POLITENESS AND MULTIMODALITY IN KOREAN AND JAPANESE

by

HYUN JI KIM

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

March 2020

DISSERTATION APPROVAL PAGE

Student: Hyun Ji Kim

Title: Politeness and Multimodality in Korean and Japanese

This dissertation has been accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of East Asian Linguistics degree in the East Asian Languages and Literatures by:

Lucien Brown	Co-Chairperson
Kaori Idemaru	Co-Chairperson
Lucien Brown	Advisor
Zhuo Jing-Schmidt	Core Member
Eric Pederson	Institutional Representative

and

Kate Mondloch	Interim Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

Original approval signatures are on file with the University of Oregon Graduate School.

Degree awarded March 2020

DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

Hyun Ji Kim

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures

March 2020

Title: Politeness and Multimodality in Korean and Japanese

This dissertation work aims to explore multimodal strategies of politeness in Korean and Japanese by investigating 7 hours of spoken and visual data produced by Korean and Japanese speakers. The analysis particularly deals with ways of controlling density of lexical information, use of kinetic cues and manipulation of gestural space in deferential and non-deferential situations. To begin, the first study examines how speech in interactions with a status-superior and a status-equal differ in the quantity of honorific lexemes, honorific sentence-ending particles, formal case-marking particles, mimetics, Chinese-origin words, pronouns, fillers and backchannels. Statistical tests revealed that use of honorifics and other lexical items that are related to formality and politeness increase in deferential situations. On the other hands, the general quantity of lexical information given to the addressee did not significantly differ in deferential and non-deferential situations. Second, in the study on kinetic cues of politeness, it was found that deference and intimacy can be embedded by manipulating multiple types of nonverbal

behavior involving manual gesture, head movements (nodding and shaking), erect body posture, eye contact and self-touch by looking at the frequency in formal and informal situations. In general, both native speakers of Korean and Japanese more actively and animatedly moved their bodies in intimate situations compared to deferential situations. An additional analysis further revealed that Korean and Japanese speakers use smaller gestural space to produce manual gestures when interacting with a superior than when interacting with a friend. In conclusion, this study contributes to developing methodological approaches of research on politeness by demonstrating that politeness-related verbal and nonverbal behaviors can be quantitatively examined. Furthermore, the statistical results indicating particular verbal and nonverbal patterns of (im)politeness support the perspective that politeness is a social practice of members of a community that share similar moral orders. Lastly, the findings that show how (im)politeness is complicatedly expressed in verbal and nonverbal ways can also have significant educational implications in that this research has brought to the forefront the issues in classes of Korean and Japanese where the focus of (im)politeness instruction has been placed mainly on honorifics rather than the true multimodality of (im)politeness.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Hyun Ji Kim

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon, Eugene
Dongguk University, Seoul, Korea

DEGREES AWARDED:

Doctor of East Asian Linguistics, 2020, University of Oregon

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

Sociopragmatics
Politeness
Second Language Acquisition

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Graduate Employee, Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures, University of Oregon, 2015-2020

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express sincere appreciation to Professors Lucien Brown and Kaori Idemaru for their assistance in the preparation of this manuscript. I also want to thank the members of the community councils for their valuable input.

I dedicate this dissertation to my beloved family

for nursing my soul with unconditional affections and love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

Chapter Page

Chapter Page

Chapter Page

Chapter Page

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure Page

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

Table Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The press and media have constantly disseminated innumerable stereotyped images that portray politicians and celebrities from Western or non-Asian cultures bowing deeply, even at a 90-degree angle, and put both their hands together in front of the chest in interactions with Asians. However, these visuals have simultaneously given rise to numerous contrasting evaluations across different cultures on the other side. If you kept bowing with your hands together in a Korean context, for example, others might be surprised and embarrassed because Buddhist monks are possibly the only people who greet in that way in Korea. This gap between what non-native people believe as etiquette or manner of general Asian cultures and negative evaluations of them made by Asians implies two facts; deference can be embodied in nonverbal means, and the manifestations of nonverbal strategies of deference are culture-specific. As mentioned in Kádár and Mills (2010: 1), politeness is one of the evident characteristics of East Asian cultures and languages, and it even stands for part of national identity.

Since politeness is embodied over multiple levels of language involving lexicons, morphology, and syntax, a large number of linguists have been dedicated to politeness-related phenomena in East Asia. Nevertheless, their focus of research has been placed exclusively on verbal aspects. For example, morpho-syntactic honorifics – e.g., *keigo* in Japanese and *contaymal* in Korean – have been one of the most popular subjects of research. The framework of Brown and Levinson (1987) which is the seminal work on politeness has also been steadily oft-cited and employed even in recent research despite of consistent new arguments contrary to the theory of politeness by Brown and Levinson. With the advent of the postmodernist approach, the interest of researchers of politeness further moved to the situational and contextual indexicality of politeness. However, the major source of data for examining politeness has remained at the verbal level even in the recent days, albeit nonverbal aspects of politeness were occasionally brought up in pre-2000 research. For how long will we turn our backs on the overflow of books aimed at

teaching culture-specific business behavior such as how to greet, exchange business cards and so forth?

Therefore, this dissertation attempts to look at the diverse dimensions of politeness-related phenomena other than particular verbal forms and expressions that have thus far not been frequently covered by comparing multimodal expressions in formal and informal contexts. First of all, Chapter II provides the background and rationale for investigating multimodality of (im)politeness by briefly giving an overview of changes in methodological and analytical approaches for research on politeness. Particularly, the transitions are summarized following the divisions of Kádár and Haugh (2013) – the first-wave, the second-wave, and the third-wave. This chapter also introduces how researchers' interest spread to multimodal aspects of politeness and examples are given of recent studies investigating multimodality. Furthermore, politeness in Korean and Japanese including idiosyncratic honorific systems in both languages is explained.

Next, Chapter III provides detailed information of the methodology which was employed for three different analyses of this dissertation analyzing the same data. Particularly, this chapter comprehensively describes demographic information of participants involving both main subjects and partners, experimental environments (locations, equipment, etc.), tasks, procedures and how to analyze data. Separate descriptions of Korean and Japanese datasets are provided because the experiments in each language were conducted in different locations.

In the ensuing three chapters, three separate experimental investigations are explained. Chapter IV focuses on the interrelationship between the amount of lexical information and politeness. This study was developed from the observation of Winter and Grawunder (2011, 2012) that found that native speakers of Korean uttered more words and produced more fillers when speaking in the formal speech style compared to when speaking in the informal speech style within the same length of time. This chapter attempts to figure out what particularly results in denser speech in a formal context by comparing the number of utterances, lexemes, content words, honorific words, mimetics,

Chinese-origin words, pronouns, case-marking particles, fillers, and backchannel that was respectively obtained from deferential and intimate situations. In addition, effect of tasks was scrutinized by statistical tests, and a cross-cultural comparison between Korean and Japanese was further drawn in Chapter IV.

Following the quantitative analysis of lexical information to shed light on an association with politeness, Chapter V looks at multiple nonverbal cues of politeness and intimacy in deferential and intimate situations. In particular, this chapter makes an attempt to apply findings from prior social psychologist studies on kinetic cues of dominance and intimacy that are characterized to be active and expressive. Referring to Brown and Winter's (2019) research on interactions in Korean, this study particularly concentrated on the frequency of manual gestures, head movement (nodding and shaking), body movement (body relaxation), eye contact and physical contacts with the interlocutor. The mean frequency in formal and informal situation was statistically compared in order to figure out how politeness is bodily expressed in Korean and Japanese.

In Chapter VI, manual gestures are investigated further in depth with the social psychologist approach. Based on previous observations that large body expressions are related to dominance and intimacy, this chapter examines whether there is any correlation between use of bigger gestural space and politeness. This study specifically investigated three separate dimensions – vertical, lateral, and front-back dimensions. The frequencies of producing large-size gestures and using both hands in deferential and intimate situations were compared. Lastly, Chapter VII summarizes the findings of this dissertation and important contributions to the field of pragmatics and suggests directions of future research.

We generally have no issue to perceive the correct level of (im)politeness which is intended by the speaker and are aware of the fact that we behave in different ways to deliver specific pragmatic meanings in the context of first language. However, we do not have a comprehensive picture explaining what factors we rely on to draw a conclusion that a certain utterance is polite or impolite. Although superficial elements such

morphological, syntactical, and lexical tools of politeness have been the main focus of research on politeness-related phenomena, less salient and less explicit factors involving lexical density, body expressions, and prosodic manipulations has attracted relatively less attention from researchers. Therefore, the present dissertation primarily aims to provide evidence that politeness is embodied in systematic multimodal means. This allows us to reify our abstract impressions and intuitions that are related to politeness. In addition, this study also attempts to suggest a new methodological approach by presenting statistically substantiated analysis, whereas prior studies on politeness have generally presented qualitative evidence. Another purpose of this study is to demonstrate how politeness is language- and culture-specific phenomena by making a cross-cultural comparison between Korean and Japanese.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RESEARCH ON POLITENESS

The main purpose of this chapter is to address the theoretical background and necessity of investigations into multimodal aspects of politeness. First, diverse approaches of methods and analysis that have been used by researchers of politeness are briefly introduced in Section 2.1. Section 2.1. promotes readers to better understand how this dissertation can contribute to the field with its relatively unique method. Section 2.2. introduces prior research on politeness in Korean and Japanese involving honorific systems which are closely related to the study on quantity of lexical information in Chapter IV. In addition, recent progress and accomplishments of research on multimodality of politeness-related phenomena are introduced in particular. This section provides the framework behind the studies in Chapter V and VI.

2.1. Prior Research on Politeness

Section 2.1. aims to present the general flow of politeness research which will aid in the understanding of the type of data, methodology and analysis that were used in this volume. Following the chronological divisions of politeness studies employed in the monograph of Kádár and Haugh (2013), this section introduces three research trends: (1) the first wave, the early politeness research based upon the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson (1987); (2) the second wave, the politeness research which adopts the discursive approach analyzing real language use; and (3) the third wave, the politeness research which views politeness-related phenomena as social practices and incorporates evaluations of politeness by multilayered groups of language users. It should be noted that this categorization of research approaches does not necessarily mean that the older approaches are outmoded and no longer utilized, but they are flexibly integrated according to the purpose of research.

2.1.1. First-wave Approach

2.1.1.1. Cooperative Principle (CP)

In general, the first-wave approach to politeness aims to establish new models of politeness theory at a somewhat abstract and theoretical level by building on Grice's (1989) Cooperative Principle (CP) as its underlying conceptual basis of the models. Grice asserted that the addressee can figure out the pragmatic meaning of speech that is intended by the speaker based upon normative expectations of communication, which Grice termed 'the four conversation maxims.' This conversation maxims are constituted of four different expectations: (1) quality, the expectation that one will be truthful; (2) quantity, the expectation that one will supply an appropriate amount of information; (3) relevance, the expectation that the provided information will be relevant; and (4) manner, the expectation that information will be clear. Grice argued that a hearer can access a pragmatic meaning which is beyond the literal and superficial meaning through the normative expectations that the speaker is either observing or not observing the CP overall (Kádár and Haugh, 2013).

For instance, imagine a scene that a mother enters her son's room and immediately says "look at this clean room" pointing at a pile of dirty clothes. This mother's statement would possibly violate the quality maxim since it is obviously untrue. From this mismatch between the mother's speech and the context, the son can read his mother's sarcastic affect and feel the necessity to clean up his room. As how this example illustrates, early researchers of politeness found Grice's CP as the foundation to develop a theoretical framework because they believed that politeness is embedded in flouting or violating the maxims or perlocution of indirect utterances. The most influential first-wave theory of politeness was introduced in *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*, written by Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson (1987). Brown and Levinson's framework aims to model politeness as implicated through forms of linguistic behavior that flout the conversational maxims in order to avoid conflict. This framework of politeness theory which is established by Brown and Levinson has kept its unprecedented position in the field of politeness research to date

2.1.1.2. Rationality and Face

Brown and Levinson (B&L (1987) herein) attempted to account for systematic aspects of polite language usage by constructing a Model Person (MP) who is a willful and fluent speaker of a natural language consisting of two special properties – rationality and face. The first key assumption that was made in B&L's theory of politeness centers on the notion of *rationality*, which refers to "the application of a specific mode of reasoning" (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 64). Through directly incorporating the Gricean CP into B&L's framework, they argued that an implicature of politeness arises when a conversation maxim is flouted because it is rational for the hearer to believe that the speaker is acting politely when flouting this maxim, and it is also rational for H to maintain the assumptions inherent in the CP by doing so.

Secondly, the assumed connection between politeness and face of B&L is fundamentally rooted in a particular interpretation of the practices by means of which face is maintained. These practices were originally termed *facework* by the renowned scholar Erving Goffman, who first introduced the notion of face into academic discourse. In his original work, Goffman extracted the notion of face from the sense of being embarrassed or humiliated, or literally 'losing face' (Goffman, 1967: 12). Therefore, the facework can be defined as any human actions that are consistent with face. Adopting the face-saving view of Goffman, B&L wrote that "our notion of face is derived from that of Goffman and from the English folk term" (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 61). Based on this theoretical background, they make assumptions that all competent adult members of a society have '*face*', which refers to "something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction" (B&L, 1987: 61). Face consists of two components: (1) negative face, the want of every member that his or her actions be unimpeded by others; and (2) positive face, the want that his or her wants be desirable to at least some others (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 62). Based on the distinct notions of positive and negative face, B&L distinguish three main

strategies to perform speech acts: positive politeness, negative politeness and off-record politeness.

In addition, B&L (1987: 12) see some speech acts are "intrinsically face-threatening", and they termed such speech acts as "face-threatening acts (FTAs)". In the context of the mutual vulnerability of face, any rational agent will seek to avoid these face-threatening acts, or will employ certain strategies to minimize the threat. However, one of the major challenges which researchers of politeness-related phenomena are confronting is to account for in what way and how much politeness behavior changes across various contexts (Kádár and Haugh, 2013). B&L (1987) argued that such contextual variation can be systematically explained by three social variables: relative power (P), social distance (D) and ranking of imposition in that culture (R).

