanzawa Naoki* (TBS)[6]. Considering variable factors of *uchi-soto* relationship（Nakane 1970; Lebra 1976; Sugimoto 2003; 井出 2006）that Japanese society exhibits, the target for analysis is limited to the institutional titles used by a speaker of a higher status to their subordinates within the same institution (i.e. within the bank at which Hanzawa is serving). Limiting the usage of address/reference terms within the bank resulted in 775 occurrences. Among these, 165 cases of '(last name)＋institutional title' were found. Within the 165 occurrences, 111 were used by subordinates to higher status persons (27 are used as reference terms), 11 were used between equals, and 1 was used by a higher status person to a subordinate, but used in self referencing. Accordingly 42 cases are of '(last name)＋institutional title' used by people of a higher status to address/refer to their subordinates, but 10 cases are used as reference terms. Thus, the number of occurrences of '(last name)＋institutional title'

used by a higher status person to address their subordinates (on which the current analysis is focused) in the data is 32. This is 19 per cent of the total usage of the '(last name)＋institutional title' within the bank.

The examples containing institutional title to be discussed in the analysis contain cases of implicational impoliteness discussed by Culpeper (2011). In order to discuss the meaning of 'non-conventional impoliteness' (Culpeper 2011), it is useful to first briefly explain 'conventionalised impoliteness'. In Kim (2014) I presented a micro-analysis of impoliteness strategies observed in the Japanese TV series *Hanzawa Naoki* (TBS) adopting Culpeper (2011) and Culpeper (2008) as a framework. I adopted the concept of face and 'sociality rights' (Spencer-Oatey 2000, 2002, 2005, 2007, 2008) and showed that some impoliteness strategies found in the Japanese data overlap with the categories and subcategories of the 'conventionalised impoliteness formulae' (Culpeper 2011) in English. The 'conventionalised impoliteness formulae' according to Culpeper (2011: 153) is "a form of language in which context-specific impoliteness effects are conventionalised". They include insults, pointed criticisms/complaints, unpalatable questions and/or presuppositions, condescensions, message enforcers, dismissals, siliencers, threats, and negative expressives such as curses and ill-wishes (Culpeper 2011: 125−136). Non-conventionalised impoliteness, on the other hand, are the impoliteness events which do not involve the conventionalised impoliteness formulae (Culpeper 2011: 155) and thus implied rather than explicit. Culpeper (2011: 155) classifies the non-conventionalised implicational impoliteness into three categories according to the way in which the implication is triggered; form-driven, convention-driven (with sub-categories of internal and external), and context-driven (with sub-categories of unmarked behaviour and absence of behaviour)[7]. The examples to be discussed here are the ones that conform to the second type, convention-driven implicational impoliteness. Below is Culpeper's (2011: 155) definition of convention-driven implicational impoliteness.

(3) Convention-driven:
(a) Internal: the context projected by part of a behaviour mismatches that projected by another part; or
(b) External: the context projected by a behaviour mismatches the context of use.
Culpeper (2011: 155)

Convention-driven implicational impoliteness includes sarcasm (Culpeper 2011:

165) which the examples to be presented in the next section exhibits. Culpeper (2011) groups the convention-driven implicational impoliteness into two depending on "whether the mismatch occurs internally within the behaviour or with some aspect of the context" (Culpeper 2011: 168). However Culpeper (2011: 168) admits that "the separation between these groups… is not always hard and fast" and presents the following example which contains both internal and external mismatch.

(4) Example from Culpeper (2011: 168)

A friend that I used to work with came to visit me with his partner (who used to work for me last year). She is pregnant and before she even said hello to me she walked into my house and said 'Yeah mate—I'm 5 months now and I'm no where [*sic.*] near as big as you were—you were a monster (laughs) wasn't she Daz' So I replied with 'Oh, hello, come in—very nice to see you again too!'

After saying this in a sarcastic tone, I looked at my friend Darren (the pregnant girls [*sic*.] partner) who cringed+mouthed silently 'sorry' to me and then said 'who's for a nice cup of tea' in a smiley voice.

