

Title	Impoliteness strategies and a power struggle as observed in the Japanese TV series Hanzawa Naoki (TBS)
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	2014
Jtitle	日本語と日本語教育 No.42 (2014. 3) ,p.27- 54
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	論文
Genre	Departmental Bulletin Paper
URL	<a href="https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00189695-20140300-0027">https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00189695-20140300-0027</a>

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.

# Impoliteness strategies and a power struggle as observed in the Japanese TV series *Hanzawa Naoki* (TBS)

Angela A-Jeoung KIM

## 1. Introduction

The current paper aims to investigate impoliteness as seen in the Japanese TV series *Hanzawa Naoki* (TBS). It does not take an academic to realise that *Hanzawa Naoki* contained many instances of verbal and non-verbal exchanges that are clearly far from being polite. The fact that it has achieved the highest viewing rating of its genre since the Heisei era<sup>1</sup> may partly be explained by the fact that audiences who contributed to the high viewing rate were attracted by the ‘entertaining function’ of impoliteness (Culpeper 2011: 234-235, see also Culpeper 2005) such as the following: ‘emotional pleasure’, ‘aesthetic pleasure’, ‘voyeuristic pleasure’, ‘the pleasure of being superior’, and ‘the pleasure of feeling secure’. One may have felt emotional pleasure in that Hanzawa, the eponymous protagonist of the series, is engaged in many instances of impoliteness where some sort of thrill was involved; aesthetic pleasure with the verbal creativity (such as the *baigaeshi da*, ‘repay twofold’ strategy) used by Hanzawa to convey impoliteness to his enemies; voyeuristic pleasure as audiences came to know that the villains will get and indeed do get “the public exposure of [their] private selves, particularly aspects that are emotionally sensitive” (Culpeper 2011: 234), as their wrongdoings are exposed; the pleasure of being superior while “observing someone in a worse state than one-self” (Culpeper 2011: 235) which in this case can be applied to both Hanzawa and the villains; and the pleasure of being secure, as it is not happening to the audience themselves but is unfolding on a TV set. Applying linguistic concepts and theories, the current paper aims to explain some of the impoliteness events illustrated in the series. The main framework for analyses used in the paper are Culpeper (2011) and Culpeper (2008). I will adopt concepts and definitions drawn from these works and from other related sources and examine impoliteness in the data.

There is a vast amount of research on politeness (see Locher and Bousfield

(2008: 1–2) for details), while it has only been relatively recently that research on impoliteness, “the long neglected ‘poor cousin’ of politeness” (Locher and Bousfield 2008: 2), “the parasite of politeness” (Culpeper 1996: 355) has been ushered into the spotlight. In the book review of Culpeper’s (2011) *“Impoliteness. Using Language to Cause Offence”*, Piotrowski (2013: 170) states that “impoliteness has attracted a lot of scholarly attention recently, with countless articles but only one edited volume (Bousfield and Locher, 2008) and one monograph (Bousfield, 2008) published so far”<sup>2</sup>. As such, there is an enormous imbalance in academic interest between politeness phenomena and impoliteness phenomena (Locher and Bousfield 2008: 1).

With respect to research on politeness, the situation within Japanese linguistics is much the same. There is much research on politeness and its related fields in Japanese. For example, Ide (1982, 1989, 2006) who pointed out how Brown and Levinson’s (1978, 1987) universal politeness theory does not fit in to the Japanese cultural context developed her own theory of *wakimae*, ‘discernment’. Some researchers support the view that Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory does not reflect the situation with Japanese (Matsumoto 1988) and there are yet those who fully support the notion of discernment (Hasegawa 2012). There are also views against discernment standing and consider that it should be regarded as a subcategory of Brown and Levinson’s theory (Fukada and Asato 2004), as well as a view that negates discernment and instead emphasises the social constructionist view (Cook 2006, 2008, 2011; Okamoto 1999, 2011). Although studies on politeness focusing on Japanese have provided much discussion and insight, and may have dealt with rudeness in passing, impoliteness *per se* has not yet been the focus of analysis in the politeness studies of Japanese. The current study attempts to contribute to the growing literature on impoliteness by presenting some examples in Japanese.

## 2. Data

There are two reasons for using *Hanzawa Naoki* (TBS) as data. The first has to do with the general difficulty of obtaining data for impoliteness. Regarding English data Culpeper (2010: 3241) points out that “impoliteness is relatively rare in terms of its general frequency” (Culpeper 2010: 3238) and that “data is a major problem for impoliteness research. Discourse completion tasks and role plays, amongst the most frequently used methodologies in quantitative politeness

research, are problematic, since people are particularly reluctant to be recorded producing impoliteness, and there are ethical considerations as well. For the same reasons, it is also very difficult to collect naturally-occurring data" (Culpeper 2010: 3241). Given that it is the case with English data it is not difficult to assume that it is not any easier to collect naturally occurring impoliteness examples in Japanese cultural setting. It may be argued harder in Japanese setting since "[w]hile indirectness, vagueness and ambiguity are facets of human behavior in any society, the Japanese norm explicitly encourages such orientations in a wide range of situations" (Sugimoto 2003: 28). There are some additional difficulties for impoliteness research in the Japanese cultural setting for one is keenly aware of the discrepancy between *honno*, 'one's natural, real, or inner wishes and proclivities' and *tatema*, 'standard, principle, or rule by which one is bound at least outwardly' (Lebra 1976: 136). There is also *omoiyari*, 'empathy' which at least one sociologist regards as important enough to describe Japanese culture an "*omoiyari* culture" (Lebra 1976: 38)<sup>3</sup>.

Culpeper (2010: 3238) identifies, however, some specific discourses as abnormal circumstances, in which impoliteness plays a central role and is relatively frequently observed: they include army recruit training, interactions between car owners and traffic wardens, and exploitative TV. Although belonging to a different genre, *Hanzawa Naoki* (TBS) falls into the category in which the circumstances of plot development play a central role in engendering friction, providing a rich source of data for impoliteness research.