2.1.1.3. Universality versus Culture-specific

A central concept in first-wave approaches is the notion of *universality* which views the linguistic politeness can be systematically interpreted and described across different languages and cultures through employing the identical underlying theoretical framework. This baseline idea to describe manifestations of language and language usage through universal parameters is thought to originate from Noam Chomsky's (e.g., 1957, 1965) work on so-called Generative Grammar. As a pragmatic answer to the grammatical parameters studied by adherents of Generative Grammar, first-wave politeness theorists echoed Chomsky's claims in proposing that politeness, which is a means of avoiding conflict, largely operates through flouting universally applicable Conversational Maxims (Kádár and Haugh, 2013).

The idea of universality first appeared in the framework of Robin Lakoff (1973, 1977), which represents the earliest attempt to theorize politeness. Lakoff argues that politeness has 'rules', which involve the following: 'Don't impose' (Rule 1), 'Give options' (Rule 2), and 'Make A feel good, be friendly' (Rule 3) (Lakoff 1973: 298). The conversational maxims are flouted when these rules are observed with the Gricean maxim 'Be polite', Lakoff claims that politeness behavior can be described universally, and the

basic difference among cultures is that they put more emphasis on one of these rules than on the others. In addition, Brown and Levinson (1987) also claim that politeness universally functions as a tool of conflict avoidance and even through the ways in which it manifests itself differ across languages and cultures underpinning it are exactly the same operational assumptions. These include, most importantly, a so-called universal notion of face and the assumed universal applicability of rationality in theorizing politeness.

While the early researchers on politeness emphasized identifying universality, later scholars who were influenced by the first-wave approach of politeness have attempted to explain cross-cultural differences in terms of the universalistic notion of face and rationality by analyzing culture-specific politeness found in the cultures emphasizing communality and normativity over individuality and agency (Kádár & Haugh, 2013). Universalistic rationality in politeness-related phenomena is generally viewed as a phenomenon orienting towards others rather than insiders. However, many researchers who have an interest in emic concepts or 'insider' perceptions of linguistic politeness have refuted the concept of universality advocated by the first-wave approaches prioritizing etic or 'outsider' concepts. According to their understanding, politeness is an inherently culture-specific phenomenon rather than a universal one.

A major point in these criticisms of universal politeness was that the concept of rationality in the early politeness studies merely reflects a modern Western interpretation of rational behavior as an individual choice to act. One of the most influential critiques has come from the Japanese sociolinguist Ide (1982, 1989) and Matsumoto (1988, 1989, 1993). Ide (1989) stated that the practice of polite behavior conforming to the social conventions or social norms is known as *wakimae* or 'discernment' in Japanese society (Hill et al., 1986: 347-348). In a particular society, an individual behaves according to the social expectations from various levels of individual status and roles. Thus, what Ide argued is that selections of linguistic forms or expressions which systematically encode the ranks and/or roles of the speaker and the hearer is the discernment aspect of linguistic politeness. On the other hand, another aspect of politeness which allows the speaker to make an active choice based on the speaker's personal decision from a relatively wider

range of possibilities is called the ‘volitional’ aspect (Hill et al., 1986: 348). Whereas Brown and Levinson discussed face wants exclusively by taking the volitional perspective of politeness, the discernment aspect of linguistic politeness is separated with its orientation toward the wants to recognize the ascribed positions or roles of the participants as well as to accommodate to the prescribed norms of the formality for particular settings. Ide (1989) asserted that honorifics are not used to raise the addressee as Brown and Levinson state, but to acknowledge the status difference between the speaker and the referent, who is very often the addressee. In other words, she claimed that Brown and Levinson’s framework fails to give a proper account of formal linguistic forms such as honorifics which the speaker must make a decision to either employ or not.

2.1.1.4. Elicited Data and Utterance-level Analysis

In general, the first-wave politeness researchers heavily relied on elicited data as their data sources. Elicitation refers to methodologies by means of which researchers are able to obtain data directly from the speakers, which can be designed according to the fitness of the specific research goals (Kádár and Haugh, 2013). In politeness research especially examining linguistic politeness-related phenomena, data can be elicited through various ways including discourse completion tasks/tests (DCTs), questionnaires/surveys, interviews and so forth. Elicitation has been consistently favored since it allows one to access analytical complexities which researchers can easily examine (Kádár and Haugh, 2013). Nevertheless, one core challenge facing first-wave approaches that elicit data for politeness research is the issue of validity since it is difficult to figure out how much authentic data was provided by the informant. Moreover, it is hard to completely exclude the possible influence of social desirability effects, that is, informants’ desire to be seen as saying the ‘right’ thing, or to think of themselves as a prototypical person who says the ‘right’ thing expected by the community due to a lack of spontaneity.

As an example of a study adopting elicited data, Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) conducted DCTs to investigate cross-cultural speech patterns, especially requests and

apologies. They provided a sheet containing incomplete conversations to the subjects, and the subjects' task was to fill out the empty slots. Consequently, what Blum-Kulka and Olshtain obtained from the tests was isolated single sentences rather than continuous discourses by multiple speakers. This implies that most of the data which the first-wave politeness researchers used was likely to be restricted to the level of utterance which is the smallest unit of communication. Kádár and Haugh (2013) state that an utterance-level analysis facilitates identifying politeness forms and strategies because it is easier to generalize the function of them for their isolation from other utterances.

2.1.1.5. Observer Coding

Observer coding of linguistic forms and strategies vis-à-vis politeness essentially includes cases where "a category system is established in advance on the basis of theory or research, and the analyst decides which category applies to each utterance/behavior" (Arundale 2010: 152). As Wilson (1970) points out, there are two fundamental ways in which we construct our interpretations of interpersonal interactions – the analyst's perspective and the participant's perspective. The limited understanding regarding the study with the researcher's perspective or the interaction within the study is the analyst's perspective, whereas the attempt to include the understandings of the participants themselves into the analysis refers to the participant's perspective. As with the way Brown and Levinson approach and interpret their data, other first-wave politeness researchers were likely to rely on observer coding. However, even though observer coding features the advantage of simpler facilitation of replicating studies, the validity of the coding leaves room for a consideration due to the lack of cross-cultural emic perspective.

2.1.2. Second-wave Approach

Section 2.1.1. introduces researchers that noticed the inconsistency between the theory of politeness by Brown and Levinson and their observations from specific

languages such as Japanese. However, a challenge supported by a particular theory to the first-wave approach has in earnest emerged with a postmodern paradigm as Watts (2005: xix) states "a shift in emphasis away from the attempt to construct a model of politeness which can be used to predict when polite behavior can be expected or to explain post-factum why it has been produced towards the need to pay closer attention to how participants in social interaction perceive politeness." According to Mills (2011), post-modernism could be understood as a type of theoretical movement which questions all concepts and evaluations established by preceding theories and dissents such seminal theories that make an attempt to universalize or generalize. This post-modernist approach to politeness particularly emphasizes the actual usage of polite forms and strategies and relevant interpretations made by the actual participants of interaction, and criticizes that the first-wave approach, which quantifies the frequency of specific polite forms and strategies, fails to reflect such real language use. Thus, Holmes (2005) states that post-modernism simply substitutes "subjectivity" for the generalizing and objectivity of quantitative analysis and what characterizes post-modern research is contextual analysis and a focus on the multi-valency of interpretation.

This methodological shift in politeness research in the second-wave approaches is also referred to as the "discursive turn" (Kádár and Haugh, 2013). A frequently proposed issue related to the first-wave approaches is the overemphasis on the analyst's perspective over the participant's or lay people's perspective. This predominant analyst's approach consequently led to an indifference towards data that presents how laymen perceive politeness. Politeness studies which analyze data within the framework in a top-down fashion naturally raised a question whether such studies represent the linguistic behavior and understanding of politeness by actual interactants rather than the researcher's limited understanding of politeness. Thus, the researchers following the postmodern perspective makes a proposition that a focus should be put on evaluations of politeness by lay language users.

2.1.2.1. First and Second-order Politeness

In order to understand the difference between first and second-wave approaches on politeness, we first need to understand the first and second-order conceptualization, as Watts et al. (1992) termed Politeness1 and Politeness2. According to Watts et al. (1992: 3), a first-order lay conceptualization of politeness refers to "the various ways in which polite behavior is perceived and talked about by members of sociocultural groups", and a second-order theoretical conceptualization of politeness refers to "a term within a theory of social behavior and language usage". In other words, a first-order conceptualization (or Politeness1) refers to the way in which a politeness-related phenomenon is perceived by its users, while second-order (or Politeness2) describes a more abstract, scientific conceptualization of the given politeness-related phenomenon (Kádár and Haugh, 2013). In relation to politeness, first-order politeness involves "commonsense notions of politeness" which refer to the "various ways in which polite behavior is perceived and talked about by members of a sociocultural group" (Watts et al., 1992: 3). Second-order politeness is a technical term "within a theory of social behavior and language usage" which refers to the "way in which politeness is defined and conceptualized by theorists" (Watts et al., 1992: 3).

In addition to the analytical approach to politeness, the first-order and second-order politeness also differ in their assumptions underlying research on politeness. Whereas research based on first-order notions of politeness proceeds on the assumption that differences in the polite forms and strategies reflect the cross-cultural ways in which politeness is conceptualized, it is often assumed in research based on second-order notions of politeness that there is universal concept of politeness across different cultures, and that differences in polite forms and strategies are simply a reflection of divergences in language-specific structures (Kádár and Haugh, 2013). In sum, the first-wave analysis of politeness which excludes the politeness perception of the users concentrates on the second-order politeness, while the second-wave which emphasizes the discursive features of politeness focuses on the first-order politeness.

2.1.2.2. Beyond Culture as the Unit of Analysis

As Eelen (2001) explains, the first-wave approach tended to employ units of analysis focused at the level of languages, societies or cultures, rather than analyzing politeness-related behavior at the level of localized individuals or smaller groups. In Brown and Levinson's (1987) universalistic framework, for instance, cultures are categorized into positive and negative politeness cultures, depending on their broad preference for mitigating face-threatening acts either by negative or positive politeness strategies. Due to this problem of missing analysis of language uses at finer levels, nevertheless, discursive theorists have proposed alternative units of analysis. One of the most important units of analysis suggested by the second-wave researchers is the *Community of Practice*, developed by the educational theorist Etienne Wenger (1998). Community of practice refers to "a group of people, who are brought together through engagement in a joint activity or task" (Kádár and Haugh, 2013). This notion of community of practice allows researchers to approach and analyze politeness-related phenomena in a relatively contextualized way, and it has been consequently developed largely in the field of gender and language research (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, 2006). However, in spite of the advantages of this notion, its value is questioned because it has a limit to presuppose a specific contact between interactants focused on a common task or activity.

As another unit of analysis, *relational networks* are also frequently adopted in politeness research. Relational networks refer to "sets of intersecting social links between persons that collectively form the basis of an identifiable group for those persons who constitute the relational network in question" (Kádár and Haugh, 2013). The politeness theorist Watts (2003) suggests that relational networks can be either *emergent* or *latent*. An emergent relational network is "one where such social links are maintained, reactivated or changed through interaction", while a latent relational network is "one that is objectified by persons that constitutes that network". Kádár and Haugh (2013) explain advantages of using relational networks as a level of analysis: (1) they enable researchers to examine politeness in a more contextualized way; and (2) they facilitate investigating cultural practices since culture is generally formed by a number of intersecting networks

of more localized relational networks. Although localized, individualized politeness behavior is obviously one of the most important units of analysis, Kádár and Haugh (2013) further argue that careful attention should be paid when dealing with politeness-related behavior found in larger and more diffuse groups.

2.1.2.3. Challenge to the Notion of Face

While the first-wave approaches to politeness, particularly those sharing the idea of Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory, treated face as something inseparable from politeness-related phenomena, this stance has been undermined as the increasing number of empirical studies based on authentic interactions come up with contrasting findings. For example, Haugh and Bargiela-Chiappini (2009) pointed out a few issues in the face-saving model of the first-wave approach. First, Haugh & Bargiela-Chiappini argue that the notion of face in the first-wave approach is not built on the folk or emic aspect of face. In other words, any emphasis was not given to the interactional and discursive components of face which are established by actual participants of interaction. Second, Haugh and Bargiela-Chiappini also call the notion of face into question by posing that the influence of identity in interaction was not reflected.

Cook's (2013) study well demonstrates the necessity to reconceptualize face as in the argument of Haugh and Bargiela-Chiappini (2009). Cook (2013) analyzed uses of Japanese referent honorifics on a program on a Japanese TV shopping channel from an indexical point of view. Especially, she focuses on the identity construction of a male participant as a salesperson and a scientist who developed the product. Cook found that avoidance of referent honorifics indexes the speaker's detached stance from the viewers, thus, helps his presentation of an identity as a scientist, while using sales-related vocabulary and referent honorifics is linked to constructing an identity as a salesperson. Thus, Cook's (2013) research illustrates that the individual face is not the fixed indicator of politeness, but implies that the concept of face should reflect both the emic and etic aspects of politeness.

2.1.2.4. Naturally Occurring Interactions

In post-2000s thinking, the claim that politeness is situated in terms of contexts, text types and genres has gained its prominence in the field of politeness research. As Kádár and Haugh (2013) state, a number of scholars argue that it is hard to predict the interactional effect of a particular polite form or strategy because the function and the interpretation of a polite behavior can vary according to its context, text type and genre. With the increasing focus on interpersonal relationships or relational shifts in politeness research, the second-wave researchers began having more interest in authentic interpersonal interactions. A fundamental difference between first-wave theories and post-2000 discursive theories of politeness is that the latter puts more emphasis on the participants' perspective or the first-order politeness. For example, Locher and Watts (2005: 16) asserted that "we consider it important to take native speaker assessments of politeness seriously and to make them the basis of a discursive, data-driven, bottom-up approach to politeness." The concept of bottom-up in Locher and Watts' study is held from an idea that theories of politeness should be built up relying on the participants' perspective, instead of top-down methodology in which the researcher first establishes theories and then employs them to analyze interactions. Due to this shift in methodology, some methodological approaches preferred by the first-wave approaches such as surveys or DCTs have been treated as less important in the new wave, and more attention has been given to naturally occurring data (Kádár and Haugh, 2013).