Culpeper (2011: 169) notes that there is an external mismatch as 'Oh, hello, come in—very nice to see you again too!' is a conventionalised politeness greeting but it mismatches the context, especially the previous utterance 'you are a monster' which is consistent with impoliteness. Culpeper (2011: 169) continues that there is internal mismatch as can be seen from the informant's report that she spoke with a sarcastic tone. Similar to Culpeper's (2011) example above, my data contain both cases of internal and external implicational impoliteness. In the following analysis section I will therefore examine implicational impoliteness as a whole rather than dividing into sections for each group.

In addition to Culpeper's implicational impoliteness, I will present examples where the institutional title used by the speaker of a higher status to address their subordinates conveys both conventionalised and non-conventionalised impoliteness. These usages are highly contextual since they occur in clear cases of conflict and involve other types of impoliteness in both verbal and non-verbal expressions. I will demonstrate that the use of institutional titles as address terms reinforce conventionalised and non-conventionalised impoliteness. The usage is overt as the title is being used in a particular context where it is not necessary. It therefore contributes to the impoliteness by making the addressee aware of the gravity of responsibility and the blame for not having fulfilled that responsibility, or for committing a wrongdoing.

3. Analysis

The following example (5) contains both internal and external implicational impoliteness. The segment below took place in the context where Asano, the manager of the Nishi Osaka Branch is asking Hanzawa to take full responsibility for the loss of five hundred million, since someone has to take the blame. Asano insists that after Hanzawa has taken responsibility and been transferred elsewhere, he (Asano) will definitely get him (Hanzawa) back to his proper position in a short time.

(5) Hanzawa: *anata no kotoba wa shinrai dekimasen.*
you Lk words Top trust cannot
"I cannot trust what you say"

Asano: *dattara dooshiro to iu n da ne? sakki*
if that is the case do what Qt say Nom Cop FP just before

kara erasoona koto o itteru ga shosen kimi wa
from arrogant thing Obj saying but after all you Top

funshoku o miyaburenakatta janaika. sore wa
fraud Obj was able to detect.Neg Cop Q that Top

→ *magiremonaku* ***yuushi kachoo*** *toshite no kimi no*
undeniably loans section chief as Lk you Lk

sekinin daroo. go oku mo no
responsibility Cop five hundred million as much as Lk

sonshitsu o dashiteoite jyooshi ni hamuku to
loss Obj cause Aux superior to oppose Qt

wa meiwaku o koomutteiru no wa watashi no
Top nuisance Obj suffering Nom Top I Lk

hoo da. shitsurei suru.
side Cop excuse myself do

"Then what do you want me to do? You have been saying arrogant things, but you couldn't detect the fraud. That is undeniably your responsibility as the loans section chief. Opposing your boss after having lost as much as five hundred million… It is me who is suffering because of this. I'll excuse myself"

Hanzawa: *wakarimashita. go oku o*
understand five hundred million Obj

torimodoseba ii n desu ne.
recover.Con good Nom Cop FP

"I understand. Things will be okay if I recover the five hundred million, right?"

→ Asano: *zehi soo shite kureta mae.* ***kitai shite iru yo***.
by all means do so Aux please counting on FP

hanzawa yuushi kachoo.
Hanzawa loans section chief

"Yes, by all means do so. I am counting on you. **Hanzawa *yuushi kachoo***".

(Episode 1, 50:43～)

What makes Asano's utterance internal implicational impoliteness is the way Asano says *kitai shite iru yo*, 'I am counting on you'. He says it without any sign of encouragement or smile, contributing to a sarcastic interpretation. What makes it external implicational impoliteness on the other hand, involves a "mismatch between expressed behaviour and the context" (Culpeper 2011: 178). The phrase *kitai shite iru yo*, 'I am counting on you' is usually used to encourage someone showing their high expectation towards the addressee. In this context however it is clear that Asano is not counting on Hanzawa at all, but is being sarcastic to the extent that what he really means is 'I doubt whether you can' or 'Let's see if you can'.

Asano's use of the institutional title to address Hanzawa in example (5) above also highlights the impoliteness. The use of the institutional address term Hanzawa *yuushi kachoo* by Asano in his second turn (the last line of the excerpt) is in fact a partial repeat of the term he used in his first turn, *yuushi kachoo*, 'loans section chief'. Asano used this word in the context of '*magiremo naku yuushi kachoo toshite no kimi no sekini*', 'undeniably responsibility of you, as the chief of the loans section', indicating that the ultimate decision to lend five hundred million was after all his (Hanzawa's) own, and thus Hanzawa is entirely responsible for the loss of it since he is the loans section chief. The use of the institutional title by Asano here enhances the interpretation of Hanzawa *yuushi kachoo* (used in his second turn) as the target to which the blame is aimed. By so doing, it can be interpreted that Asano is reminding Hanzawa of his social role at work and his responsibility.