Although it is not naturally occurring data, the validity of this material can be justified by the viewing ratings of the series. Maynard (2001: ix) justifies her use of TV series as data by saying that "although the language used in the TV drama series is different from the language we normally use in everyday lives, it may not be an over-statement to say that the language used in the media itself is shaping an aspect of Japanese culture these days where mass media has found its way into our everyday life so much" (my translation). Maynard (2001: ix) supports her use of *Beautiful Life* (TBS) by quoting the ratings figures of 31.8% for the first episode and 47.1% at the highest moment of viewing on its final episode; she notes that it is amazing phenomenon, and indicates how deeply the TV series spread among so many people and their lives. *Hanzawa Naoki* (TBS) reached an average rating during the final episode of 42.2% which is the highest rating recorded during the Heisei period<sup>4</sup>, overtaking the last episode of *Beautiful Life*

(41.3%) which had been the previous title-holder<sup>5</sup>. In addition, the fact that one of the phrases that the protagonist Hanzawa used “*baigaeshi da*”, ‘repay twofold’ has been chosen as one of the *shingo/ryuukogo taisho* (an award that is given to words or phrases which have trended during the year) indicates that the series has indeed had many people who identify with it and influenced common speech<sup>6</sup>.

Here follows a brief plot of the story to make it clear why there are many occasions where impoliteness can be observed in the series. Hanzawa Naoki is head of the loans division in the Osaka West branch of the largest bank in Japan and the central plot of the story develops mainly around his workplace, involving two serious unlawful doings of his bosses (Asano, the Branch Manager, and later Owada, an Executive Director). Hanzawa first finds himself in the situation where he has done nothing wrong but his branch manager Asano conspires against him so that Asano himself gets a personal gain at the cost of a five hundred million yen loss for the bank. Asano tries to hold Hanzawa responsible for the loss. Hanzawa, unwilling to accept such injustice, openly opposes Asano and successfully gets himself out of the trouble. As a consequence Hanzawa is promoted to the main branch in Tokyo. He is then tasked with a huge assignment, the result of which will determine not only his own, but also the future of his organization. While on assignment, he finds out that there is a major conspiracy within the bank plotted by Owada, an Executive Director much higher than him. Hanzawa also has a personal reason for revenge, and after a series of struggles, he completes his assignment and carries the revenge through to its conclusion. Since there are many instances where Hanzawa and his enemies exchange explicit insults, showing contemptuous behaviour both verbally and non-verbally, the interactions in the data are a rich resource for analysing impoliteness.

### 3. Background

Some concepts and terms need to be noted before moving onto the analysis. First of all, impoliteness is defined in Culpeper (2008: 36) as following:

“Impoliteness, as I would define it, involves communicative behaviour intending to cause the “face loss” of a target or perceived by the target to be so. And face loss in the context of impoliteness involves a “conflict and clash of interests”, as the producer wishes (or is perceived to wish) to devalue “the positive social values” (Goffman 1967: 5) a target wants to claim for themselves or to deny some of their entitlements to freedom from imposition or freedom of association. Thus, impoliteness

can restrict an interactant's action-environment insofar as the producer pressures the interactants into a reaction, whether that means taking self-preservatory action or deciding not to react".

Given this definition, it is clear that in *Hanzawa Naoki*, Hanzawa (and his friends) and those who are his enemies have been scrupulously 'impolite' to each other. The conduct and sometimes the very existence of these characters can clash with the interests of the other parties. Within these clashes of interest and the restriction of the other party's action-environment, there is an incontrovertible power struggle: "(i)f power in discourse is defined as the restriction of somebody's action-environment and a clash or conflict of interests, then it can be argued that impoliteness always involves power as it forces (or at least pressurises) the target to react" (Culpeper 2008: 42). Similarly, Locher and Bousfield (2008: 8) assert that "impoliteness is an exercise of power as it has arguably always in some way *an effect* on one's addressees in that it alters the future action-environment of one's interlocutors". The setting of *Hanzawa Naoki* is highly hierarchical and thus the powerful and the powerless are quite clear. Although such a setting remains throughout, with every impolite interaction, there is shift of power in the sense indicated by Culpeper and Locher and Bousfield.

For the analysis, the questions Culpeper (2011) raised have been asked. Culpeper (2011) adopts Spencer-Oatey's (2000, 2002, 2005, 2007, 2008) 'rapport management' as his analytical framework. Basically there are three types of face and two types of sociality rights. Culpeper adds his own questions to determine whether a specific potential impolite interaction involved each concept. They are summarised in Tables 1 and 2.

In addition, Culpeper (2011: 118) also discusses a terminological issue regarding 'threatening' face or face 'threat'. Different from politeness work, which is related to one's concern for a potential face-threatening act and thus, indicates that he/she has the other's interests at heart, impoliteness is "constituted by word and actions which themselves are taken as damaging face" (Culpeper 2011: 118). Culpeper (2011: 118) goes on to say that the semantics of 'threat' is a precursor of future damage and thus, proclaims that 'face-attack' is more appropriate in case of impoliteness. I will also adopt this term.

Given these definitions of the central terms and concepts I will move onto the analysis and will discuss other concepts and terms in the analysis where necessary.

Table 1. Definitions and summary questions regarding Face and Sociality rights as provided in Spencer-Oatey (2008) and Culpeper (2011)

	Spencer-Oatey	Culpeper
Face	Following Goffman (1967: 5): "I define face as 'the positive social <i>value</i> a person effectively claims for himself [ <i>sic</i> ] by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact' [my emphasis]" (Spencer-Oatey 2008: 13)	Does the interaction evoke an understanding that something counters a positive attribute (or attributes) which a participant claims not only to have but to be assumed by other participant(s) as having? (2011: 27)
Sociality rights	The management of sociality rights and obligations...involves the management of social expectancies, which I define as 'fundamental social <i>entitlements</i> that a person effectively claims for him/herself in his/her interactions with others'. In other words, face is associated with personal/relational/social value, and is concerned with people's sense of worth, dignity, honor, reputation, competence and so on. Sociality rights and obligations, on the other hand, are concerned with social expectancies, and reflect people's concerns over fairness, consideration and behavioural appropriateness. (Spencer-Oatey 2008: 13–14, cited in Culpeper 2011: 39)	Does the interaction evoke an understanding that something counters a state of affairs which a participant considers to be considerate and fair? (2011: 39)