Naturally occurring data allows researchers to access to a wide variety of datasets and it can be collected from various ways of recording. Although researchers are not always required to audio- or video-record naturally occurring interactions, it is encouraged to record and transcribe their data since the validity of researchers' memory to reconstruct the interaction to interpret and analyze is open to question. Kádár and Haugh (2013) introduce frequently used methods to collect naturally occurring data. First, computer-mediated communication (CMC) is one of the most noteworthy and most popular data sources in discursive research. As an example, Haugh (2010) analyzed the variability and argumentativity surrounding evaluations of an email sent by a lecturer to a student, and his analysis led to a new insight into the ways how evaluations of

impoliteness and the moral norms can be co-constructed, negotiated and disputed in (online) interactions. Second, historical texts are another important data source in discursive research. The examination of diachronically situated politeness is helpful to account for specific peculiarities of contemporary politeness usage, and it allows us to revisit a particular prescriptive assumption about a politeness-related phenomenon which is built by contemporary understanding of politeness.

Third, institutional discourse is another important data type as it particularly provides information on the relationship between power and politeness, and politeness is used as a tool to enforce or redistribute the institutional power in the discourse (Kádár and Haugh, 2013). For instance, Geyer (2008) analyzed the usage of the polite and plain forms in multiparty discourses in semiformal faculty meetings at Japanese secondary schools. Her findings demonstrate they ways in which age, gender, and length of employment at the school of the participants influence their choices of different speech levels. Lastly, post-recording interviews are often carried out by certain researchers in order to reconstruct the states of mind of participants related to politeness after the actual interaction.

2.1.3. Third-wave Approach

Research with the second-wave approach resists to see politeness as something cultural, but focuses on individual contexts as stated in Section 1.2.2. However, as Kádár (2019: 156) points out, the second-wave has its own limitations such as that context cannot explain every polite behavior that is formed by culture-specific factors. Thus, the third-wave of politeness research reverts to the first-wave to some extent due to its modeling linguistic politeness at the level of languages and cultures. Nonetheless, the third-wave characterizes its methodological change with examinations of behavioral and evaluative tendencies found in politeness-related phenomena (Kádár, 2019). In other words, the researchers of the third-wave view politeness as social practices constructed by the participations of the community members including evaluations regarding

politeness. Furthermore, the third-wave incorporates quantitative approaches into the qualitative approach of the second-wave.

However, a question might be casted that the individual variability in evaluations of politeness and the underlying moral implication in such evaluations are inevitably and inherently controversial. Thus, Kádár & Haugh (2013) propose the necessity to distinguish analysts' own evaluations of politeness and those of the participants themselves in a similar vein with the distinction between first-order and second-order understandings of politeness. In detail, third-wave researchers attempt to investigate any possible level of evaluations involving the speaker, the hearer, and the observers. In addition to multilayered evaluations of politeness, the third-wave approach also aims to extend their research interest to the multimodal aspects of politeness-related phenomena. Indeed, the idea that politeness is embodied in prosody and other kinetic cues such as facial expression and gesture is not newly bought up by the third-wave approach. Brown & Levinson (1987: 172) already reported the use of prosodic and kinetic hedges in Tzetal. Nonetheless, it is noteworthy that the current third-wave researchers initiated actively incorporating multimodal analysis into their studies by more systematic means.

2.1.3.1. Politeness and Interpersonal Evaluation

As emphasized in the view of the earlier politeness studies, one of the allegedly important functions of politeness is to avoid conflict with other interactants. For example, Halliday (1970: 175) states that the interpersonal function of politeness "serves to establish and maintain social relations." Moreover, Leech (1983: 56) interprets the interpersonal function of politeness as "language functioning as an expression of one's attitudes and an influence upon the attitudes and behavior of the hearer". Regarding interpersonal pragmatics, these quotations illustrate the two strongly linked areas: (1) interpersonal relations, which refers to "mutual social connections among people that are mediated by interaction, including power, intimacy, roles, rights and obligations," and (2) interpersonal attitudes, which refer to "perspectives, usually value-laden and emotionally charged, on others that are mediated by interaction, including generosity, sympathy,

like/dislike, disgust, fear and anger" (Culpeper and Haugh, 2014). Furthermore, the area of interpersonal attitudes is connected to (1) interpersonal emotions, which encompass embodied feelings or states of mind often characterized by participants as "irrational and subjective, unconscious rather than deliberate [and] genuine rather than artificial" (Edwards, 1999: 273), and (2) interpersonal evaluations, which involve "appraisals or assessment of persons, or our relationships with those persons, which influence the way we think and feel about those persons and relationships, and consequently sometimes what we do" (Kádár and Haugh, 2013: 61).

Kádár and Haugh (2013: 60) assert that more emphasis should be placed on the notion of evaluation or attitude when examining politeness-related phenomena since politeness or impoliteness inevitably involve the evaluations at multiple levels produced by the speaker and hearer, and even the third party. Kádár and Haugh (2013) further explain that there are four key dimensions of interpersonal evaluations: (1) persons and relationships, (2) categorization, (3) valency, and (4) normative frame of reference. First, a person can be conceptualized as an individual in a social environment, and is thus a socially defined concept. While persons in a biological sense are all cognitively independent individuals, persons in an interpersonal sense are conceptualized in different ways across social groups. There is an important link between the conceptualization of persons and the relational networks through which they are constituted. A relationship, following Arundale (2010: 138), can be conceptualized as "establishing and maintaining of connection between two otherwise separate individuals." Secondly, categorization involves commonsense or ordinary knowledge that is related to persons, and how we expect them to behave in the context of those relationships. This goes beyond prototypical persons (such as teachers and students in a general sense) to include specific persons (such as 'my mother' or 'my friend'). Third, valency refers to various scales such as ranging from good to bad, appropriate to inappropriate, like to dislike and so on. This concept is brought up to explain that valency in the context to evaluate politeness is inevitably emotively charged. There are a number of ways of evaluating that do not fall straightforwardly into being labeled either 'polite' or 'impolite'. Finally, normative frame of reference refers to the perception that others from the same social group would

evaluate a person or relationship in the identical way. The normative understandings can be situated relative to any social unit, ranging from dyads and relatively closed relational networks (such as families or groups of close friends), through to a localized grouping such as a workplace or community group, through to larger and thus inevitably more diffuse societal or cultural groups. Kádár and Haugh (2013) are pointing out that evaluations of politeness involve not only a high level or abstract societal or cultural frame of reference, but can also involve the relational histories of those persons (or groups of persons) involved.

2.1.3.2. Politeness and Social Practice

According to Kádár and Haugh (2013), social actions and meanings not only raise evaluations related to politeness, but they also may themselves become the object to evaluate politeness. Politeness is understood as a social practice in the third-wave approach to politeness, because it involves evaluations generated by social or interactional actions and meanings that are commonly recognizable to participants in general. Social actions and meanings are necessarily dependent upon normative practices which refer to ways of formulating conversation and conduct that are interpreted as doing and meaning certain things understood by all participants.

The *moral order* refers to "what members of a sociocultural group or relational network 'take for granted'," or what the ethnomethodologist Harold Garfinkel (1967: 35-36) referred to as the "'seen but unnoticed', expected, background features of everyday scenes." Kádár and Haugh (2013) maintain the importance of the notion of moral order in politeness research because this background to interpretation and evaluation of politeness is not just a matter of common knowledge existing in the community, but it exists at a more fundamental level. In other words, moral orders are the criteria for the members to judge what social actions and meanings are appropriate/inappropriate, good/bad, polite/impolite and the like. An evaluation of politeness consequently embodies an implicit reliance to the moral order which is perceived to be in common among multiple participants or by at least one of them. Another crucial argument that Garfinkel (1967)

made is that the 'seen but unnoticed' expectations constituting moral order are both "socially standardized and standardizing" (p. 36). This means they are not simple norms that afford or constrain the behavior of members to some extent, but rather the means by which one makes a claim to be a member of society in the first place.

However, members of a society do not always claim their membership by conforming social norms according to their moral decisions. Kádár and Márquez-Reiter's (2015) research on bystander intervention demonstrates how conventional social norms or "social oughts" (Culpeper, 2011) and moral principles or "moral ought" may conflict by analyzing a reality show *Primetime: What Would You Do? (WWYD*). The format of this show is that actors act out particular scenes in which some type of conflict or illegal activity takes place, and hidden cameras record whether bystanders intervene or not. In this setting, the ground of the wrongdoer's behavior is based on the notion of the negative face which is the right to be undisturbed, which conflicts the absolute moral norms behind the intervener's action. The examples in the study show that the expected moral order is not described with metacommunicative evaluations, but the way in which the bystander intervenes. Kádár and Márquez-Reiter found that when a bystander decides to intervene in an event, moral issues are at the center of the metacommunicative articulation or voicing, rather than the social norms.

2.1.3.3. Multimodality of Politeness

In contrast to the under-emphasis on nonverbal strategies of politeness in the first- and second-waves, the movement to investigate multimodality of politeness-related phenomena in depth was set out post-2000 (e.g., Culpeper 2005, 2011). Studies to look at vocal aspects of politeness first pay attention to difference in pitch in formal and informal contexts due to its salience and easily measurable feature. As for research examining pitch, studies on the perception of politeness in Catalan (e.g., Payà, 2003; Payrató, 2002) find that falling tone is perceived as the politest pitch pattern. Tsuji's (2004) cross-cultural study, which compares pitch levels used by English and Japanese speakers during text-reading, spontaneous speech and role-plays, found a contrasting use of pitch.

High pitch was used differently in the two languages: it was used to mark friendliness in informal speech of English, while it was used to signal deference or politeness in the formal speech register of Japanese.

Relatively more recent studies, on the other hand, attempt to delve into various prosodic measurements. Winter and Grawunder (2012) compared formal and informal Korean speech by investigating pitch, pause measurements, voice quality measurements (e.g. local jitter and shimmer, H1-H2) and fillers. They found decreases in pitch, intensity and breathiness occurred in Korean polite speech. In terms of perception of polite speech, Brown et al. (2014) demonstrated that Korean speakers can successfully perceive the correct level of politeness which is intended by the speaker with 70% accuracy when listening to stimuli lacking honorific markers. In addition, there are other studies reporting the important role of co-speech body expressions in distinguishing politeness and impoliteness. For instance, Nadeu and Prieto (2011) found that the speaker's visual information such as smile or neutral facial expression is correlated with high pitch in perception of politeness. McKinnon and Prieto (2014) also revealed that prosodic and gestural patterns work together when evaluating of genuine and mock impoliteness. Brown and Winter (2019) concentrated solely on gestural components of politeness referring to social psychologist studies that examine kinetic cues of power or dominance to investigate nonverbal behaviors of intimacy and deference. They analyzed nonverbal expressions of actors in Korean TV dramas and found that erect and compact body position, direct orientation towards the interlocutor and suppressed gesture and physical touch are associated with deference.

2.2. Research on Japanese and Korean Politeness

2.2.1. Concept of Politeness in Japanese and Korean

With regard to cross-cultural research on politeness, as Mills (2011) points out, 'politeness' per se is a problematic term since politeness is not just a strategy to avoid conflict as the early theories of politeness conforming the universalist view, but it also socially indexes (Tekourafi, 2001: 11). There is a large volume of research on politeness

scrutinizing cross-cultural differences in the notion of politeness. For example, indirectness is not less directly associated with politeness in Japanese requests compared to British English as revealed by Fukushima (1996). Moreover, as demonstrated in Pizziconi's study (2007), British English speakers associate 'polite' with appropriate, nice, considerate, courteous, distant, kind, friendly, well-mannered, and educated, whereas Japanese speakers associated '*teineina*' (polite) with *reigitadashii* (appropriate/well-mannered), *omoiyarinoaru* (considerate), *seijitsuna* (sincere, decent), *shinsetsuna* (kind), *kenkyona* (modest, humble), *joohinna* (refined, genteel), *herikudaru* (humble), *wakimaeru* (discerning), and *enryogachina* (reserved, modest). This cross-cultural metalinguistic analysis illustrates culture-specific concepts of politeness in British English and Japanese.

In addition to Japanese, in Korean Brown (2011b) sees *kongson*, which is a Sino-Korean word comprised of two different Chinese characters 'respect' and 'humility', as the closest equivalent to the English word 'politeness'. Brown (2011b) also suggests another word *contay* 'respect, deference' which cannot be separated from the notion of Korean politeness. Additionally, Yoon (2004) states that the distinction between *wui salam* (literally 'above person' which corresponds to superiors) and *alay salam* (literally 'below person' which corresponds to inferiors) is important in terms of the use of Korean honorifics due to the hierarchical and vertical conceptualization of social relations in Korea. This dichotomous distinction of social relationships is well reflected in the speech styles which can be broadly divided into two groups: *panmal* (plain, non-respectful language) versus *contaymal* (polite, respectful language). Concerning the use of honorifics in Korean, the speaker who displays respect (*contay*) towards their elders or superiors is likely to be described as *yayuy pal-un* 'displaying upright courtesy', whereas when the speaker fails to show appropriate respect s/he will be evaluated as *yayuy eps-nun* 'lacking courtesy' or *mos paywu-n* 'uneducated' (Yoon, 2004: 206). On the other hand, in respect to the im/polite evaluations of acting towards status intimates, status equals and status subordinates, the speaker who features rude behavior towards friends is described as *kipon-i eps-nun* 'lacking foundations' or *mayne eps-nun* 'lacking manners' (Brown, 2013: 169). These studies of metalinguistic notions of politeness in Korean and

Japanese imply the importance of intercultural, and even intracultural, approach to politeness-related phenomenon.