In discussing internal implicational impoliteness, Culpeper examines cases of 'verbal formula mismatches' (Culpeper 2011: 174)[8]. A clear example of verbal formula mismatches that Culpeper (2011: 174) presents is "could you just fuck off". Here, the verbal formula mismatch is observed with polite 'could you' and an extremely impolite 'just fuck off'. The next example from the data, although minus the lexical immoderation of rudeness as the one in English just mentioned, has a similarity to this.

(6) Asano: *zuibunto kattena koto o shite kureta mono desu*
pretty selfish thing Obj do Aux indeed Cop

nee. ***hanzawa yuushi kachoo***.
FP Hanzawa loans section chief

"You did me a favour doing such a selfish thing, **Hanzawa *yuushi kachoo***".

(Episode 3, 49:02)

Asano in (6) is reproaching Hanzawa about what he (Hanzawa) has done. The action is referring to Hanzawa's seizure of their client's (Higashida) overseas real estate. Since Asano has an illegal and secretive deal with Higashida, he is bursting with indignation in fear of being discovered. Asano's utterance *kattena koto o suru* in itself is a straight forward impoliteness since it means 'to have one's own way' or 'doing a selfish thing'. The intensifier *zuibun(to)* 'pretty' is added to it to enhance the force of impoliteness. In addition to this, the 'verbal formula mismatch' is observed as ～*te kureta* which is an auxiliary verb conveying "the idea that the speaker received a favor" (Makino and Tsutsui 1989: 219) and that "the speaker feels that the person for whom the action was performed has benefited from the action" (3A Network (ed.) 2012: 153). To use ～*te kureta* together with *zuibunto kattena koto o suru* in this context therefore literally means that he has benefited from Hanzawa's selfish action, achieving sarcastic effect as much as saying 'thank you so much for nothing'. Further, *mono da*, adds the exclamative effect (Maynard 2005: 66), roughly translated to mean similar to 'indeed' or 'how could you'. Since it is clear that Asano is talking to Hanzawa, the overt (as it is unnecessary to mark the person who did it) and marked usage of address term here reinforces the meaning of 'Thanks to YOU for nothing'. Also in so doing, Asano is using the institutional title Hanzawa *yuushi kachoo*, 'the loans section chief Hanzawa' instead of the address terms Asano frequently uses to refer to Hanzawa throughout the

series such as Hanzawa-*kun*, or *kimi*[9]. The use of the institutional title strengthens the force of impoliteness, as it not only emphasizes the person who performed the action, but also performing such an action in the capacity of his position as the loans section chief. Thus, reinforcing the effect of accusation and holding Hanzawa responsible for such an action.

The following examples (7) and (8) also illustrate cases of implicational impoliteness. Both examples can be regarded as internal since they have a mismatch in the content of what they are saying and how they are produced. They can also be regarded as external since in the broad understanding of the context where these utterances were produced there is a mismatch of context of use of these utterances. In these examples the impoliteness is conveyed through the manner they were produced as well as the facial expressions accompanying them. The impoliteness here is a mismatch of verbal politeness with non-verbal cues which creates greater rudeness (Culpeper 2011: 169).

(7) Ogiso: *tookyoo de wa zuibun sewani natta ne.*
Tokyo in Top pretty be much obliged to.Past FP

hanzawa yuushi kachoo.
Hanzawa loans section chief

"I was much obliged to you in Tokyo, **Hanzawa *yuushi kachoo***."
(Episode 3, 1:00:57)

Ogiso's utterance in (7) was produced when he met Hanzawa at Nishi Osaka Branch. Ogiso and Hanzawa's previous meeting had taken place in Tokyo, as mentioned in his utterance. In that meeting, Ogiso was interviewing Hanzawa (it is in the same setting as example (1) above) and tried to force Hanzawa to accept and admit full responsibility for the loss of five hundred million yen. However Hanzawa did not do so, and rather retaliated. Ogiso bears a grudge against Hanzawa for this and is saying (7), making specific reference to the event. *Sewa ni naru* means 'to be much obliged', 'be indebted', an expression which is close to 'thank you for the other day'. Here the mismatch of verbal politeness with non-verbal cues makes the utterance even more impolite; *sewani natta ne* is said with not even a hint of a smile or nodding (greeting). Ogiso was saying this as he was walking towards Hanzawa, looking straight at him without any smile, but with an extremely hostile look and an overbearing manner. In addition to this, when Ogiso said *hanzawa yuushi kachoo*, he said it as if he were spitting every single word.