#### 4. Analysis

To rephrase the story line using the terms mentioned above, Hanzawa's having become an offender of impoliteness has its roots in the fact that he has felt that he has been denied sociality rights. He was "unduly exploited, disadvantaged, unfairly dealt with, controlled or imposed upon" (to borrow the Culpeper's (2011: 40) question for equity rights shown in Table 2). In other words, he was denied equity rights by Asano and his followers. The segment presented below contains many different functions and types of impoliteness, produced by various people of

Table 2. Definitions and summary questions regarding sub-categories of Face and Sociality rights as provided in Spencer-Oatey (2002, 2005, 2007) and Culpeper (2011)

	Spencer-Oatey	Culpeper
Quality face	We have a fundamental desire for people to evaluate us positively in terms of our personal qualities: e.g. our competence, abilities, appearance etc. Quality face is concerned with the value that we effectively claim for ourselves in terms of such personal qualities as these, and so is closely associated with our sense of personal self-esteem. (Spencer-Oatey 2002: 540, cited in Culpeper 2011: 28)	Does the interaction evoke an understanding that something counters positive values which a participant claims not only to have as a specific individual but to be assumed by other participant(s) as having? (2011: 28)
Social identity face	We have a fundamental desire for people to acknowledge and uphold our social identities or roles, e.g. as group leader, valued customer, close friend. Social identity face is concerned with the value that we effectively claim for ourselves in terms of social or group roles, and is closely associated with our sense of public worth. (Spencer-Oatey 2002: 540, cited in Culpeper 2011: 28)	Does the interaction evoke an understanding that something counters positive values which a participant claims not only to have in common with all other members in a particular group, but to be assumed by other participant(s) as having? (2011: 29)
Relational face	Relational: the relationship between the participants (e.g. distance-closeness, equality-inequality, perceptions of role rights and obligations), and the ways in which this relationship is managed or negotiated. (Spencer-Oatey 2007: 647, cited in Culpeper 2011: 30, Culpeper disagrees with 'rights and obligation' part of the definition and includes 'significant others' which refer "not merely to partners, but to any person or group of people in a relationship considered significant (e.g. partners, family, friends)" (Culpeper 2011: 30))	Does the interaction evoke an understanding that something counters positive values about the relations which a participant claims not only to have with a significant other or others but to be assumed by that/those significant other(s) and/or other participant(s) as having? (2011: 30)



Table 2. Continued.

	Spencer-Oatey	Culpeper
Equity (rights) <sup>7</sup>	<p>...people have a fundamental belief that they are entitled to personal consideration from others and to be treated fairly; in other words, that they are not unduly imposed upon, that they are not unfairly ordered about, and that they are not taken advantage of or exploited. This principle ... seems to have three components: cost-benefit considerations (the principle that people should not be exploited or disadvantaged), fairness and reciprocity (the belief that costs and benefits should be 'fair' and kept roughly in balance), and autonomy-control (the belief that people should not be unduly controlled or imposed upon). (Spencer-Oatey 2005: 100, cited in Culpeper 2011: 40)</p>	<p>Does the interaction evoke an understanding that something counters a state of affairs in which a participant considers that they are not unduly exploited, disadvantaged, unfairly dealt with, controlled or imposed upon? (2011: 40)</p>
Association (rights)	<p>...people have a fundamental belief that they are entitled to an association with others that is in keeping with the type of relationship that they have with them. This principle ... seems to have three components: involvement (the principle that people should have appropriate amount and types of 'activity' involvement with others), empathy (the belief that people should share appropriate concerns, feelings and interests with others), and respect (the belief that people should show appropriate amounts of respectfulness for others). (Spencer-Oatey 2005: 100, cited in Culpeper 2011: 41)</p>	<p>Does the interaction evoke an understanding that something counters a state of affairs in which a participant considers that they have an appropriate level of behavioural involvement and sharing of concerns, feelings and interests with others, and are accorded an appropriate level of respect? (2011: 41)</p>

different status and rank within an inherent hierarchical institution. The segment is from a scene where a *sairyoorinten* is taking place, in episode 3. A *sairyoorinten* is when the loans division is examined by someone from the main branch, and the purpose is to investigate whether the loans division has been making appropriate decisions. In the example Haida (a subordinate of Ogiso) is the head inspector.

There is some relevant background information to the segment, this *sairyoorinten* is put on as a conspiracy, to uncover an excuse to get Hanzawa out of his position. Asano, as the branch manager, has organized the inspection and Ogiso, who is from the human resources division, also bears a grudge to Hanzawa. In an earlier episode, when Ogiso tried to force Hanzawa to accept and admit his full responsibility for the loss of five hundred million yen, Hanzawa did not do so, and as becomes clear in this episode, Ogiso is set for revenge. Here I provide a brief description of the position and relationships to understand the example: Asano *shitenchoo* (branch manager), Ogiso *jichoo* (deputy manager), Haida *kensayaku* (inspector), two other inspectors and Tomari (a friend and colleague who entered the bank at the same time as Hanzawa). Kakiuchi is a subordinate of Hanzawa.

- (1) It is the second day of inspection, and the inspectors has been pointing out that important supporting documents were not in the file. There had been similar problem with other files they inspected on the first day.

1 Haida: *benmei no hitotsu mo dekinai no ka. nasakenai otoko da.*  
excuse Lk one even cannot Nom Q pathetic man Cop  
“Can’t you even make an excuse for yourself? You are a pathetic man.”