2.2.2. Honorifics

This study follows the definition of honorifics by Brown (2011a: 19) that "resources for indexing the relative position of interlocutors, referents and bystanders either in the lexicon or the morpho-syntax of a language". Both Japanese and Korean have been one of the popular areas of research interests in the field of politeness research for their developed systems of honorifics. As a common quality, Japanese and Korean are mainly comprised of two broad categories: referent honorifics and addressee or hearer honorifics. Referent honorifics are used to "index the relation between the speaker and the referent within the sentence", whereas hearer honorifics directly "index the relationship between the speaker and the hearer and do not require the hearer to appear as a sentence referent to be triggered" (Brown, 2008: 2). However, despite such fascinating similarities, there also exist differences between the honorifics in the two languages, although there are a handful of studies comparing two honorific systems as in the studies of Brown (2008, 2010). In this section, the honorific systems of Korean and Japanese are introduced while specifically focusing on the hearer honorifics due to the relevance to the following empirical studies.

2.2.2.1. Korean Honorific System

Japanese and Korean honorifics, particularly hearer honorifics, are achieved by a system of inflectional endings, or "speech style". The most significant difference between the two languages is derived from the categories of speech styles. In terms of Korean, hearer honorifics or speech styles are known to be more complex than Japanese because they can be categorized into six distinct styles as illustrated in (1), even though only four of them are generally used by the younger generations (Brown 2008). Notably, each honorific style has its non-honorific counterpart. Non-honorific styles contain "plain"

{T} style or *–ta* ending and "intimate" {E} style or *–e* ending, while honorific styles consist of "polite" {Y} style or *–yo* ending and "deferential" {P} style or *–supnita* ending. In addition to those pairs, there are authoritative styles in Korean which are normally used by the elder speakers of Korean towards their younger adult interlocutors, and they can be sorted into "familiar" {N} style or *–ney* ending and the "semi-formal" {S} style or *–so* ending (Brown, 2008, 2010; Yeon and Brown, 2013).

(1)	a.	Pap-i	masiss-ta	["plain" {T} style]
		Rice-NOM	delicious-DEC	
	b.	Pap-i	masiss-e	["intimate" {E} style]
		Rice-NOM	delicious-DEC	
	c.	Pap-i	masiss-eyo	["polite" {Y} style]
		Rice-NOM	delicious-DEC	
	d.	Pap-i	masiss-supnita	["deferential" {P} style]
		Rice-NOM	delicious-DEC	
	e.	Pap-i	masiss-ney	["familiar" {N} style]
		Rice-NOM	delicious-DEC	
	f.	Pap-i	masiss-so	["semi-formal" {S} style]
		Rice-NOM	delicious-DEC	

Taking the four levels of speech styles that are most frequently employed into consideration, Korean hearer honorifics can be understood to constitute two levels of deference and two levels of intimacy. Several conventional approaches to Korean speech styles such as Suh (1984) have assumed that the distinction is made by "formality": the non-honorific {T} style and the honorific {P} are formal, whereas the non-honorific {E} and the honorific {Y} are informal. Nonetheless, this perspective has been found problematic by recent studies on Korean speech styles. For instance, Brown (2008) points out that {T} has no formal function in spoken language, and it is likely to be utilized in casual interaction between intimate speakers or when addressing status inferiors rather

than in formal conversation (p. 5). As an alternative way to explain these contrasting speech styles, Brown (2008) poses that the underlying expressive meaning and status of information is the key to distinguishing the speech styles. For example, {T} and {P} are not compatible with a number of epistemic modal pre-final endings that mark the state of information, such as *-ci-/-canha-* (shared information), and *-ney-* (newly perceived information while {E} and {Y} can take those. Furthermore, they also cannot appear with the volitional *-lkey* and the connective ending *-ko* and *-nuntey* (Brown, 2008). Although each speech style is qualitatively different from each other, as aforementioned the present study concentrates on the distinction between honorifics and non-honorifics in order to analyze the data.

Korean referent honorifics also mark the relationship between the speaker and the referent who could be either the addressee or a third person. The system of Korean referent honorifics is constituted of subject honorifics and object honorifics (Brown, 2011a: 30). First, when describing a state or an action of the subject of a sentence uttered by the speaker who is a status superior, the subject honorific marker *-si-* can be added to the predicate before the speech style ending (Brown, 2015a: 309). There is a set of honorific verb stem which cooccur with *-si-* such as *cwumwus*i- 'sleep', *kyeysi-* 'stay' and *tusi-* 'drink/eat'. In addition to honorific verb stems, there is also a set of honorific nouns such as *cinci* 'meal', *sengham* 'name' and *yensey* 'age' (Brown, 2015a: 309). Moreover, the substitution of *-kkeyse* for the nominative case-marking particle *-i/ka* is another important device of subject honorification. On the other hand, Korean object honorifics is used only when the object is socially superior both to the speaker and the subject referent (Brown, 2011a). There is no verbal suffix for object honorification which is equivalent to the subject honorific verbal suffix *-si-*. However, there is a small set of lexical substitutions. Examples include verbs such as *tulita* 'give', *poyta* 'see' and *yeccwuta* 'ask', nouns such as *malssum* 'words' and particles such as *-kkey* 'to (dative)' (Brown, 2011a: 36). In a nutshell, honorification can occur at almost any place in utterance.

2.2.2.2. Japanese Honorific System

The Japanese honorific system is also often divided into addressee honorifics and referent honorifics (Kuno, 1973: 20; Shibatani, 1990: 375). First, the Japanese addressee honorication is known as *teineigo* which literally means ‘polite language’. Japanese speech styles particularly consist of a simple two-way division between the polite form and the non-honorific plain form as shown in (2) (Brown, 2010; Dunn, 1999; Martin, 1964). The polite form is marked by the *desu* form of the copula or by adding *–masu* to the verb stem, whereas the plain form lacks such honorific markings (Dunn, 1999; Okamoto, 1999).

(2) a. Gohan-ga oishii [plain style]
Rice-NOM delicious
b. Gohan-ga oishii-desu [polite style]
Rice-NOM delicious-COP-DIST

Japanese referent honorification can be further divided into *sonkeigo* ‘respect language’ and *kenjogo* ‘humbling language’. When describing actions or states of a socially superior or his/her in-group members, respect form is used. The respect honorifics are characterized by grammatical constructions such as *o*-Verb-*ni naru*, *o*-Verb-*da*, and Verb-*(r)areru*. In addition to the honorific verbal constructions, there is also a set of honorific verbal substitutions. Examples include *kudasaru* ‘give’, *irassyaru* ‘there be, come, go’, *ossyaru* ‘speak’, *nasaru* ‘do’, *meshiagaru* ‘eat/drink’ and so forth. Moreover, the humble honorifics is generally used when the speaker humbly depicts actions or states of her own or her in-group member. Notably, the actions or states have to be related to the hearer who is superior to the speaker. The humble honorification has a grammatical construction *o*-Verb-*suru* and a set of lexical substitutes. Such lexical substitutes include pronouns (e.g., the first-person pronoun *watakushi*), verbs (e.g., *sashiageru* ‘give’, *oru* ‘there be’, *mousu* ‘speak’, *itasu* ‘do’, *itadaku* ‘eat/drink/receive’).

2.2.2.3. Speech Style Shifting

In both Japanese and Korean, it is not difficult to observe that a speaker frequently switches his or her speech styles in the same conversation. This kind of linguistic phenomenon is called *speech style shifting*. In accordance with Brown (2008, 2010), style shifting in Japanese and Korean holds some similarities whereas the patterns of switching inevitably differ due to the different number of speech styles: Japanese speakers use two speech styles and Korean speakers use four speech style {P}, {Y}, {E} and {T} in most of the occasions. More specifically in Korean, mixing the formal style and the deferential style seems to be determined by the level of formality and the age-rank relationship (Yeon and Brown, 2013: 173-174). If a speaker is speaking to a person in a superior and higher position, the possibility that the speaker more frequently employs the deferential style is likely to increase even when mixing the two speech styles. Moreover, the deferential style often appears in set expressions such as greeting, expressing appreciation and apologizing. In addition, the deferential style tends to take place in the situation of delivering information which may be possibly new to the addressee particularly in semi-structured discussions such as academic debates or TV talk shows, although a speaker might switch to the polite style in order to associate with the audience in such relatively formal situation (Yeon and Brown, 2013: 174). For example, Brown (2015b) analyzed style shifting between the deferential and polite forms in a Korean talk show and revealed that the deferential form indexes "formal presentation stance" and shifting to the polite form indexes the affective stances of speakers.

In Japanese, a number of researchers have examined the pragmatic functions of Japanese speech style shifting. These studies have dealt with a variety of social contexts such as caregiver-children relations (Cook, 1997), superior-subordinate interactions in the workplace (Saito, 2010), salesperson-customer conversations (Okamoto, 1999), and peer-to-peer interaction (Dunn, 1999), etc. Most of the studies place their focus particularly on the shift between the plain and the polite forms. For example, Okamoto (1999) analyzed audio-taped dyadic conversations that took place in various social contexts and observed that Japanese speakers mix of honorific and non-honorific forms for the same addressee in the same interaction. The findings of this study demonstrate that context in which the

speakers of Japanese are likely to use the plain form such as exclamatory, emotional, or soliloquy-like expressions, and style shifts between the plain form and the polite form could be utilized as a strategy to avoid sounding too formal or too informal. Then, Okamoto made a conclusion that native speakers of Japanese may manipulate the two kinds of speech styles in order to create a desired context, in particular, preferred interpersonal relations and identities. In general, it is known that the native speakers of Japanese rely on the concept of in- and out-group membership to determine the speech style. Cook (1996) and Dunn (1999) explain that this indicator of speech styles is based on social distance between interactants and that the plain form is first acquired by young children within the family setting or in-group context, thereby it is consequently associated with intimacy and spontaneous self-expression. On the other hand, the polite form is acquired relatively later as interaction with out-group members increases, thereby the polite form is likely to be a more disciplined, socially aware style of behavior.

2.2.3. Prior Research on Multimodal Polite Expressions in Korean and Japanese

Section 2.1.3.3 introduced recent studies on multimodal elements of politeness in general. This section particularly covers research on Korean and Japanese which form the basis of the studies in Chapter V and VI. First, in terms of Japanese, some studies such as Kita & Ide (2007) and Dunn (2011, 2013) have found that politeness is co-constructed with polite linguistic forms and non-verbal behaviors. For instance, Dunn (2011, 2013) investigated Japanese business etiquette training to figure out how both honorifics and other forms of linguistic politeness are taught. Interestingly, many instructors in the training seminars emphasized that use of honorifics alone is insufficient and other components of communication such as speaking clearly, smiling, and showing a positive attitude are important as well. For example, when the instructor explained how to speak ‘beautifully’ in order to convey the appropriate demeanor as a representative of one’s company, they advised to pay attention to posture, gesture, placement of hands and feet, and the movements used in extending one’s business card. In addition to nonverbal behavior in business context, Kita and Ide (2007) reported that Japanese more frequently

use nodding, *aizuchi* (or backchannels), and final particles than members of other communities in general. Especially, Kita and Ide (2007) concluded that these verbal and nonverbal means to demonstrate politeness are all reciprocally constructed because of the ideology prevalent in Japan to put an emphasis on one's consideration (*omoiyari*) and cooperation with the interactant. Besides kinetic cues of politeness, there are also a few studies investigating the prosodic attribute of politeness in Japanese. As an empirical example, Ofuka et al. (2000) conducted both production and perception tests to tease out what prosodic features the Japanese are likely to rely on to distinguish the formality or informality of conversation. Those tests revealed that the native speakers of Japanese manipulate their F0 movement in the final part of utterances and speech rate to deliver their polite voice – the final pitch rise and slower speech rate are correlated with polite utterances. Sherr-Ziarko (2018) further analyzed interviews in Japanese reflecting the study of Ofuka et al. (2000) by examining F0, intensity, pause frequency and articulation. However, Sherr-Ziarko found a contrasting result to the finding of the study of Ofuka et al. (2000) that higher pitch is significantly preferred in informal speech. He also identified that increased intensity, increased articulation rate, and decreased pause rate are prosodic attributes of informal speech. Even though these studies show inconsistency in their findings, they call for a need for further phonetical research on politeness in order for a better understanding of multimodal nature of politeness.

As for Korean, Winter and Grawunder (2012) investigate the phonetic properties of formal and informal speech registers in Korean by examining F0, intensity, voice quality and speaking rate. The researchers found that when speaking in formal speech register, Korean male and female speakers generally lowered their average pitch, and a decrease in the variation of range in fundamental frequency and intensity was also found. Furthermore, formality occasioned the breathiness-related changes, slower speech rate and frequent non-lexical fillers. The findings suggest that a variety of different means of vocal expression play an important role in signaling formality in Korean. While Winter and Grawunder (2012) conducted a production research, Brown et al. (2014) conducted a perception test to confirm whether Korean and American listeners can distinguish the intended honorific level of Korean utterances from phonetic information alone without

morphological and lexical markings. They found that American and Korean listeners both performed above chance although the performances of English listeners were generally worse than Koreans. The results indicate that even though phonetic cues are considered as secondary, there may be specific contexts in which their role supersedes that of morphological and lexical forms.

In addition to these studies on prosodic attributes of politeness, Brown and Winter (2019) extracted clips from three Korean television drams in order to compare the different nonverbal behaviors used when "doing deference" and "performing intimacy". They analyzed asymmetrical and symmetrical interactions between status inferiors and status superiors, that is, position, body orientation, facial and head gestures, manual gestures, self-touching, haptics, and prerogative. The results show that status inferiors index deference through the adoption of non-threatening, non-confident and submissive postures, whereas status superiors engage in "power posing" (Carney, Hall, and LeBeau, 2005) or more open and bigger postures. Performing intimacy was characterized by aminatedness, casualness, and frequent reciprocated movements and there was overall more symmetry of nonverbal behaviors in intimate situations. In sum, the findings of studies on multimodal politeness in Japanese and Korean imply the importance of considering multiple aspects of (im)politeness.