The following example (8) also contains internal/external implicational impoliteness. The context in which this utterance was produced was at the committee meeting. Just before this segment, Hanzawa had revealed an illegal act Owada had done and stated so at the committee meeting. Owada denied the whole incident and insisted that it was a false accusation. Hanzawa who has something on Kishikawa, then asked Kishikawa to confess to his participation in the part of Owada's ill doing. As Kishikawa is about to speak, Owada says the following.

(8) Owada: *enryo wa iranai yo* ***kishikawa buchoo***.
hesitation Top no need FP Kishikawa executive manager

omotteru koto o (Pause) *shoo=jikini* (Pause) *iinasai.*
thinking thing Obj honestly say.Imp

"Don't hesitate. **Kishikawa *buchoo***. Honestly say what you have in your mind"

(Episode 10, 1:01:36)

Here Owada says to Kishikawa that no hesitation is needed and tells him to 'honestly', *shoojikini* say what he really wants to say. *Omotteru koto o*, 'what you have in your mind' was said very slowly as if he were trying to make it clear to Kishikawa that he should not dare say anything against Owada himself. *Shoo=jikini* (= sign indicates elongated sound), 'honestly', was said with emphasis on the first part of the word and an elongated *o* as if he were exhaling to try and appear genuine. There were pauses after *omotteru koto o* and *shoojikini* which added to the suspenseful and overbearing tone together with the emphasis and elongation. Also, Owada said *omotteru koto o* with an artificial smile while shooting a coercive look (such as "I dare you to say it") at Kishikawa, which comes across as threatening. The use of *Kishikawa buchoo* here could imply that if Kishikawa wanted to keep his position as an executive manager he should not say anything against Owada since both their futures lie in Kishikawa's testimony. Owada's use of the institutional title thus can be regarded as trying to heighten Kishikawa's awareness of his position as an executive manager and at the same time, a subordinate of Owada. By overtly mentioning his institutional title, Owada might have wanted to guide him (Kishikawa) to make the right choice in what he says (i.e. not saying what he knows since it will ruin both of them).

Thus far I have discussed cases of the use of an institutional title in the event of non-conventionalised implicational impoliteness. I claimed that the use of an

institutional title in these situations is when the speaker is trying to heighten the addressee's awareness of their social position and thus often used in the context of accusation and blame. It is also aimed at their institutional responsibility. Considering the infrequent use of addressing a subordinate by the use of institutional title, it can be regarded as a marked form. By using the marked form it contributes to imply the gravity of the addressee's responsibility as a person who holds the institutional title. In addition to institutional titles used in the non-conventionalised implicational impoliteness events, there are cases of usage with utterances that contain conventionalised impoliteness.

The examples (9), (10), and (11) all drawn from episode 3, during *sairyoorinten*, the inspection session by the inspectors to examine whether appropriate decisions of loans have been made. Conspired by Asano who wants to remove Hanzawa from his current position, the inspection team has selected disputable clients to investigate. In (9) Haida, the head inspector is examining the files of the clients, and insisting that Hanzawa should withdraw the loan from a particular client as the client is not making profits. Hanzawa insists that they should continue with the loan since the client is expected to make profits this year.

(9) Haida: *sonna shooko dokoni aru n da yo.*
such evidence where exist Nom Cop FP

gutaitekina konkyo wa?
specific basis Top

"Where is the evidence to prove that? What's the specific basis for (that decision)?"