2 Hanzawa: *dewa o nozomi doori benmei o saseteitadakimasu.*  
well then Hon wish as excuse Obj humbly do

*waga oosaka nishi shiten yuushika ga yuushi o jikkooshiteiru*  
our Osaka West branch loans division Sub loan Obj carry out

*kigyoo no uchi yaku nanawari ga anteishita rieki o*  
company Lk among about 70% Sub stable profit Obj

*umidashiteiru yuuryoo saki desu. desuga konkai no kensa*  
produce excellent client Cop but this time Lk inspection

<i>taishoo</i>	<i>niwa</i>	<i>nazeka</i>		<i>nokori</i>	<i>sanwari</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>gyooseki</i>
object	for	for some reason		rest	30%	Lk	accomplishment

<i>fushin</i>	<i>to</i>	<i>gyoookusaki</i>		<i>bakari</i>	<i>ga</i>
stagnation	and	clients who are not doing well		only	Sub

<i>kenshutsusareteiru</i>	<i>yoo</i>	<i>da.</i>
was found	it seems	Cop

“Then I will be honored to provide my excuses as you wish. Among the companies our Osaka West branch provides loans to, approximately 70% are profitable prime customers. However, for some reason, it seems like the rest 30% which are not doing very well are chosen.”

Hadia's utterance in turn 1 is a clear indication of face-attack (quality face, and social identity face) and his remark is an insult, especially as he employs the term *nasakenai otoko*, 'a pathetic man'. More specifically, such an insulting term can also be classified as a 'personalized negative vocative' or a 'personalized negative assertion', both of which are subcategories of insult in "conventionalised impoliteness formulae in English" (Culpepper 2011: 135)<sup>8</sup>.

To this, Hanzawa's counter attack begins in turn 2. Hanzawa presents himself as taking the attack 'can't you even make an excuse for yourself?' at face value and states that he will provide excuse 'as he (Haida) wishes'. In saying this, he uses *onozomi doori benmei o saseteitadakimasu*, using an honorific *o*+*nozomi*, 'your respectable wish' and uses *~saseteitadakimasu*, 'I will do it' (lit. I will humbly receive the favor of you letting me do it.). The fact that he could have just used *benmei o saseteitadakimasu* but expressly added *onozomi doori*, knowing that Haida's utterance did not mean he wanted an excuse from Hanzawa, is an instance of sarcasm (Schnurr et al. 2008). Hanzawa goes on to express his suspicion of the process by pointing out that the selected clients are only those who are not doing very well, which is indirectly accusing the inspection team of not granting equity rights.

3	Haida:	<i>nani</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>iitai</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>da.</i>
		what	Sub	want to say	Nom	Cop

“What are you trying to say?”

- 4 Hanzawa: *jibunno un no warusa o kuyanderu n desu yo.*  
 my fortune Lk badness Obj feeling sorry Nom Cop FP

*moshi kore ga hontooni nanno itomo naku erabareta kekka*  
 if this Sub really without any intention was chosen result

*naraba [ desu ga.*  
 if Cop but

“I am only feeling sorry for myself for being so unlucky. If this is really the result of random selection without any intention”

In turn 4, Hanzawa continues answering the question ‘what are you trying to say’ and flouts the maxim of manner (by being ambiguous)<sup>9</sup>. What he is trying to say is in fact, that the clients have been unfairly chosen. However, he answers it by stating that he is only feeling sorry for himself for his lack of luck. If he is feeling bad with his unlucky predicament, he may well have some harsh feelings for the very agent who brought the situation upon. He shifts his speaking style in the way that it is a little more casual by adding *yo* all of sudden. However, without any pause, Hanzawa inserts his more pronounced suspicion using the *moshi, ba* conditional form, implicating that he does not believe that it was chosen randomly.

- 5 Ogiso: [ *kimi wa wareware ga koini kensa taisho o*  
 you Top we Sub deliberately inspection object Obj

*eranderu to demo ittai no ka*  
 select Qt or something want to say Lk Q

“Are you trying to say that we have chosen the inspection objects deliberately?”

- 6 Hanzawa: *watashino kattena omoikomi desu kara doozo o ki ni nasaranaide*  
 my unsupported belief Cop because please Hon don’t worry (Hon)

*kudasai. tada konkai no sairyoorinten ni wa saisho kara*  
 please but this time Lk inspection with Top beginning from

*akui o kanjizuniwa iraremasen.*  
malice Obj cannot help feeling

“It is my own unsupported belief so please do not worry about it. However, I cannot help feeling malice from the beginning with this inspection”

- 7 Haida: *jibunno kanri fuyukitodoki o tanani agete*  
one's own management negligence Obj without seeing faults
- nan nan da sono taido wa. konna n dakara go*  
what Nom Cop that attitude Top like this Nom because five
- oku mo no sonshitsu o dashite heiki de irareru*  
hundred million so much as Lk make loss not bothered
- n da yo.*  
Nom Cop FP

“What kind of attitude is that without seeing your own negligent management? Because you are like this, you are here like nothing happened even after causing the loss of so much as five hundred million”

- 8 Hanzawa: *ima sore to kore wa kankeinai daro.*  
now that and this Top unrelated Cop  
“That is not related to this”

Ogiso is confronted with Hanzawa's suspicion overlapping his utterance (indicating impatience), and Hanzawa in turn 6 again uses sarcasm, saying not to mind as it is his own speculation. The phrase he uses comes across as sarcastic, albeit it is a very polite expression on the surface. The reason this phrase sounds more impolite also has to do with what follows it. He continues with a contrastive connective *tada*, which contrasts with what he claimed as his mere suspicion. His 'mere suspicion' indeed had grounds for support, as he has been sensing *akui*, 'malice'.

In turn 7, Haida criticizes Hanzawa's attitude, and adds information which is clearly flouting the maxims of quantity and relevance. The former being more informative than the current purpose, and the latter, as the information is of no relevance to the current exchange. Hanzawa mercilessly attacks Haida's quality face

and social identity face by pointing out his incompetence in judgement (incompetent enough to mention something that is irrelevant), and therefore, being an incompetent inspector. The blunt form *kankeinai daro* contrasts with the expressions he has been using (honorifics) and reinforces the impoliteness.