2.2.4. Indexicality

When the concept of indexicality is applied to language, it refers to "the capacity of linguistic signs to 'invoke' some other object, while not explicitly describing or referring to it" (Pizziconi and Christie, 2017). In other words, indexicality is the tacit pragmatic meaning created by certain pragmatic forms or expressions. Although honorifics are grammatical encodings of the pragmatic value of deference in Korean and Japanese, when they are used in particular social contexts, they can index various situational meanings since the interpretation of meaning is mediated in the given situational context (Cook, 1998). Ochs (1988, 1990, 1996) proposes two types of indexes in order to "capture the fluidity and multiplicity of indexical meanings" (Cook, 2013:

180): (1) direct index, act or stances expressed through linguistic forms; and (2) indirect index, situational meanings further expressed by those forms. Ochs claims that sociocultural variables such as gender, social status and roles, and speech acts are not directly indexed by linguistic forms, but indirectly indexed in given communicative contexts. Therefore, the multiple indexicalities of specific pragmatic forms may indicate that it is absolutely necessary to separate forms from meanings in the research of politeness, and a need to consider direct and indirect indexicalities determined by context also arises. As a study regarding honorifics and indexical meaning in Korean found, Brown (2015b) investigated shifts in two honorific styles, how shifts between polite form *–yo* and deferential form *–supnita* found in a Korean talk show indicated how direct and indirect indexicalities appear. His analysis revealed that the difference between *–yo* and *–supnita* is that the latter directly indexes presentational qualities, whereas the former does not. The direct indexical meaning of *–yo* is rather associated with "social distance stance". Thus, when used in juxtaposition with *–supnita* in public speech, the comparative informality of *–yo* leads to an association with a relatively casual and affective way of talking, but one which is still deferential enough in contexts such as a daytime talk show. This study illustrates the way in which a direct indexicality leads to an indirect indexicality within a specific context.

In terms of research on social indexicality of honorifics in Japanese, Fukada and Asato (2004), who rejected the theory of discernment by Ide (1989), reported that it is easily observed that Japanese native speakers who are socially superior employ honorific expressions in interaction with a person in a lower status. In these cases, Fukada and Asato postulated that the formality of the situation creates a temporary distance between interlocutors which triggers the use of honorifics. Therefore, this research implies that the meaning and function of polite expressions are situated and context-dependent, rather than predetermined by the social norms. Other researchers who were influenced by discursive and postmodern approaches, on the other hand, aimed to develop a more contingent type of theories which may account for contextualized expressions of (im)politeness (see Mills, 2011) through examining naturally occurring conversations. For instance, Cook (1998) analyzed different communicative contexts, a TV interview

program and a neighborhood quarrel taken place in Japan. She noticed that the interviewer of the show sometimes shifts to the plain form in summary and/or assessment turns, often in the form of an echo response. Also, she pointed out that in the neighborhood quarrel, a landlord continues to use the plain form, while a tenant shifts his speech from the plain form to the polite form when he recognizes his interactant as his landlord. Cook (1998) interpreted these dynamic shifting styles that the mixed use of the polite and plain forms in the same discourse does not automatically index a status difference, and that any situational meaning is an outcome of multiple co-occurring contextual features. To summarize, the indexicality of honorific and non-honorifics in Japanese and Korean is not always bound to a relative power difference or demonstration of (im)politeness, but it is rather determined by the situational and contextual stance of the speaker.

CHAPTER III

GENERAL METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

Chapter II illustrates the overall flow of research on politeness in terms of theoretical and methodological approaches and provides information on politeness in Korean and Japanese. In this chapter, how those prior studies are reflected in this dissertation is laid out. The original studies of this volume that Chapter IV, V and VI deal with primarily are aligned with the methodological and analytical approach of the third-wave in a few ways. First, I attempt to carry out quantitative analysis in order to explain how politeness-related behaviors are influenced by not just contextual factors but also social norms of a community. Second, in contrast to the preceding studies that focus on verbal politeness strategies, particularly use of specific morphosyntactic forms, lexicons and grammatical constructions, this volume investigates a different level of polite speech which is quantity of lexical information including multiples parts of speech. In addition, I attempt to look at multimodality of politeness by applying and developing the methods that were used in previous studies to examining naturally occurring interactions. Therefore, Chapter III describes research design including the methodology of data collection and analysis. In Section 2, details about procedures to collect data produced by native speakers of Korean and Japanese are separately explained. However, this chapter only reports the processes for collecting one set of data for each language because the following three studies share the same dataset. Section 3 introduces objects of analysis and how to analyze data for each study in detail.

3.2. Data Collection

3.2.1. Korean Data

The Korean data of the present research was designed and collected by a collaborative research team comprised of a number of linguistic experts involving socio-pragmatists and phoneticians. The data was originally gathered in order to examine multi-modalities of politeness such as verbal aspects (i.e., morphology and syntax) and nonverbal aspects (i.e., phonetics and body movements). The process of collecting the Korean data was carried out in a university located in Seoul, Korea.

First of all, in terms of the design to videotape interactions of the subjects, the research team chose a sound booth that was comparted for phonetic experiments in order to meet the research requirement for phonetic analysis. The dimensions of sound booth were 148 cm wide x 198 cm long x 188 cm high. The participants were sitting down on a stool with no armrest directly facing his or her partner. The chairs were fixed to the ground and could not be moved. The distance between the front edges of both chairs was 84 cm, and distance between the middle points of both chairs was 118 cm. This chair arrangement was set to keep one's personal space based on previous cross-cultural studies. For example, Beaulieu (2004) measured the two closest chair legs of participant's and the interviewer's chair and found that average personal distance for Asians (Chinese, Japanese and Thai participants) is 70 cm in the setting of semi-structured interview. All the conversations of participants were simultaneously videotaped and audio-taped. The angle of the camera captured the profiles of the participants from the upper body to above the shins.

As for the subjects, seven male and seven female Korean college students participated as the main participants in the experiment. The average age of the participants was 22.15, and all of them reported that they are from Seoul or the metropolitan area of Seoul (Gyeonggi Province) where the standard Korean is generally spoken. Three of the subjects have experience living in English-speaking countries for time periods ranging from 8 months to 2.67 years. Regarding the sub-participants, a male professor in his 60s played the role of the status-superior participated. He is from North Gyeongsang Province and self-reported as a speaker of Gyeongsang dialect. Moreover, he was working as a university professor at the time of data collection. He had lived in the United States for 6 years in total and his English fluency is at the advanced level. Five

male and nine female college students participated in the study as sub-participants to play the role of status-equal. These sub-participants were all in their 20s at the time of the experiment. The gender of the sub-participants was in general same as the main participants except for two male main participants who participated with female friends. They were recruited by the main participants asked to bring their close friend in order to control for the degree of social distance.

The processes of data collection were comprised of two distinct sessions in order to identify the influence of relative power of the interactant (P) and social distance (D): one session with a professor (+P, +D) and the other session was with a friend (=P, -D). Half of the subjects were first paired up with the professor and the other half of them were paired up with their friend to avoid any possible order effects. Each recording session constituted four different tasks to test contextual influence.

First, the subjects were instructed to have a casual conversation about movies that they watched recently, although they briefly had time to introduce each other in the beginning of the dyadic conversation. This movie task was the most casual conversation among the four tasks, and aimed to help the participant get familiar with the experimental environment.

The second task, which is the narrative task, was to describe the plot of an animated cartoon which is the “Canary Row” of “Tweety and Sylvester” cartoon by Warner Bros. This animation was selected since it has been often employed in research on co-speech gesture (e.g., Alibali and Don, 2001; Kita, 2000; Kita and Özyürek, 2003; McNeil, 2005; McNeill & Duncan, 2000). The story for the narrative task was about a cat Sylvester trying to catch a tiny yellow bird, which is Tweety, but always ending up with a failure. All the subjects watched the cartoon in advance of the recording session, and explained all the events they watched. The sub-participants were allowed to ask questions for better understanding of the story.

The third task was the Map Task which replicates the methodology used in the research of Brown et al. (1983). The maps provided by HCRC Map Task Corpus[1] were used for the data collection. This Map Task has been used for various linguistic fields, e.g., disfluency coding (Lickley and Bard, 1998), gaze coding (Boyle et al., 1994), turn taking (Forsyth et al., 2008). In terms of the task, the main participants and the sub-participants were given maps in which the starting point is shared but some of the other locations are not shared with each other. The participants took turns to depict the route from the start point to the destination on the map. However, it is important to note that the third task was excluded from all analyses because the subjects' hands were occupied with a pen and a clipboard where maps were fixed on, and the condition was thus not ideal for participants to produce gesture.

The last task was a role play of an apology situation with a professor and a friend. The methodology of the role play task used in Brown's (2011) study which consists of the "professor role-play" and the "friend role-play" was adopted. Although Brown's study was designed for L2 learners of Korean, it can be applied for the native speakers of Korean since the research aimed to examine the use of Korean honorifics and non-honorifics. Regarding the task, the main participants played the role of a student and the professor played the role of a professor in the professor role-play, whereas both the main and sub-participants acted out as a close friend of each other in the friend role-play. It should be noted that the information of each role including identity and the relationship between interlocutors in terms of social distance or solidarity was not provided by the researcher, thereby the participants had to assume those social factors on their own. As for the context, the pre-set situation varied depending on the interactant: (1) the participants had to apologize for being late for their meeting and losing the professor's book which was not available anymore in the professor role-play; and (2) they also had to apologize to their friend for being late and breaking the friend's camera in the friend role-play. Therefore, the purpose of the role plays was to make a face-threatening context.

[1] See http://groups.inf.ed.ac.uk/maptask/

After finishing the four tasks in the first session with the professor, the subjects worked on the identical tasks with their friend and vice versa.

All the conversations were simultaneously videotaped and audio-taped. The participants sat on a stool with no armrests and talked directly facing toward each other during the recording phase. The angle of the camera captured the profiles of the participants from the upper body to above the shins. Then, all the interactions were transcribed and nonverbal expressions were also coded with ELAN.

3.2.2. Japanese Data

The present study replicates the methodology utilized for the Korean data in order to collect Japanese as well, except the use of two Japanese professors who are male and female instead of a single male professor as in the Korean data. The process of collecting Japanese data took place at a university located in the Northwestern region of the United States. Three female and four male Japanese students participated as main subjects. All the main participants were from Japan and studying at an American university as a one-year exchange student at the time of experiment. Their average age was 21, and they were all born and grew up in Tokyo and/or the metropolitan area of Tokyo except two participants who are from Hokkaido and Fukuoka. Nevertheless, they reported that they use the standard Japanese in their daily interactions, and none of the participants had lived abroad more than half year.

As requested from the Korean students, the Japanese students were also asked to bring their close friend to the session with the status-equal. The sex of the sub-participants was identical to the main participants, although one male participant showed up with a female partner. The sub-participants, four females and three males, recruited by the main participants were also in their early 20s when the research was carried out. In terms of the participants who played the role of the status-superior, one male Japanese professor and one female Japanese professor participated as aforementioned. The female professor was in the mid-50s at the point of the date collection. She was born and grew up in Tokyo, and self-reported that she speaks in the standard Japanese or Tokyo dialect.

However, she had lived in English-spoken countries including Australia and the United States for more than 24 years. On the other hand, the male professor in his early 40 was born and grew up in Fukuoka, but attended college and has worked in Tokyo more than 20 years, thereby he is considerably familiar with using the Tokyo dialect. In addition, he also spent one and a half years in the United States at the ages of 6 and 7, and was working as a professor of American literature at a university located in Tokyo at the time of the data collection. Therefore, both the professors were fluent L2 speakers of English.

The recording sessions were conducted in a linguistic laboratory which was not blocked by the walls normally found in a booth since it was mainly designed for gesture research. The subjects were sitting down in a chair with a backrest but no armrest directly facing his or her partner. The distance between the front edges of both chairs was 84 cm which is same in the Korean data. The participants were also instructed not to move their chair prior to the recording. All the interactions of subjects were videotaped and audiotaped, and the camera was shooting the profile of participants. The participants completed the identical tasks employed in the Korean data. A half of participants first interacted with a superior and the other half first interacted with a friend in order counterbalance the order effects.

In regards to the limitation of the Japanese data, it must be acknowledged that using two professors with different genders might lead to different behavioral patterns of the Japanese subjects. However, even if the research manipulated the gender of the status-superior, still it is almost impossible to determine whether the gender difference in the socially superiors solely affects the interactions – whether the behavior of the subjects is influenced by personal attitude and personality of both the status superiors and the status inferiors, or whether the result is the mixture of prementioned factors. Actually, there has been a number of politeness research in which gender had no effect. For instance, Winter and Grawunder (2012) manipulated the conditions of interlocutors involving age, occupation, social distance, and social power, but not gender in order to examine the phonetic properties of formal and informal speech registers in Korean. They revealed that both Korean male and female speakers adopt identical strategies to encode formality, e.g., lowering their pitch and intensity.

Moreover, Tamaoka et al. (2010) investigated whether two gender-related factors, ‘gender-identity’ (whether the speaker is male or female) and ‘gender-congruence’ (whether or not the gender of speaker and listener is the same), act differently in determining levels of politeness in Japanese and Korean. They utilized a decision tree analysis which describes the hierarchies of factors to predict politeness levels specific to young Japanese and Koreans. As for Japanese, social distance or the extent of solidarity was the strongest followed by power and gender-identity/gender-congruence. As for Koreans, power was the strongest factor followed by distance and gender-relevant factors. Thus, in the context of politeness studies, the fact that the importance of social power and distance overrides a gender effect has been supported by a large volume of studies.