Hanzawa: *shisanhyoo ga aru hazu desu ga.*
profit forecast Sub exist fairly certain Cop but
"I am fairly certain that there is a profit forecast (in the file)"

Haida: *shisanhyoo*.
profit forecast
"The profit forecast"

(Haida and another inspector search through the file and do not find the profit forecast)

Haida: *naijanaika sonna mono. iikagenna koto itte*
not here such thing unreliable thing say

moraccha komaru yo. musekinin
Aux be in trouble FP irresponsible

janaika ***hanzawa kachoo***.
Cop Hanzawa section chief

"There is no such a thing. We find it troublesome of you saying such unreliable things. It is irresponsible of you, **Hanzawa *kachoo***"

(Episode 3, 1:04:15～)

Haida demands the evidence for Hanzawa's decision to continue with the loan but Hanzawa could not find the profit forecast in the file, the evidential document to justify his decision as appropriate. Haida accuses Hanzawa of saying something irresponsible, *musekinin janaika*, 'it is irresponsible (of you)' which qualifies as 'pointed complaints' in conventionalised impoliteness. The force of accusation is reinforced by the use of Hanzawa's institutional title as *kachoo*. By explicitly mentioning 'it is irresponsible Hanzawa *kachoo*', it makes the force of blame (for being irresponsible) pointed directly to Hanzawa as a section chief who is responsible for having the files in order.

The example below is from the second day of the inspection. Continuing from the first day, there are further cases where necessary evidential documents are not in the files. In the context where the example was drawn, Kakiuchi almost begged Haida to look through the file one more time since he believed that the document must be there. Haida thows the file to Kakiuchi so that he can look for it himself. Kakiuchi is desperately searching the documents.

(10) Haida: *doonanda yo. atta no ka.*
how is it FP exist Nom Q
"How is it, (is the document) there?"

Kakiuchi: (desperately looking through the pages) *arimasen*.
not here

"No, not here"

Haida: *kinoo kara are ga nai kore ga nai.*
yesterday from that Sub don't exist this Sub don't exist

hanzawa kachoo *bukatachi ni dooiu*
Hanzawa section chief subordinates to what kind of

kanri shidoo o shiteru n desu ka.
management supervision Obj do Nom Cop Q

"This is not here and that is not here from yesterday. **Hanzawa *kachoo***, what kind of managerial supervision are you providing for your subordinates?"

(Episode 3, 1:11:59～)

In (10), finding another case of an important document missing, Haida is accusing Hanzawa of not fulfilling his supervisory duty for his subordinates (conventionalised impoliteness: pointed complaints). As Haida is saying what kind of managerial supervision is Hanzawa providing for his subordinates, Haida uses Hanzawa *kachoo*, unmistakably directing the blame to Hanzawa who should be providing supervision to his subordinates on how to manage the files. The use of the institutional title thus adds to the force of blame for what seems to Haida as unfulfilled duty and irresponsible behaviour of Hanzawa as loans section chief.

(11) is from the last day of the inspection and Haida is asking for another evidential document of the client for which Hanzawa is responsible. Hanzawa insists that it is in the file and Haida says it is not. Ogiso who is sitting next to Haida is shouting to Hanzawa referring to the reoccurring situation of not having the crucial documents filed.

(11) Ogiso: *mata ka ne* ***hanzawa kachoo***. *iikagennishite*
again Q FP Hanzawa section chief stop it

kure nai ka.
Aux Neg Q

"Not again, **Hanzawa *kachoo***, please stop it"

(Episode 3, 1:27:23)

In (11), conventionalised impoliteness is found such as *mata ka ne*, 'again?' (meaning 'oh, not again'; pointed complaints) and *iikagennishite kurenai ka*, '(please) stop it' (dismissal). Once again, Hanzawa's institutional title is used to point out and blame his unfulfilled duty. As the use of the institutional title by a higher status speaker to their subordinate is infrequent throughout the data, and Ogiso could have called him Hanzawa or *kimi* as he has in other situations[10], the marked form, the use of institutional title implies that Ogiso is blaming Hanzawa for not fulfilling his official duty. It is emphasizing that he has the responsibility to fulfill his duty and do the job properly but failed.

The last example (12) below illustrates another interesting aspect of the use of institutional title by the superior (Owada, the managing director) to his subordi-

nate (Kaise, a branch manager). In a single interaction (on the phone) with Kaise, Owada uses three different address terms, one of which is the institutional title.

(12) This relates to Owada's conspired bypass loan which he instructed Kaise to carry out in the past. On the verge of this fraud being discovered by Hanzawa, Owada (must have) contacted Kaise to let him know that Hanzawa would visit him to inquire[11]. After Hanzawa has gone, Kaise calls Owada on the phone.