- 9 Ogiso: *moo ii. kyoo wa kore made da.*  
 that's enough today Top up to here Cop  
 "That's enough, that's all for today"

- 10 Hanzawa: *chotto matte kudasai.*  
 little please wait  
 "Please wait"

- 11 Tomari: *hanzawa.*  
 "Hanzawa"

- 12 Ogiso: *yuushi ga dookoo iu maeni kimi ga ginkoo in toshite*  
 loan Sub this or that say before you Sub banker as  
  
*tekikaku ka dooka kentoo suru hitsuyoo ga aru na.*  
 being qualified whether or not consider is necessary FP

"Before we say this or that about the loan, we should examine whether you qualify as a banker"

In this setting, Asano and the inspectors can be regarded as exercising 'Coercive impoliteness' (Culpeper 2011). Culpeper (2011: 226) defines the term as following:

"Coercive impoliteness is impoliteness that seeks a realignment of values between the producer and the target such that the producer benefits or has their current benefits reinforced or protected (the labels producer and target need not refer to individuals, but could refer to group or institutions). It involves coercive action that is not in the interest of the target, and hence involves both the restriction of a person's action-environment and a clash of interests"

And continues

"I would predict that coercive impoliteness is more likely to occur in situa-

tions where there is an imbalance of social structural power...A powerful participant has more freedom to be impolite, because he or she can (a) reduce the ability of the less powerful participant to retaliate with impoliteness (e.g. through the denial of speaking rights), and (b) threaten more severe retaliation should the less powerful participant be impolite in return" (Culpeper 2011: 227–228)

Ogiso's turn 9, clearly indicates the denial of Hanzawa's speaking rights, so that he cannot retaliate with further impoliteness. Having denied Hanzawa's right to speak, Ogiso in turn 12 goes on to attack Hanzawa's quality face and social identity face. Ogiso's turns in 9 and 12 illustrate also the denial of Hanzawa's equity rights.

The next example shows further examples of various impolitenesses, it also has some more instances of Japanese that match the conventionalised impoliteness formulae in English, and it also exhibits 'mock impoliteness'.

(2) Episode 3

- 1 Ogiso: *sassato shitamae. jikan no muda da.*  
quickly do Imp time Lk waste Cop  
"Hurry up. It's a waste of time"
- 2 Hanzawa: *arimasen ne.*  
do not exist FP  
"(the documents are) not here"
- 3 Haida: *fuzakeru na. =*  
don't be silly  
"Stop that nonsense"
- 4 Hanzawa: *= okashii desu ne. kesa wa atta n desu ga.*  
strange Cop FP this morning Top existed Nom Cop but  
"This is strange. The documents were here this morning"
- 5 (Silence)
- 6 Tomari: *oi, kesa tte dooiu koto da yo.*  
hey this morning Qt what thing Cop FP  
"What do you mean by this morning"

- 7 Hanzawa: *doomo shonichi kara shiryoo ga ikutsuka funshitsu shiteiru*  
it seems first day from material Sub several being lost

*yoo nanode dono fairu ni nan no shiryoo ga*  
it seems because which file in what Lk material Sub

*sonaetsuke rareteiru no ka o zenbu matometa n desu yo. yonaka*  
is being equipped Nom Q Obj all arranged Nom Cop FP night

*no ichiji made kakarimashita ga ne.*  
Lk one o'clock until took Sub FP

“It seems to be the case that some documents went missing from the first day. So we have put together the material which was in the file although it took us until 1 am”

- 8 Haida: *omaera sorede.*  
you Pl that's why  
“You guys that's why...”

- 9 Hanzawa: *takaishi tekkoo no gijiroku ga sonzaisuru koto wa kono risuto*  
Takaishi Steel Lk minutes Sub exist thing Top this list

*ga shoomei shiteiru. nanoni ima nai to iu koto wa.....*  
Sub is proving but now don't exist Qt say thing Top

*anta tachi koso dooiu kanri o shiteru n desu ka. (stands up)*  
you Pl just what kind of is managing Nom Cop Q

“The list proves the fact that the minutes of Takaishi Steel exist. That it is not here means.....how are YOU managing the files (it is not us but you guys who have problems with managing the files)?”

In turns 1 and 3, Ogiso and Haida use ‘pointed criticisms/complaints’, another one of the ‘conventionalised impoliteness formulae’ mentioned earlier. Latching with Haida’s insult in turn 3, Hanzawa in turn 4 states that it is strange. The effect of the latching suggests that he wants to silence Haida. This interpretation is strengthened as the utterance is also said with a louder volume, as if he is drowning Haida out. With Tomari’s prompt in turn 6 Hanzawa explains that he and his



team made a list to prove what was in each file. His utterance *antatachi koso dooiu kanri o shiteru n desuka* is a rhetorical question, it is not a question really to find out how they are managing the file but to blame them for losing it. The personal pronoun *anta* with its vulgarity (*Nihonkokugo daijiten* 2003) and the use of *tachi* (when the more polite item *gata* is available but not chosen) add to the force of impoliteness. The semantic content attacks quality face as well as social identity face, as it is indicating their (lack of) ability and competence, questioning their appropriate status in the bank.

- 10 Haida:     *wareware ga nakushita tte iu no ka.*  
                   we           Sub lost           Qt say   Nom Q  
                   ‘Are you saying that we’ve lost them?’
- 11 Insp1:     *kikizutenaran ne.*  
                   unpardonable   FP  
                   ‘It is unpardonable’
- 12 Insp2:     *konna buiyoku hajimete da yo.*  
                   such as this   insult   first time Cop   FP  
                   ‘I’ve never been insulted this much’

In turn 10 Haida confronts Hanzawa’s impoliteness by explicitly saying what has been implied by Hanzawa; that the inspection team has lost the documents. This prompts the other two inspectors to immediately voice their unequivocal indignation. Although these two may not have been the specific targets of Hanzawa’s impoliteness it is certain that Hanzawa’s enemies (their allies) are insulted and if Hanzawa meant it as impoliteness, it is certainly successfully conveyed (Locher and Watts 2008).