3.3. Analysis

The idea of research on lexical density in deferential context originates from prior studies of Winter and Grawunder (2011: 7) in which the researchers found that speech in the polite style is characterized with higher lexical density than non-polite speech. Lexical density is generally used to measure the lexical richness of texts. It is known that texts with a lower density are more intelligible (Ure, 1971; Halliday, 1985), but high lexical density is not straightforwardly connected to high lexical diversity containing many different types of word as Johansson (2008) points out. Chapter IV, therefore, aims to figure out how politeness can be reflected in manipulating lexical density and what results if speakers differentiate lexical density in deferential and non-referential speech. However, this study does not simply calculate the lexical density which is gained by dividing the total number of content words by the total number of morphemes and multiplying the number by 100. That is because lexical density does not give a thorough account for the reason why speakers control the intelligibility of speech by lexical density. In addition, the definition of ‘word’ is unclear in Winter and Grawunder (2011) as to whether it refers to content words or syllables, and whether it involves function

words such as case markers, sentence endings markers, auxiliary verbs, suffixes, prefixes and the like.

Consequently, it is necessary to look at all possible items of speech in order to shed light on the relation between lexical density and politeness. First, whether the general amount of lexical information is correlated with politeness is tested by examining the total number of utterances and morphemes in addition to lexical density due to the possibility that verbosity affects the lexical density. Moreover, Chapter IV confirms the quality of polite speech such as lexical richness and lexical diversity by examining the frequency of different word types. Nonetheless, specific word types that are particularly related to politeness and attribute to lower lexical density were selectively investigated. As for word types related to politeness, honorific lexemes including subject and object honorific elements and honorific sentence-ending markers were chosen. Furthermore, the word types which are either frequently or infrequently uttered in spoken texts such as formal case-marking particles, mimetic words, Chinese-origin words, fillers and backchannels. Regarding the word types influencing lower lexical density, the number of particle ellipsis and pronouns were selected. The frequency of those word types was converted to the figures with the same formula to calculate lexical density in order to identify the density of each word type.

In addition, Chapter IV also attempts to make a cross-cultural comparison which has not been carried out in preceding studies. The reason why Japanese was chosen for the object of comparison is because Korean is not the only language which is well known for its highly developed system of honorification at both lexical and morphosyntactic levels. Speakers of both Korean and Japanese have to select an appropriate speech style between the honorific style and the non-honorific style for every single utterance (cf. Sohn, 1999; Tokunaga, 1992). This language-specific feature in both languages particularly facilitates analyzing distinct language uses in deferential and non-deferential contexts. The cross-cultural comparison will provide a deeper insight into what culture-specific factor possibly influences the language usage in a quantitative manner. To sum up, Chapter IV provides an explanation of how the quantity and quality of lexical information differs in Korean and Japanese deferential situations.

Brown and Winter (2019) reported an in-depth profile of nonverbal expressions of deference and intimacy in Korean. However, physical circumstances were not consistent since the sources of data were Korean television dramas in which the researchers hold no control for interactional settings. Although such physical circumstances, of course, are objects which speakers can manage to express politeness, it is uncertain whether one can observe the same behavioral patterns of deference and intimacy when the interactional setting is consistent. Moreover, a question about authenticity of the data might be casted. Therefore, Chapter V analyzed natural interactions where the physical distance between two interlocutors and the degree of power held by the interlocutors are controlled. Following the methodology of Brown and Winter's (2019) work, the frequency of manual gestures, nodding, head-shaking, erect body posture, avoidance of eye contact with the interlocutor, self-touch and physical contact with the interlocutor were analyzed. The frequency of those nonverbal behaviors represents the frequency per second rather than the raw frequency throughout the entire interaction. Following Chapter IV, a cross-cultural comparison was further drawn in order to confirm whether there is any similarity or dissimilarity between Korean and Japanese even in nonverbal communication of deference.

Prior studies dealing with nonverbal expressions of interpersonal relations have reported that power is associated with a large gesture space (e.g., Brown and Prieto, 2017; Brown and Winter, 2019; Hall et al., 2005). However, their analysis was limited to qualitative descriptions, rather than reporting based on quantitative evidence. Additionally, it was not specified whether such large-size gestures take every dimension of space such as vertical, lateral and front-back dimensions. Therefore, I attempted to define what large gestural space is and examine how consistent use of big gestural space is across multiple space dimensions in Chapter VI. In addition, the frequency of using both hands which inevitably takes larger gesture space was also investigated. The frequency of using big gestural space and both hands in deferential situations was compared to that in non-deferential situations in order to provide quantitative evidence to reinforce previous findings. All the quantitative analysis that is reported in Chapter IV, V and VI was statistically tested to ensure the validity of effect.

3.4. Conclusion

Chapter III demonstrates how I designed the methodology for this volume by referring to a number of prior studies in general. More specifically, I provided details describing the way in which data was collected and analyzed while including the rationale of each separate study justifying the appropriateness of the methodology. Throughout Chapter I to III, it is clarified that the main purpose of the dissertation is to take a look at the diverse dimensions of polite behaviors from lexical density to bodily expressions in order for expanding the scope of research on politeness. This attempt is expected to illustrate that politeness is a sophisticated phenomenon. In addition, the quantitative analysis was particularly carried out following the third-wave approach which views verbal and nonverbal behaviors to show speakers' politeness as social practices. The following three chapters offer more detailed information of methodology and analysis with further explanations of theoretical background.

CHAPTER IV

LEXICAL INFORMATION AND POLITENESS

4.1. Introduction

Early research dealing with politeness (e.g., Geertz, 1960: 173; Martin, 1964) has pointed out that the speaker uses more marked styles which is characterized longer and more elaborate structures of language in order to express his or her deference as stated in Brown and Levinson (1987: 278), and this argument has been supported by ensuing empirical studies. For example, Winter and Grawunder's (2011) compared prosodic elements between the formal and informal speech registers in Korean, and they revealed that Korean speakers produce more words in the same length of time when speaking in the formal speech style compared to the informal counterpart by analyzing speech rate. However, these preceding studies have not been connected to further works examining what kind of lexical component actually contributes to the verbose attribute of polite sentences in depth and in detail. In addition, any cross-cultural comparison has not been made to date.

This chapter, therefore, specifically investigates speech production tasks with two different interpersonal conditions — deferential vs. non-deferential situations. In each condition, 14 native speakers of Korean and 7 native speakers of Japanese interacted with either the socially superior or the socially equal. In the analysis, the current chapter especially focuses on largely two levels of lexical differences between two interpersonal conditions: first, I analyze the general lexical density. Second, I analyze the frequency of different types of lexemes including honorific lexemes, Chinese-origin words, mimetics, case-marking particles, pronouns and referential terms, fillers, and backchannels used in binary interactive conditions. Prior studies on the morphosyntactic aspect of polite speech register tended to concentrate on the qualitative correlation between the use or nonuse of honorifics and the given context to interpret the intended social meaning. This study,

however, seeks to provide evidence showing that politeness is also expressed in quantitative means.

Examining the lexical density in deferential and non-deferential contexts is important for several reasons. First, it can provide a new analytical approach beyond the current trend focusing heavily on the qualitative features of verbal politeness. Previous politeness-related research employing a quantitative analytical method has been limited to investigating perceived degree of politeness (e.g., Hill et al., 1986; Morand, 2000), preference of verbal polite strategies (e.g., Byon, 2006), the number of descriptive words to evaluate of a politeness-related event (e.g., Haugh, 2010; Okano & Brown, 2018). If it turns out that speakers systemically modulate the quantity of the entire lexical elements, researchers of politeness can further develop their studies to shed light on what makes a particular sentence perceived as politer than others, what leads speakers to use specific verbal strategies and the like by making a connection with the lexical-level analysis.

In addition, study of lexical density has an educational implication for the field of second language (L2) acquisition. In general, in language classes of Korean and Japanese, the polite form is taught as the only channel to communicate the speaker's deference, as Cook (2008: 185-186) points out that dialogues in textbooks are lacking in authentic features of naturally occurring conversations. Finding out the elaborate ways in which native speakers of Korean and Japanese manipulate general lexical density and the use of different types of lexicons may be found helpful for L2 learners to enhance their understanding of politeness in the target language and speak in more native-like ways.

4.2. Methodology

The detailed information of data including participants and procedures of data collection is covered in Chapter III. Therefore, Section 4.2. largely focus on introducing the analysis and hypothesis of this study. Section 4.2.1. provides descriptions of what and how linguistic items were analyzed. Section 4.2.2. describes expected results of analysis based on preceding research. In particular, a hypothesis for each lexical item was separately made.

4.2.1. Analysis

This study largely examines three different categories of lexical information as Table 1 illustrates — quantity of honorifics, quantity of general lexical information, and quantity of other lexical items. To begin with, the category of quantity of honorifics includes honorific lexemes and honorific sentence-endings. This categorization was purposefully chosen since honorific sentence-endings are relevant to hearer honorifics, and honorific morphosyntactic markers and vocabulary are associated to referent honorifics. These items are first analyzed in order to test the prevalent association between honorifics and politeness in both Korean and Japanese by quantitative means.

Table 1. Categories of analysis

Quantity of Honorifics	• Honorific lexemes • Honorific sentence-endings
Quantity of general lexical information	• Utterances • Morphemes • Content words
Quantity of other lexical items	• Particles • Mimetics • Chinese-origin words • Pronouns • Fillers • Backchannels

In regard to honorific lexemes, occurrences of honorific lexemes including honorific lexicons per se (i.e., honorific nouns, adjectives, adverbs, and verbs), honorific particles, honorific prefix and suffix used in two interactive types were compared. In particular, the honorific lexemes that were analyzed in this study are all second-person honorifics which corresponds to addressee honorifics. Meanwhile, the honorific sentence-endings or speech styles were separately counted due to their impact on the modality of the entire utterance. As for Korean honorific sentence-ending, deferential style *-pnita* and

polite style *-yo* (cf. Brown, 2008; Yeon and Brown, 2013) were involved in the analysis[2]. On the other hand, the polite (or distal) style *desu/masu* (cf. Brown, 2010; Dunn, 1999; Martin, 1964) was exclusively analyzed. In order to gain the average quantity of honorific items, the total occurrences of honorific lexemes and honorific sentence-endings in each interactive condition were divided by the total number of morphemes, and then converted to percentage to facilitate statistical analysis.

In addition, the general lexical information to which the interlocutor can access was analyzed by looking at the average number of utterances[3] and morphemes[4] and the proportion of content words[5]. The raw number of utterances and morphemes produced by participants were used to obtain the mean value. On the other hand, the proportion of content words to the total number of morphemes which corresponds to lexical density (cf. Johansson, 2009) was obtained through dividing the total number of content words by the total number of morphemes. Then, the values were converted to percentage to facilitate statistical analyses. Johansson (2009: 65) argues that "a text with a high proportion of content words contains more information than a text with a high proportion of function words". Thus, we can compare the amount of information in each interactive type by investigating lexical density.

[2] An honorific verbal suffix -si- is not included in the category of honorific sentence-endings, since -si- can be used not only with various sentence-ending particles, but also with conjunctive particles such as -ko, -mye. Thus, it is categorized as an honorific lexeme.

[3] As for the definition of an utterance, the current study followed the one which is defined by Crookes and Rulon (1985: 9) with a few modifications. In this study, each utterance is distinguished from another if there was a change in intonation contour regardless of whether it is expected to be the sentence boundary or not. However, if there was a noticeable pause between two phrases or words even though there exists no distinctive intonation change, they were divided into two individual utterances. Finally, although there is neither shift in intonation nor pause, if the semantic relation in one utterance is inappropriate, the phrase was split to chunks based on the semantic relations.

[4] The concept of morphemes in this study includes content words and function words in a broad sense. In terms of shortened forms in both Korean and Japanese, the original forms were used for analysis. In addition, the inflectional part and the stem of predicates and adverbials were separately counted. Lastly, a compound verb was counted as one word.

[5] Nouns, main verbs, adverbs and adjectives were categorized as content words following the definitions in Hartmann and Stork (1972) and Quirk et al. (1985).

Moreover, other lexical items involving particles, mimetics, Chinese-origin words, pronouns, fillers and backchannels were further analyzed because they are used to express (in)formality in either implicit or explicit ways. First, with respect to case-marking particles, occurrences of formal and informal versions of Korean dative particles[6] (*eykey/kkey* vs. *hantey*), Korean comitative particles[7] (*wa/kwa* vs. *lang/hako*), and Japanese quotative particles[8] (*to* vs. *tte*) appeared in respectively deferential and intimate situations were compared. In addition to (in)formal case-marking particles, this study also made a comparison between the average frequencies of particle ellipsis in two interactive types due to the correlation between particle ellipsis and informality.

Second, the occurrences of mimetic words and onomatopoeia were counted as they are less likely to be used in a formal context[9]. In a similar vein, how differently the Sino-Korean and Sino-Japanese words were employed in formal and informal conditions is also examined since Chinese-origin words in both Korean and Japanese tend to appear in literary language, academic vocabulary and formal speech (cf. Sohn (1999) for Korean, and Kageyama and Kishimoto (2016) for Japanese). Furthermore, the average occurrence of pronouns in each interaction type was compared since using function words like pronouns influences the general lexical density. On the other hand, the average proportion of fillers to the total number of utterances in deferential and intimate

[6] Yeon and Brown (2013: 109) note that *kkey* is the honorific counterpart of a dative particle *eykey*, while they view *hantey* as a colloquial version. *Eykey* is the most general form, but it is often found in formal texts.

[7] The comitative particle *kwa/wa* is the most generally used compared to *hako* and *lang/ilang*, though it is normally seen in formal texts such as formal writing or structured speech (Yeon and Brown, 20013: 118). On the other hand, Yeon and Brown (2013: 118) defines *hako* as "the most commonly used form in everyday speech". Lastly, *lang/ilang*, which is generally found in spoken context like *hako*, is likely to have more casual and colloquial connotation than *hako* and cannot be used in formal or polite speech (Yeon and Brown, 2013: 119).

[8] The quotative particle *to* can appear regardless of the formality of the circumstance, although it is more likely to be found in formal texts. In everyday context, *tte*, which is the colloquial version of to (Makino and Tsutsui, 1996), is more preferred than *to*.