1 Kaise: *moshimoshi, kaise desu ga osshatta toori hanzawa ga*
hello Kaise Cop but you said as Hanzawa Sub

kimashita.
came

"Hello, this is Kaise. Hanzawa came as you said"

2 Owada: *a soo, sorede*?
right so
"Right. And ?"

3 Kaise: *mochiron nanimo shiranai to*
of course nothing know.Neg Qt

shira o kiritooshimashita.
pretend to be ignorant.Past

"Of course I pretended to be ignorant all the way through"

4→ Owada: ***kaise-kun***, *nan no hanashi ka yoku wakaranai na*
Kaise-kun, what Lk story Q well know.Neg FP
"**Kaise-*kun***, I have no idea what you are talking about"

5 Kaise: *ha*?
Uh
"Uh?"

6→ Owada: *nani o shitaka wa shiranai ga* ***kimi*** *ga*
what Obj do.Past.Q Top know.Neg but **kimi** Sub

katteni yatta koto daroo?
on your own do.Past thing Cop

"I don't know what you did but it is something that ***kimi*** did on your own, right?"

7 (silence)

8→ Owada: *soo daroo* ***kaise-kun***.
so Cop **Kaise-kun**
"It is the case, right **Kaise-*kun***"

9 Kaise: *hai. subete watashi no sekinin de shita koto*
yes all my Lk responsibility with do.Past thing

desu. jyoomu ni wa issai kankei
Cop managing director to Top absolutely relation

gozaimasen.
exist.Neg

"Yes, I am fully responsible for what I did. You (the managing director) are absolutely unrelated to this"

10→ Owada: *un, sooka. korekaramo yoroshiku tanomu yo.*
yes right from now on best regards ask FP

kaise shitenchoo.
Kaise branch manager

"Yes, right. I'll keep on counting on you. **Kaise *shitenchoo***"
(Episode 7, 1:26:20～)

The impoliteness involved in this example may be implicational as Owada is pretending he does not know anything about the wrongdoing he had instructed Kaise to undertake. In turns 4 and 8, Owada addresses Kaise as Kaise-*kun*, in turn 6, *kimi*, and in turn 10, Kaise *shitenchoo*. Kaise-*kun* has a personal tone in comparison to the 'last name＋institutional title', he switched to Kaise *shitenchoo* after the transaction has successfully been completed (Owada's purpose was to get Kaise to not say anything to Hanzawa for his (Owada's) own sake). Here, the institutional title is used at the end of their interaction. Using 'last name＋*kun*' and *kimi* throughout the phone conversation and then using the institutional title at the termination of the interaction can be regarded as the speaker's expression of some kind of change in his attitude[12]. This can be considered in relation to Ide's (1982) claim that the use of institutional title by a person of higher status to address their subordinate involves formality, mentioned at the beginning of this paper. By being formal, Owada is putting an end to what had been going on between Kaise and himself behind the scene, as if nothing had happened and that their interaction and relationship is nothing but formal and official. Reminding Kaise of his role as a

branch manager, *shitenchoo*, Owada is at the same time, reminding him of the fact that Kaise is his subordinate who should be obedient. Being obedient to one's senior seems to be natural in the particular workplace illustrated in *Hanzawa Naoki* (TBS).

4. Concluding remarks

The current paper examined the use of institutional titles by a higher status person to their subordinates from the data extracted from *Hanzawa Naoki* (TBS). The findings show that the context where the institutional titles are used involve many cases of conventionalised and non-conventionalised impoliteness. Further I have shown that the institutional titles are used to heighten the addressee's awareness of their role in the workplace and the gravity of their responsibility as someone with the social role indicated by their institutional title. This could explain the reason why institutional titles in the data were often found in situations that contain accusation and blame for someone's unfulfilled responsibility or for having done something wrong.

Depending on the institutional culture and power relationship within which they are operating, different address terms are expected to be used. In her study which examined the use of address/reference terms in a number of Japanese workplaces 小林 (2002: 117) showed that 'last name＋*san*' was found many times[13]. She claimed that 'last name＋*san*' can be regarded as the most general term used in the workplace. The data collected from *Hanzawa Naoki* (TBS), however, did not contain many cases of 'last name＋*san*' (11 occurrences)[14]. Examining a variety of data from different settings and personal relationships will help contribute to the deeper understanding of how institutional titles are used in the Japanese workplace.