- 13 Ogiiso: *asano shitenchoo kore wa ikura nandemo anmarida. kono*  
                   Asano branch manager this Top just too much Cop this
- yuushi kachoo mondai ga arisugimasu yo.*  
                   loan section head problem Sub excessively have FP
- ‘Asano shitenchoo, this is just too much. This section head has excessive problems’

In turn 13 Ogiso's utterance is negative about Hanzawa (quality face, social identity face). Also the last utterance in turn 13, matches a category in conventionalised impoliteness formulae in English, a negative comment referring to Hanzawa, which is addressed to the branch manager in front of Hanzawa (although the third-person usage is not the same as the one used in the conventionalised impoliteness formulae in English, the form itself is the same as a sub-category of insults, 'personalised third-person negative references (in the hearing of the target)'). *~Sugiru in mondai ga arisugimasu*, functions to intensify the fact that Hanzawa has many problems. Although *~sugiru* is not a modifier, the effect is similar to what Culpeper (2011: 141) notes: "...intensifying modifiers play a role in exacerbating the impoliteness of impoliteness expressions, especially in the context of insults".

- 14 Asano: *hanzawa kun koreijyoo migurushii mane o shite shiten no*  
Hanzawa Ad more than this disgraceful act Obj do branch Lk

*namae ni doro o nuru no wa yametamae.*  
name to bring shame Nom Top stop Imp

"Hanzawa, stop bring shame on the name of our branch by being  
disgraceful more than you have been"

Asano's utterance in turn 14 also matches a category of conventionalised impoliteness formulae in English, which is 'unpalatable questions and/or presuppositions'. What he is telling Hanzawa is to stop being disgraceful so that he does not bring even more shame to the name of the branch. This is a clear-cut expression of impoliteness as even if Hanzawa stopped now it does not change the fact that he is being regarded as having been disgraceful and having brought the shame enough already (attack of quality face and social identity face).

- 15 Ogiso: *kiiteru no ka hanzawa iikagenni jibun no hi o mitomero*  
listening Nom Q Hanzawa no more recognize one's fault Imp

*to itteru n da. sonna detaramena risuto ateni naru*  
Qt saying Nom Cop such unreliable list be depended upon



*kesa made wa kakujitsuni sonzaishiteita naniyori*  
 this morning until Top certainly existed more than anything

*no shooko deshoo ga.*  
 Lk proof right? but

“Just to be on the safe side, we’ve taken photos of the missing documents early this morning with the morning paper. Here are the minutes that are missing now. This is the best evidence which proves that these missing documents existed until this morning”

- 19 Haida: *dakara tte wareware o utagau no wa doo nan da yo.*  
 so Qt we Obj suspect Nom Top how is FP  
 “Even if that’s as you say, how is it that you suspect us?”

- 20 Hanzawa: *sodesu ne. watashi mo anata gata o shinjitai.*  
 that’s right FP I also you Pl Obj want to believe

*desukara ima kono ba de zenin no mochimono o*  
 so now this place at everyone Lk belongings Obj

*aratame sasetekudasai.*  
 check please let (me)

“You are right. I also want to believe you. Therefore, please let me check everyone’s belongings here right now”

- 21 Haida: *nani bakana koto itte n da yo. sonna koto shite moshi*  
 what foolish thing say Nom Cop FP such thing do and if

*nanimo detekonaka ttara kimi wa tada ja sumasarenai zo.*  
 nothing come out if you Top will not get away with it FP

“You are talking nonsense. If you do such a thing and nothing comes out, you won’t be able to get away with it”

- 22 Hanzawa: *kakugo no ue desu.*  
 preparedness Lk upon Cop  
 “I am fully aware of that”

- 23 Ogiso: *jitsuni fuyukai da. kimi no ooboo ni tsukiau*  
truly unpleasant Cop you Lk high-handedness with go along

*tsumori wa nai yo.*  
intention Top none FP

“It is offensive indeed. I have no intention of going along with your high-handedness”

In turn 21, Haida uses pointed criticism/complaints (*nani bakana koto itten da*), and a threat (*sonna kotoshite moshi nanimo detekonakattara, kimiwa tadaja sumasarenai*), both of which are the categories of conventionalised impoliteness formulae in English. He also uses the particle *zo* which imparts a strong assertion. Through these threats Haida is attacking Hanzawa’s equity rights. Ogiso’s turn in 23, *fuyukai da* is a straightforward expression of the fact that he is displeased and disapproves of what is happening, and to make this quite clear he uses the intensifying modifier *jitsuni*. Although he is talking about his own feelings, there is no doubt who caused him to feel like this. Also the lexical choice of *ooboo* contributes to his attack on Hanzawa’s quality face.

- 24 Tomari: (Pounds the table) *mattaku desu. nantoiu iigakari da.*  
it surely is Cop what a false accusation Cop

*iikagenni shiro yo. hanzawa.*  
enough is enough FP Hanzawa

“I couldn’t agree more with you. What kind of false accusation is it? That’s enough Hanzawa.”

- 25 Haida: *soo da. tomari kun no iu toori da.*  
that’s right Cop Tomari Ad Lk say as Cop  
“That’s right, it is as Tomari says”

- 26 (Asano smiles satisfyingly)

- 27 Tomari: *koko made bujyokusarete damatterareru ka.* (Throws his own bag open)  
here until be insulted how can I (we) keep silent

*saa, minasan keppaku o shoomeisuru tameni kaban*  
 here we are everyone innocence Obj proof in order to bag

*no nakami o misete yarimashoo. yamashii tokoro ga*  
 Lk contents Obj let's show feel guilty about place Sub

*nakereba nanno mondai mo nai. kakugoshiro yo hanzawa.*  
 if not what problem not either be prepared FP Hanzawa

(as he is saying this, he has his back turned to the others and is facing Hanzawa, and winks at him with a smile)

“Do you think we will do nothing having been insulted so much? Well, everyone, let's show him what we have in our bags to prove our innocence. If we have nothing to feel guilty about, there should be no problem. Hanzawa, be prepared for the trouble you have got yourself into”

Tomari, who believes that he was added in the inspection team to throw Hanzawa off his guard volunteers his strong disapproval in turn 24. This is in line with Haida and Ogiso's protest (*mattaku desu*) regarding Hanzawa's suggestion of checking everyone's belongings. On the surface, it is impoliteness to Hanzawa, by using *iigakari*, he is pointing out that Hanzawa has been violating the inspection team's equity rights. At the same time he is attacking Hanzawa's quality face as well as his social identity face. However, this is 'mock impoliteness' which “consists of impolite forms whose effects are (at least theoretically for the most part) cancelled by the context” (Culpeper 2011: 208).