[9] In both Korea and Japan, children learn new words from mimetics in early childhood (see Kim et al., 2014 for Korean; Yoshida, 2012 for Japanese), although the emphasis on using mimetics decreases at higher education (Jo, 2005). Therefore, use of mimetics is avoided in formal context because of the connection between baby talk and mimetics in spite of its advantage to communicate sensual information in vivid and simple ways.

situations were investigated since production of fillers are more frequently observed in a formal situation (cf. Winter and Grawunder, 2012). Lastly, the frequency of backchannels was analyzed because of the relation between backchannels and affiliative and collaborative stance (cf. Kita and Ide, 2007).

In terms of statistical analysis, dependent observation *t*-tests were conducted in SPSS in order to make a comparison between the mean frequencies of a particular lexical item in formal and informal conditions. The independent variable of the present study was the interactive type — an interaction with the status-superior and an interaction with the status-equal. The dependent variable was the average proportion of a particular lexical item to the total number of morphemes (or utterances for particle ellipsis, fillers, and backchannels) which is converted to percentage. However, the average value of raw frequency was used to examine the quantity of utterances and morphemes. In addition, 2 (interaction type) x 3 (task) repeated measure ANOVA tests with repeated measures on interaction type and task were conducted in order to compare effect of task types on the quantity of a particular linguistic feature in deferential and non-deferential conditions. Given the Task by Interaction type interaction, post hoc tests using paired sample *t*-tests comparing percent honorific morphology across three tasks were run. This study used Bonferroni's correction for multiple tests ($\alpha = 0.017$).

4.2.2. Hypothesis

According to the Cooperative Principles of Grice (1975) and the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson (1987), a pragmatic meaning, politeness in the present study, arises when a communicative maxim is violated. Most especially, the Quantity Maxim which is the expectation that the speaker will provide the appropriate amount of information would be the most relevant to this study among the four distinct communicative maxims. This indicates that we can expect to observe a difference in the amount of information which the interactant can access depending on the level of politeness in a given context. As supportive findings to make a hypothesis whether the quantity of information increases or decreases in the deferential situation, Winter and

Grawunder (2011) found that Korean native speakers produce more words and fillers when speaking the polite speech style. This finding is aligned with Brown and Levinson's (1987: 278) argument that honorifics are comprised of longer and more sophisticated alternatives of the non-marked forms.

On the other hand, previous studies have reported that frequent backchannels correlate with politeness due to their function of showing attentiveness and yielding a speech turn (e.g., Maynard, 1997; White, 1989). If these theoretical and empirical works are put together, three hypotheses can be formulated. First, participants will use more honorific morphosyntactic markers and lexemes in deferential situations than non-deferential situations. Second, the quantity of general lexical density will increase in interaction with a status superior. Third, a rise in lexical items that tend to be employed in formal context such as formal case-marking particles, Chinese-origin words, fillers and backchannels will be observed in deferential interactions, whereas use of other lexical items which represent casualness or non-formal modality will conversely decrease in the same type of interactions.

4.3. Results

This section demonstrates the results of statistical analysis which show the distinct ways in which lexical information is manipulated respectively in deferential and intimate situations. Prior to drawing a comparison between the Korean data and Japanese data, the general findings in each language which aggregate the mean values from all the three tasks are separately reported in order to account for the impact of the power that the interactant holds. Then, effects of task types and gender of the participants are explained respectively.

4.3.1. Korean

4.3.1.1. General Results

The following Table 2 reports the results of dependent observation *t*-tests, and it illustrates whether the relative social power of the interlocutor quantitatively influenced the production of each lexical item in the Korean context. The first column of the table presents the different levels of linguistic units and lexical items that this study analyzed. The second column presents whether the use of a particular lexical item increases or not in a deferential situation. 'Positive' direction means that participants uttered more words in the deferential interaction than the non-deferential interaction, and 'Negative' direction means that less words were used in a deferential condition. The third column presents whether the difference between the mean value in deferential and non-deferential situations was significant or not. In the case where the *p*-value is below .050, the average quantity of the corresponding lexical item in deferential situations was significantly different from non-deferential situations.

Table 2. Effect of each lexical category in Korean

Quantity of honorifics	**Direction**	***p*-value**
Honorific lexemes	Positive	$p < 0.001$
Honorific sentence-endings	Positive	$p < 0.001$
Quantity of general lexical information		
Utterances	Negative	$p = 0.029$
Morphemes	Negative	$p = 0.026$
Content words	Positive	$p = 0.223$
Quantity of other lexical items		
Formal dative particles	Positive	$p = 0.004$
Formal comitative particles	Positive	$p = 0.057$
Particle ellipsis	Negative	$p < 0.001$
Mimetics	Negative	$p = 0.001$
Sino-Korean words	Positive	$p < 0.001$
Pronouns	Negative	$p < 0.001$
Fillers	Positive	$p = 0.002$
Backchannels	Positive	$p = 0.040$

Note. $n = 14$, significance level = 0.05

In general, Korean participants produced more words when the interlocutor holds more power than them. In detail, use of both honorific lexemes and honorific sentence-endings increased at the statistically significant level in deferential situations as expected by the hypothesis. However, the general lexical information turned out to be more complicated than the quantity of honorifics. The number of utterances and morphemes decreased with a statistical significance, whereas the number of content words or lexical density increased in spite of its lack of the statistical effect. In terms of other lexical items, first, an increase in the use of formal lexical items including formal dative particles, formal comitative particles, Sino-Korean words, fillers and backchannels was found as was hypothesized. On the other hand, decrease in non-formal lexical items such as particle ellipsis, mimetics and pronouns were observed as also predicted. The descriptive statistics including means value and standard deviations in deferential and non-deferential situations is reported in Table 1, 2 and 3 in Appendix.

4.3.1.2. Effect of Task

Table 3 reports effect of tasks type on usage of each linguistic category in deferential and non-deferential situations by Korean participants. The item which features *p*-value below .017 in the table has statistically significant effect of task. In other words, speakers' use of the linguistic item across the three types of tasks is significantly different. According to the results of ANOVA as in Table 3, Korean speakers distinctively manipulated production of honorific sentence-endings, content words, particle ellipsis and pronouns across the three tasks in order to express their deference.

Following table 4 reports what lexical items were quantitatively manipulated by Korean participants in three different types of task — a task to talk about movies, a task to narrate a story of cartoon, and a task of role play. The checked lexical items in the second, third, and fourth columns demonstrate whether there was any significant difference in the amount of lexical item between deferential and intimate situations in each task. The lexical items that turned out to be statistically insignificant by *t*-tests are left blank.

Table 3. Effect of task types in Korean

Quantity of honorifics	***p*-value**
Honorific lexemes	$p = 0.026$
Honorific sentence-endings	$p = 0.007$
Quantity of general lexical information	
Utterances	$p = 0.463$
Morphemes	$p = 0.588$
Content words	$p = 0.003$
Quantity of other lexical items	
Formal dative particles	$p = 0.023$
Formal comitative particles	$p = 0.586$
Particle ellipsis	$p = 0.009$
Mimetics	$p = 0.617$
Sino-Korean words	$p = 0.024$
Pronouns	$p = 0.002$
Fillers	$p = 0.501$
Backchannels	$p = 0.011$

Table 4 indicates that Korean participants variously modulate the quantity of lexical information the least when trying to communicate their deference in performing the movie task ($n = 6$) compared to the narration task ($n = 11$) and the role play task ($n = 9$). Regarding the quantity of honorifics, use of both honorific lexemes and honorific sentence-endings significantly increased in all tasks. However, change in the quantity of general lexical information is specifically significant only in the task of narration, although the quantity of content words also significantly increased in the role play. With respect to other lexical items, the number of words associated with formality such as formal dative particles, Sino-Korean words, fillers and backchannels was found significant at least in one task. Use of informality-related words such as particle ellipsis and pronouns significantly decreased across all the tasks, while the number of mimetics significantly changed in the narration task.

Table 4. Significant difference in quantity of lexical information in each task (Korean)

Quantity of honorifics	Movie	Narration	Role Play
Honorific lexemes	○	○	○
Honorific sentence-endings	○	○	○
Quantity of general lexical information			
Utterances		○	
Morphemes		○	
Content words		○	○
Quantity of other lexical items			
Formal dative particles			○
Formal comitative particles			
Particle ellipsis	○	○	○
Mimetics		○	
Sino-Korean words	○	○	○
Pronouns	○	○	○
Fillers	○	○	○
Backchannels		○	○
Number of significant lexical items	6	11	9

4.3.2. Japanese

4.3.2.1. General Results

Table 5 below reports the results of dependent observation *t*-tests comparing the mean frequency of each lexical item in formal and informal conditions, and it explains whether the difference in the interlocutor's social power has any influence on the production of each lexical item within interactions in Japanese. The contents of the first column present the different levels of linguistic units and lexical items. The contents of the second column present the direction of change in the use of a particular lexical item within a deferential context. 'Positive' direction stands for an increase in word production in formal interactions, and 'Negative' direction stands for a decrease in word production in the same condition. The third column presents the statistical significance of the

difference between the mean value in deferential and intimate situations. The *p*-values greater than .050 indicate that the gap between the average quantity of a particular lexical item in formal and informal situations did not reach the significance level.

Table 5. Effect of each lexical category in Japanese

Quantity of honorifics	**Direction**	***p*-value**
Honorific lexemes	Positive	$p = 0.038$
Honorific sentence-endings	Positive	$p < 0.001$
Quantity of general lexical information		
Utterances	Positive	$p = 0.969$
Morphemes	Positive	$p = 0.357$
Content words	Negative	$p = 0.204$
Quantity of other lexical items		
Formal quotative particles	Positive	$p = 0.434$
Particle ellipsis	Negative	$p < 0.001$
Mimetics	Negative	$p = 0.009$
Sino-Japanese words	Negative	$p = 0.754$
Pronouns	Negative	$p = 0.159$
Fillers	Positive	$p = 0.739$
Backchannels	Positive	$p = 0.340$

Note. $n = 7$, significance level = 0.05

In general, the number of words produced by Japanese participants increased in the case where they interacted with a superior. In detail, the results show that the increase in the quantity of honorific lexemes and honorific sentence-endings in deferential situations was statistically significant. In terms of the quantity of general lexical information, both the number of utterances and morphemes increased as predicted, while the number of content words reversely decreased in the deferential context. The number of lexical items related to formality generally increased except Sino-Japanese words, whereas the number of other lexical items related to informality including particle ellipsis, mimetics and pronouns all decreased. With respect to statistical significance,

however, differences only in use of particle ellipsis and mimetics between two interactive conditions were meaningful. The descriptive statistics including mean values and standard deviations in deferential and non-deferential situations is reported in Table 4, 5 and 6 of Appendix.

4.3.2.2. Effect of Task

Table 6 reports effect of tasks type on usage of each linguistic category in deferential and non-deferential situations by Japanese participants. The item which features *p*-value below .017 in the table has statistically significant effect of task on speakers' expression of deference. According to the results of ANOVA as in Table 6, a difference in only production of Sino-Japanese words across different tasks was statistically meaningful.

Table 6. Effect of task types in Japanese

Quantity of honorifics	***p*-value**
Honorific lexemes	$p = 0.518$
Honorific sentence-endings	$p = 0.123$
Quantity of general lexical information	
Utterances	$p = 0.740$
Morphemes	$p = 0.743$
Content words	$p = 0.607$
Quantity of other lexical items	
Formal quotative particles	$p = 0.420$
Particle ellipsis	$p = 0.834$
Mimetics	$p = 0.356$
Sino-Japanese words	$p = 0.005$
Pronouns	$p = 0.732$
Fillers	$p = 0.911$
Backchannels	$p = 0.034$

Following Table 7 reports the results of the *t*-tests which show what lexical items had a statistical significance for the difference between deferential and non-deferential situations within each task. The lexical items having a significant quantitative difference between formal and informal contexts are the checked lexical items with a circle in the second, third, and fourth columns.

Table 7. Significant difference in quantity of lexical information in each task (Japanese)

Quantity of honorifics	**Movie**	**Narration**	**Role Play**
Honorific lexemes			
Honorific sentence-endings	○	○	○
Quantity of general lexical information			
Utterances			
Morphemes			
Content words			○
Quantity of other lexical items			
Formal quotative particles			
Particle ellipsis	○	○	
Mimetics		○	
Sino-Japanese words			○
Pronouns			
Fillers			
Backchannels			○
Number of significant lexical items	2	3	4

In terms of the quantity of honorifics, the result shows that the change only in use of honorific sentence-endings was found significant across all three types of tasks. The quantity of general lexical information was not differentiated in all task types, except that there was a significant decrease in the quantity of content words in the task of role play. Regarding formal lexical items, the number of Sino-Japanese words and backchannels significantly increased only in the role-playing task. The number of informality-related lexical items including mimetics and particle ellipsis significantly decreased in the movie

task and the narration task. Even though Japanese subjects employed the biggest number of lexical items in the role play task (n = 4), the effect of task type was not apparent as only two items in the movie task and three items in the narration task were significantly controlled.

4.3.3. Cross-cultural Comparison

This section reports distinct strategies of politeness employed by Korean and Japanese participants. Table 8 is a summary of increases and decreases in quantity of various lexical items in deferential situations. If participants used more lexical items in deferential interactions compared to intimate interactions, the relevant lexical items were marked with ‘positive’ in the second and third columns, whereas a decrease in the number of words was marked with ‘negative’. In the case where Korean and Japanese speakers differently manipulated the amount of lexical information, the direction of change was marked in bold.

First of all, both Korean and Japanese subjects increased use of honorifics including both honorific lexemes and honorific sentence-endings with a statistical significance. In terms of the quantity of general lexical information, Korean and Japanese subjects employed opposite strategies. The number of utterances and morphemes produced by Korean participants decreased at a statistically significant level, while the number of content words increased in deferential situations although the statistical significance was not meaningful. On the other hand, the number of utterances and morphemes produced by Japanese participants increased, whereas the number of content words decreased. However, the change in the quantity of general lexical information in Japanese was not statistically significant. As for the number of other lexical items, Korean and Japanese subjects generally showed similar manipulation of quantity of words in spite of the weak statistical significance for the Japanese data. In particular, the use of Chinese-origin words by Korean and Japanese students was completely opposite.