Notes

[1] Makino and Tsutsui (1989) also mention the use of institutional titles by a speaker of higher social status to an addressee who is a subordinate, yet from a different perspective from the current study. They explain the use of the speaker's own institutional title when the situation is as described above and state that "the speaker cannot use his own social role term as a form of self-address" (Makino and Tsutsui 1989: 31).

[2] There are 111 cases out of total 165 of '(last name)＋institutional title' used within

Hanzawa's bank. See note 4 for other specific details of the data.

[3] Makino and Tsutsui (1989: 28) explain the second person pronouns in terms of level of formality and note that *anata* is formal, *kimi* when used to refer to male is informal and *omae* is very informal. According to Russell (1981: 118), *kimi* is "used by men to those lower status and younger in age", and *omae* and *anata* are used to address "equals or those of inferior status" (Russell 1981: 118). *Kimi* is known to indicate that "the speaker considers the addressee as a person of equal status or inferior in some relevant respects" (Kitagawa and Lehrer 1990: 753−754). *Omae* is similar to *kimi* with respect to the social status (Kitagawa and Lehrer 1990: 754). Also *anata* implies that "the speaker considers the address to be a person worthy of some respect and affection" (Kitagawa and Lehrer 1990: 753).

[4] The frequency of these terms found in the data (indicated in numbers in a bracket) is as following: *kimi(tachi)* (99), *anata* (12) and *omae* (37), 'you', 'last name＋*kun*' (e.g. Hanzawa-*kun*) (61), 'last name only' (e.g. Hanzawa) (70), and 'first name only' (e.g. Shinnosuke) (3). The three occurrences in the data where the first name only was used to address a subordinate was quite unexpected. The use of it was limited to one person, Sakamoto Shinnosuke (junior subordinate at Hanzawa's bank). One usage was found in the utterance of Naito (division manager) to Shinnosuke in episode 7, and the other two were by Hanzawa addressing Shinnosuke in episodes 7 and 8. Although it is outside the scope of the current study, the workplace hierarchy and interpersonal relationship should closely be examined to clarify the cause for such an uncommon use.

[5] Sadaoka's rank position is unclear, however, it can be inferred that he is in a high enough (at least above Hanzawa) position to be an interviewer at an accusative interview with Hanzawa about (falsely accused Hanzawa's) loss of five hundred million.

[6] This is a trial database and the number of the usage of address/reference terms could increase in the future revision. Although the database needs further revising process, and thus I am tentative to give a definite number of occurrences, I believe that the database is still valid in its current form for the purpose of current analysis since it at least shows the tendency of the frequency of use of institutional title by the speaker of a higher social status to address their subordinates.

[7] See Culpeper (2011) for details of the categories of implicational impoliteness.

[8] Leech (2014: 238) discusses a similar phenomenon as 'attitude clash'.

[9] The frequency of Asano's use of various terms to address Hanzawa (total of 46 cases) is as follows: *kimi* (23), Hanzawa-*kun* (9), Hanzawa *yuushi kachoo* (5), Hanzawa (3), *anata* (3), *omae* (2), and Hanzawa *kachoo* (1).

[10] In fact *kimi* is the most frequent term Ogiso uses to address Hanzawa as it occupies 60 per cent of his use of addressing Hanzawa (9 out of 15 cases in total). Other than *kimi*, there are single uses of each term Hanzawa, Hanzawa-*kun*, Hanzawa *kachoo*, Hanzawa *yuushi kachoo*. There are 2 cases of *omae(ra)*, which is used in addressing Hanzawa and members of his section.

[11] We as an audience can only infer that Owada contacted Kaise to let him know that Hanzawa would be coming since there is no scene in the series as such. We can infer this from Kaise's utterance in line 1.

[12] See Kim (2012) for the analysis of the change of address/reference terms during a single interaction.

[13] According to 遠藤・尾崎 (2002) the 12 hours of data 小林 (2002) used are collected from 21 informants of males in their 20s to 50s. The informants recorded real life natural conversations at their respective workplaces. The informants' occupations include company employee (9), research/education (7), self-employed (4), and free-lance (1).