Tomari's mock impoliteness is satisfying in double measure, because the enemies (the real target of impoliteness on the part of Hanzawa and Tomari) had their triumphant smile after Tomari's turn in 24. To betray them after having done so is even more satisfying and, in addition, linguistically he is fully on the inspectors' side. Tomari also uses *misete yaru* in which  $\sim$ *teyaru* includes the condescending meaning; and the final line has a type of threat (*kakugo shiro yo*). Tomari's mock impoliteness created the situation where everyone has to show their bags as Hanzawa initially suggested. In this regard, this mock impoliteness contributed “to strengthen social bonds between the producer and intended recipient” (Bousfield 2008: 136).

## Discussion

The analysis of the current study demonstrates that some characteristics have become clearer with Japanese data, and this could lead to further research.

First, the use of terms of address. The use of address terms and their impact have been discussed in Kim (2010, 2012, 2013). Kim (2012) especially examined how the use and the change of an address term indicated the speaker's emotional change as well. In the present data as shown in the examples, there were *anta tachi*, *anata gata* on the part of Hanzawa, and *kimi*, *omaera* by the members of inspection team. The use of terms of address plays an important role as a strategy that imparts impoliteness.

Secondly, the predicate omission. Cook (2006, 2008) discusses style shifts observed during academic consultation between professors and students in the university setting. Cook's findings include how students omit predicates (produce incomplete sentences) in order not to have to choose either the *masu* or plain form. This is one of the strategies used by students "to avoid creating unequal relationship" (Cook 2008: 29). Although the strategy itself is not impolite, when it is used in the situation where power struggle occurs, this could be used as a strategy to avoid creating an unequal relationship. For example observe the following instance in which Hanzawa is talking to people of higher rank:

### (3) Episode 3

Hanzawa:      *nyuushibu*      *ga*      *okonau*      *sairyoorinten*      *ni*      *wazawaza*  
                  loans division Sub      carry out      sairyoorinten      to      despite trouble

*jinjibu*                              *no*      *ogiso jichoo*                              *made*      *okoshi*  
                  human resources division Lk Ogiso deputy manager even      come (Hon)

*itadakeru*                              *to*      *wa.*  
                  able to receive                              Qt      Top

"Oh, I didn't expect that Ogiso jichoo from the human resources division would join us with all the trouble for the inspection to be held for loans division"

## (4) Episode 3

Hanzawa:     *yoteedoori*     *datta*     *no*     *dewa?*  
                   as planned     Cop     Nom     isn't it  
                   "Isn't that as planned?"

## (5) Episode 4

Hanzawa:     *watashi ni donna mondai ga aru to.*  
                   I           to     what kind of     problem     Sub     exist     Qt  
                   "What kind of problem are you saying that I have?"

The omitted predicates would be *omoimasen deshita*, 'I didn't think', *arimasenka*, 'isn't that (so)' and *osshatte iru no desuka*, 'you are saying~', respectively.

Third, Locher and Watts (2005, cited in Schnurr et al. 2008) show that both impolite and overly-polite behavior are negatively marked. With regard to Japanese, Shibamoto-Smith (2011) discusses 'insult by honorification'. Although Shibamoto-Smith's analysis is focused on the verb *iu*, 'say', as a general tendency it seems that being overly-polite could serve as being impolite in Japanese especially in the situations where there is conflict. In a similar vein, impoliteness with style shifts and the use of interactional particles could also provide an insight.

## 5. Conclusion

The study thus far has presented a micro-analysis of a specific data set adopting the concept of face and sociality rights. It was also shown that there are some overlaps with the categories and subcategories of conventionalised impoliteness formulae in English. Since the study is limited, I consider it as a provisional base for further study. In the future, it will be necessary to have a more quantitative analysis and find out whether the framework based on English could cover the Japanese data.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/entertainment/tv/tnews/2013\\_1217-OYT8T00493.htm](http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/entertainment/tv/tnews/2013_1217-OYT8T00493.htm) (Accessed on 24 December 2013)

<sup>2</sup> This is as of when the book review was being written.



- <sup>3</sup> “*Omoiyari* refers to the ability and willingness to feel what others are feeling, to vicariously experience the pleasure or pain that they are undergoing, and to help them satisfy their wishes” (Lebra 1976: 38).
- <sup>4</sup> [http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/entertainment/tv/tnews/2013\\_1217-OYT8T00493.htm](http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/entertainment/tv/tnews/2013_1217-OYT8T00493.htm) (My translation, Accessed on 24 December 2013))
- <sup>5</sup> It has been reported that the highest ratings during the final episode of *Hanzawa Naoki* (TBS) were 46.7% in the *Kanto* area, and 50.4% in the *Kansai* area. (<http://nlab.itmedia.co.jp/nl/articles/1309/24/news047.html> (Accessed on 24 December 2013)).
- <sup>6</sup> <http://singo.jiyu.co.jp/> (Accessed on 13 January 2014)
- <sup>7</sup> I have put brackets around ‘rights’ since Equity and Association rights are referred to as ‘interactional principles’ in a later work of Spencer-Oatey (Culpeper 2011: 40). Culpeper (2011) however, refers to them as rights. Adopting Culpeper (2011), I will also use the term equity and association rights.
- <sup>8</sup> It is interesting to note that some of the occasions in Japanese resemble very much the ‘conventionalised impoliteness formulae in English’. Here are the categories and subcategories of the conventionalised impoliteness formulae in English: Insults (Personalized negative vocatives; Personalized negative assertions; Personalized negative references; Personalized third-person negative references (in hearing of the target)); Pointed criticism/complaints; Unpalatable questions and/or presuppositions; Condescensions; Message enforcers; Dismissals; Silencers; Threats; Negative expressives (e.g. curses, ill-wishes) (Culpeper 2011: 135–136).
- <sup>9</sup> Culpeper (2011) shows illustrations of implicational impoliteness to explain how Gricean account can capture some aspects of impoliteness. A summary of co-operative principles and maxims of conversation (Grice 1975; 1978, adopted from Levinson 1983: 101–102) are as following: (1) The co-operative principle: make your own contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged (2) The maxim of quality: try to make your contribution one that is true, specifically: (i) do not say what you believe to be false; (ii) do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence (3) The maxim of quantity: (i) make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purpose of the exchange; (ii) do not make your contribution more informative than is required (4) The maxim of relevance: make your contribution relevant (5) The maxim of manner: be perspicuous, and specifically: (i) avoid obscurity; (ii) avoid ambiguity; (iii) be brief; (iv) be orderly).

#### **Transliteration and transcription conventions**

- Ad    terms of address/reference
- Cop    various forms of copula

FP	final particle
Hon	honorific
Imp	imperative
Lk	linking nominal
Nom	nominalizer
Obj	object marker
Pl	plural
Q	question marker
Qt	quotation marker
Sub	subject marker
Top	topic marker
[	overlapping talk
=	latching

### Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Dr. Jamie Greenbaum for reading through this paper and providing insightful comments. However, any errors herein are mine.

### References

- Bousfield, Derek. 2008. *Impoliteness in Interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. 1978. Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In Esther N. Goody (ed.) *Questions and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 59–289.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, Haruko Minegishi. 2006. Japanese politeness as an interactional achievement: Academic consultation sessions in Japanese universities. *Multilingua* 25: 269–291.
- Cook, Haruko Minegishi. 2008. Style shifts in Japanese academic consultations. In Kimberly Jones and Tsuyoshi Ono (eds.) *Style Shifts in Japanese*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Cook, Haruko Minegishi. 2011. Are honorifics polite? Uses of referent honorifics in Japanese committee meeting. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 3655–3672.
- Culpeper, Jonathan. 1996. Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 349–367.

- Culpeper, Jonathan. 2005. Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: The Weakest Link. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture* 1: 35–72.
- 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, 17–43.
- Culpeper, Jonathan. 2010. Conventionalised impoliteness formulae. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 3232–3245.
- Culpeper, Jonathan. 2011. *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fukada, Atsushi and Noriko Asato. 2004. Universal politeness theory: Application to the use of Japanese honorifics. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36: 1991–2002.
- Goffman, Erving. 1967. *Interactional Ritual. Essays on Face-to-face Behavior*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Grice, H. Paul. 1975. Logic and conversation. In Peter Cole and Jerry Morgan (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press, 41–58.
- Grice, H. Paul. 1978. Further notes on logic and conversation. In Peter Cole (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics 9: Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press, 113–128.
- Hasegawa, Yoko. 2012. Against the social constructionist account of Japanese politeness. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture* 8: 245–268.
- Ide, Sachiko. 1982. Japanese sociolinguistics: Politeness and women's language. *Lingua* 57: 357–385.
- Ide, Sachiko. 1989. Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua* 8 (2–3): 223–248.
- Ide, Sachiko. 2006. *Wakimae no Goyooron*. Tokyo: Taishuukan.
- Kim, Angela A-Jeoung. 2010. More than just 'He' and 'She'-- A sociolinguistic approach: A comparison of the use of '彼(kare)' and '彼女(kanojo)' in Japanese with the English third-person singular pronouns. *Japanese and Japanese Language Education* 38: 27–54.
- 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. 2013. Linguistic strategies used during a debate in the Japanese Diet: Individual characteristics and the tactical use of rhetoric and impoliteness.

*Japanese and Japanese Language Education* 41: 1–30.

- Lebra, Takie Sugiyama. 1976. *Japanese Patterns of Behavior*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Locher, Miriam A. and Derek Bousfield (eds.). 2008. *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Locher, Miriam A. and Derek Bousfield. 2008. Chapter 1 Introduction: Impoliteness and power in language. 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, 1–13.
- Locher, Miriam A. and Richard J. Watts. 2005. Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture* 1 (1): 9–33.
- Locher, Miriam A. and Richard J. Watts. 2008. Chapter 4 Relational work and impoliteness: Negotiating norms of linguistic behaviour. 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, 79–99.
- Matsumoto, Yoshiko. 1988. Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12: 403–426.
- Maynard, Senko K. 2001. *Koisuru Futari no 'Kanjyoo Kotoba'*. Tokyo: Kurosio Shuppan.
- Nihonkokugo daijiten*. Dai nihan. Dai ikkan. 2003. Tokyo: Shogakukan.
- Okamoto, Shigeko. 1999. Situated politeness: Manipulating honorific and non-honorific expressions in Japanese conversations. *Pragmatics* 9 (1) 51–74.
- Okamoto, Shigeko. 2011. The use and interpretation of addressee honorifics and plain forms in Japanese: Diversity, multiplicity, and ambiguity. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 3673–3688.
- Piotrowski, Michal. 2013. Book review: Impoliteness. *Using language to cause offence*. Jonathan Culpeper, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011. *Journal of Pragmatics* 57: 170–172.
- Schnurr, Stephanie, Meredith Marra and Janet Holmes. 2008. Chapter 9 Impoliteness as a means of contesting power relations in the workplace. 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, 211–229.
- Shibamoto-Smith, Janet S. 2011. Honorifics, “politeness”, and power in Japanese political debate. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 3707–3719.
- 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, 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: 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: 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.

### 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, *Episodes 3 and 4*.

To confirm the facts on *Hanzawa Naoki*, I have used the following websites:

[http://www.tbs.co.jp/hanzawa\\_naoki/cast/osaka.html](http://www.tbs.co.jp/hanzawa_naoki/cast/osaka.html)

<http://ja.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E5%8D%8A%E6%B2%A2%E7%9B%B4%E6%A8%B9>