[14] The high occurrence of 'last name＋*san*' in 小林 (2002)'s findings could be due to the fact that her data was collected in real life workplaces, or that the industries she looked at did not involve a mega bank such as the one illustrated in *Hanzawa Naoki* (TBS) where there is a strong sense of hierarchy. Also an over exaggeration for the TV series in the use of (or non-use of) particular terms could be the reason for rare occurrence of 'last name＋*san*' in the series. I am indebted to Sally McCullough for pointing this out to me. The exaggeration, however, makes the series well suited for the analysis of impoliteness as it is quite difficult "to collect naturally occurring impoliteness examples in Japanese cultural setting" (Kim 2014: 29). See Kim (2014) for details of the difficulties involved specifically in Japanese cultural setting with cultural concepts.

Transliteration

Aux	auxiliary
Con	conditional
Cop	various forms of copula
FP	final particle
Lk	linking nominal
Neg	negative
Nom	nominalizer
Obj	object marker

Past	past tense
Q	question marker
Qt	quotation marker
Sub	subject marker
Top	topic marker

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Sally McCullough for reading through this paper and providing insightful comments. However, any errors herein are mine. I also would like to thank Sheng-Han Hsieh for his assistance with data input.

References

3A Network (ed.). 2012. *Minnano Nihongo Elementary Japanese I Translation & Grammar Notes- English*. Tokyo: 3A Network.

Culpeper, Jonathan. 2008. Chapter 2 Reflections on impoliteness, relational work and power. In Derek Bousfield and Miriam A. Locher (eds.) *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice.* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 17−43.

Culpeper, Jonathan. 2011. *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Kim, Angela A-Jeoung. 2012. Power and solidarity as observed in the forms of address/reference in Japanese political discourse: Focusing on selected samples from the minutes of the Diet (2001−2005) in BCCWJ. *Japanese and Japanese Language Education* 40: 19−47.

Kim, Angela A-Jeoung. 2014. Impoliteness strategies and a power struggle as observed in the Japanese TV series Hanzawa Naoki (TBS). *Japanese and Japanese Language Education* 42: 27−54.

Kitagawa, Chisato and Adrienne Lehrer. 1990. Impersonal uses of personal pronouns. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 739−759.

Lebra, Takie Sugiyama. 1976. *Japanese Patterns of Behavior*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Leech, Geoffrey. 2014. *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Makino, Seiichi and Michio Tsutsui. 1989. *A Dictionary of Basic Japanese Grammar*.

Tokyo: The Japan Times.

Maynard, Senko K. 2005. *Expressive Japanese: A Reference Guide to Sharing Emotion and Empathy*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

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

Nakane, Chie. 1970. *Japanese Society*. Victoria: Penguin Books.

Russell, Harriet. 1981. Second person pronouns in Japanese. *Sophia Linguistica* 8/9: 116−128.

Spencer-Oatey, Helen. 2000. Rapport management: A framework for analysis. In Spencer-Oatey (ed.) *Culturally Speaking: Managing Rapport through Talk across Cultures*. London/New York: Continuum. pp. 11−46.

Spencer-Oatey, Helen. 2002. Managing rapport in talk: Using rapport sensitive incidents to explore the motivational concerns underlying the management of relations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34(5): 529−545.

Spencer-Oatey, Helen. 2005. (Im)Politeness, face and perceptions of rapport: Unpacking their bases and interrelationships. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture* 1(1): 95−119.

Spencer-Oatey, Helen. 2007. Theories of identity and the analysis of face. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39(4): 639−656.

Spencer-Oatey, Helen. 2008. *Culturally Speaking: Culture, Communication and Politeness Theory.* Second Edition. London/New York: Continuum.

Sugimoto, Yoshio. 2003. *An Introduction to Japanese Society.* Second Edition. New York: Cambridge University Press.

井出祥子（2006）『わきまえの語用論』大修館書店.

遠藤織枝・尾崎喜光（2002）「第 1 章 調査の概要」『男性のことば・職場編』ひつじ書房. pp. 9−32.

小林美穂子（2002）「第 7 章 職場で使われる「呼称」」『男性のことば・職場編』ひつじ書房. pp. 99−119.

Data

Hanzawa Naoki. 2013. Original story by Ikeido Jun, script by Yatsu Hiroyuki, produced by Iyoda Hidenori and Iida Kazutaka, and directed by Fukuzawa Katsuo. TBS, *Episode 1〜Episode10. DVD.*

To confirm the facts on *Hanzawa Naoki*, (TBS) I have used the following website: https://ja.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E5%8D%8A%E6%B2%A2%E7%9B%B4%E6%A8%B9