Table 8. Directions of change in quantity of lexical information in Korean and Japanese

Quantity of honorifics	Korean	Japanese
Honorific lexemes	Positive ($p < 0.001$)	Positive ($p = 0.038$)
Honorific sentence-endings	Positive ($p < 0.001$)	Positive ($p < 0.001$)
Quantity of general lexical information		
Utterances	**Negative (**$p = 0.029$)	**Positive** ($p = 0.969$)
Morphemes	**Negative** ($p = 0.026$)	**Positive** ($p = 0.357$)
Content words	**Positive** ($p = 0.223$)	**Negative** ($p = 0.204$)
Quantity of other lexical items		
Formal case-marking particles	Positive ($p = 0.004$)*	Positive ($p = 0.434$)
Particle ellipsis	Negative ($p < 0.001$)	Negative ($p < 0.001$)
Mimetics	Negative ($p = 0.001$)	Negative ($p = 0.009$)
Chinese-origin words	**Positive** ($p < 0.001$)	**Negative** ($p = 0.754$)
Pronouns	Negative ($p < 0.001$)	Negative ($p = 0.159$)
Fillers	Positive ($p = 0.002$)	Positive ($p = 0.739$)
Backchannels	Positive ($p = 0.040$)	Positive ($p = 0.340$)

* This value presents statistical significance of the formal dative particle only. The p-value for the formal comitative particles is 0.057.

4.4. Discussion

4.4.1. Quantity of Honorifics

Honorifics, particularly in both Korean and Japanese, were often described as a fixed system or resource to mark politeness in early formalist studies. If that were true, the participants of this study had to utter exclusively in the polite speech style in interaction with a status-superior, and not surprisingly, the analysis revealed that honorific words in deferential situations used by native speakers of both Korean and Japanese actually outnumbered those in non-deferential situations regardless of task types. Does this mean that we have to take these results for granted and believe the equation of politeness with honorifics?

The discursive approach holds the perspective that use of distinct levels of speech styles is rather determined by a speaker's individual choice to index particular social meaning beyond politeness in a given context. The direct indexical meaning of honorifics is previously thought as (im)politeness as Pizziconi and Christie (2017) state. However, the recent third-wave approach which is interested in individual variability argues that using either honorific or non-honorific linguistic elements are associated with negotiating relation with the interactant, marking one's social and emotional stances, constructing and negotiating one's identities and so forth. This perspective concerning multiple layers of indexicality of honorifics has been supported by a number of experimental evidence including studies on sarcastic stance (e.g. Brown 2013), self-presentational stance and marking distance (e.g. Cook, 2008), constructing national identities (e.g. Kádár et al., 2013; Okano & Brown, 2018), presenting gender identities (e.g. Sclafani, 2009), etc.

According to Kádár and Haugh (2013), (im)politeness can be seen as a social practice because evaluations of (im)politeness are based on social actions and relevant meanings that are recognizable to every member of the society. Although we rely on individual choice regarding use of honorifics, the quantitative analysis of this study indicates that such linguistic choice is not completely free from the social norms or moral order of the community where the speaker belongs to regardless of what indexical meaning the speaker intends to communicate. Therefore, the current study adds quantitative evidence demonstrating social attribute of (im)politeness to previous studies that have a limitation to induce a generality from qualitative analysis.

4.4.2. Quantity of General Lexical Information

The quantitative analysis of interactions in Korean and Japanese revealed that the quantity of lexical information which an addressee can gain from a speaker's speech did not significantly differ in deferential and non-deferential situations. This result contradicts the hypothesis of this study which was made based on Gricean approach and prior experimental observations. However, if taking a closer look at the results in Section 4.3.1.2 and 4.3.2.2., it is notable that specific lexical information measures played a

significant role in particular types of task. Consequently, it is inducible that the context of interaction has an influence on manipulating the quantity of lexical information. This section therefore attempts to figure out what possibly caused the difference between the hypothesis and the results of the present study by comparing the study which this research mainly refers to.

First of all, this study set three different contexts for the experiment: (1) the movie task, (2) the narrative task, and (3) the role-play task. The major difference in these tasks was the amount of contextual information which the speaker and the hearer can access. The topic which participants were allowed to explain was only an animation story for the narrative task, while they were able to deal with any topic related to recently watched movies for the movie task. As for the role-play task, participants were given a particular context in which they had to make an apologize, but they had some degree of freedom to make up contexts including the reason why they were late, how to recompense an item and so forth. Thus, the speaker's choice of lexical items would be inevitably limited when context is limited. Then, the speaker consequently has to rely on other devices rather than use of particular types of lexicon in order to express deference or other social meanings. Such devices apparently include honorific elements. In the case of Korean speakers, however, the findings indicate that manipulating the quantity of lexical information is another means to index politeness.

On the other hand, Winter and Grawunder (2011) created a greater number of contexts than the current study for their data. First, they conducted a Mailbox Task in which a participant leaves a message and a recipe in cellphone mailbox. Second, they also conducted Discourse Completion Tasks with five different situations: (1) requesting a letter of recommendation from a professor or a language textbook from a friend, (2) giving an excuse for being tardy, (3) giving directions, (4) correcting a mistake, and (5) congratulating someone on a music performance. Since contextual details were already given, it does make sense that the participants are more likely to rely on other ways such as managing the quantity of lexical information to communicate their polite stance than those of the current study. Moreover, the speech samples which were not obtained by Winter and Grawunder (2011) from dyadic interactions. Their participants read

instructions and situational information on a computer screen and produced speech in a sound booth. This interactional factor caused even more impact on the quantity of the lexical information.

However, this polite strategy to provide different amounts of lexical information may not be preferred by speakers of Japanese because lexical information measures were found to be generally insignificant in Japanese. The amount of content words significantly decreased only in the role-play task. It is possible to assume that the degree of reliance on honorifics, particularly honorific sentence-endings, to express deference in Japanese might be as high as in Korean. Also, they may rely on other language-specific verbal and nonverbal resources of deference. In addition, the results imply that manipulating the quantity of lexical information is not a salient strategy to negotiate and present gender identity in both Korean and Japanese.

4.4.3. Quantity of Other Lexical Items

The lexical items which were chosen to examine the use in deferential and non-deferential interactions can be largely divided into two: (1) those to express formality such as formal case-markers, Chinese-origin words, fillers and backchannels; and (2) those to express informality such as particle ellipsis, mimetics and pronouns. In general, the number of lexicons related to formality increased, whereas the number of the other lexicons related to informality decreased in deferential situations both in Korean and Japanese. Furthermore, gender effect in the use of formal and informal lexical items was not significant in any of the language groups. Even though the choice of these formal or informal lexical items is not grammatically obligatory, but rather dependent upon individual decisions, how could the use of each lexical item reach the level of generality?

As mentioned in previous section, a speaker's individual choice regarding a specific form or strategy such as use of honorifics is likely to be made within the range of social expectations that the society or the community of the speaker shares. This behavioral pattern which is found in a particular speech group could have not been formed if any individuals did not attend to a cognitive-level process of making a

connection between a particular linguistic form and relevant meanings. This interpretation of utterance referring to a set of assumptions or expectations is the core of the Relevance Theory which is proposed by Sperber and Wilson (1986, 1995) as an alternative of the Gricean norm-based approach. According to the relevance-theoretic approach, the addressee first judges the speaker's verbal behavior whether it is compatible with the accessible expectations that are based on the given relationship. If it was compatible, the verbal information is not relevant enough to be worth the addressee's attention because it conveys only literal meaning (see Jary, 1998; Escandell-Vidal, 1998). In other words, the addressee infers the intended meaning only when the utterance is not relevant to the context.

When applying the Relevance Theory to the present study, for example, avoidance of omitting case-marking particles by both Korean and Japanese participants can be interpreted as polite because the addressee would find it usual in face-to-face interactions. In terms of honorifics, however, hearers will not find it incompatible with their expectations in deferential situations. This might bring cause to consider honorifics as counter-evidence to the Relevance Theory. Nevertheless, Escandell-Vidal (1998: 53) asserts that politeness can be also inferred by the addressee when the utterance overtly fulfills the expectations relevant to the social relationship. This contrasting way of implicature of politeness within different lexical items reflects the fact that related assumptions vary. Thus, members of the same speech group share the same assumption about each lexical item.

Then, how can we account for the lexical items that failed to reach statistical significance? This can be explained by the fact that preexisting information or knowledge is normally stored as a set of assumptions as Sperber & Wilson (1986, 1995: 87-88) state. One assumption, therefore, can either strengthen or weaken others as a set of assumptions relevant to a particular verbal behavior is intertwined with each other. For instance, backchannels function as a continuer in turn-taking (Schegloff, 1982), an acknowledgement token (Young and Miller, 2004), a marker of agreement or comprehension (Tottie, 1999), a marker of collaborative and affiliative stance (Kita and Ide, 2007) and so on. The statistical analysis of this study found that Japanese speakers

did not control the production of backchannels at the significant level, but this cannot simply lead to the conclusion that backchanneling is not an important indicator of politeness within any situation in Japanese. That is because it is hard to catch what implicature a backchannel has in every single utterance with the analytical approach of this study. As reported in both 3.1.3 and 3.2.3, in a similar vein, dissimilar strategies of lexical items were used by the same participants with the identical interlocutor in each task. This difference in task types further support how important situational factors are.

To sum up, the results of analysis imply that we adopt a particular verbal strategy which is relevant to the context or relationship with the interlocutor, so that the addressee can activate their accessible knowledge and make assumptions of the meanings that are embedded in the verbal form. As members of the same community tend to rely on the same social norms or expectations, we might be able to observe uniform patterns of using different lexical items and distinct levels of language to some extent. Rather, we should focus on what leads to such quantitative difference.

4.4.4. Cross-cultural Difference

The analysis found that opposite uses of a few lexical items in Korean and Japanese data such as the number of utterances, morphemes, content words, and Chinese-origin words as reported in the section 3.3. Part of the results also can be explained with the relevance-theoretic view as the way in which addressees make an association between contextual factors such as social expectations and interpreting social meaning from a given verbal strategy is similar. The social expectations which we possess are inevitably affected by cultural factors since we learn the ways in which other members of the culture perceive and think and behave to be a normal member (Janney and Arndt, 1992: 30). Escandell-Vidal (1998: 48) concretely states that “conventions may differ from culture to culture: cultural variation can thus be seen as the result of the distribution of different sets of representations concerning both the embedded representation and the conditions that determine its appropriate uses”. In other words, the premise which a particular verbal form or strategy is varied in each cultural group turned to be correct in

the results. Therefore, use of specific types of lexical items and verbosity can correlate with a different degree of (im)politeness in Korean and Japanese cultures.

If cultural variation attributes to the speaker's choice of a particular lexical item, what culture-specific factors influence it? First of all, we should contemplate a possibility that there was a difference in perception of relation with the status-superior between the Korean and Japanese students of this study. Korean speakers tend to decide the level of politeness based on the hierarchical social rankings, while Japanese speakers, especially women, consider *uchi-soto-kankei* (in- and out-group membership) with the interlocutor (see Eo, 2008; Tamaoka et al., 2010). In other words, Japanese speakers are likely to determine the relationship with an interactant in a more relative and subjective way than Korean speakers relying on more objective factors such as the interlocutor's age and occupation in order to behave politely. In the present study, a male professor in his 60s participated as the superior role in the experiment which was carried out in Korea. Notably, the professor generally maintained his non-honorific speech style throughout all the sessions with distinct students, and it seems to reflect a reliance on the Korean social hierarchy. According to Kim (2011), a superior's non-use of honorific statements to a subordinate is commonly observed despite of potential threat against the superior's face per se, and such omissions of honorifics by a socially superior is not evaluated as impolite and inappropriate since Korean honorifics do not encode politeness in a discursive sense. Consequently, from the findings that Korean subjects manipulated more various lexical items than Japanese subjects at a statistically significant level, it is possible to presume that the Korean subjects inevitably felt more of a sense of obligation to modulate lexical items to express their politeness than the Japanese participants due to those factors which are related to social ranking including the male professor's age, profession and use of non-honorifics by the interlocutor.

In contrast to the Korean data, it is considerably noticeable that a pair of Japanese professors of the other sex, who played the role of the socially superior, generally spoke in the polite speech style, although they irregularly shifted to non-honorifics. Thus, at least in terms of using honorifics, we can infer that both the Japanese professors and students considered themselves as out-group members. Then, why did they use the

smaller number of lexical items than the Korean participants? The first possible explanation is general gender difference in polite behavior. Tamaoka et al. (2010) found that Japanese female college students appear politer than male students when there is an asymmetry of social power between interactants. The gender ratio of the Japanese data was not unlike the Korean data, that is, there were more male subjects than female subjects. Consequently, the result might be driven by the Japanese male participants who are less likely to express their politeness. Moreover, the gender of the interlocutor should be taken into consideration. There was a gender variation across the professors in the Japanese data, whereas there was no gender variation of the professor in the Korean data; two out of seven Japanese participants (one male and one female) interacted with the female status-superior and five of seven participants (three males and two females) performed with the male status-superior. According to Tamaoka et al. (2010), young Japanese speakers showed more politeness when the interlocutor's gender is not identical. As more than half of the Japanese subjects interacted with the same gender, the result could be influenced by the participants who demonstrated less politeness.

The second plausible factor which caused the cross-cultural difference would be interpersonal variation. One of the Japanese professors who was in his 40s more actively attempted to find common places with students such as interests in pop culture involving music, movies, and TV shows compared to the Korean professor and the female professor. Also, he more frequently shifted his speech style to non-honorifics than the other professors. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the Japanese participants who completed the tasks with the male Japanese superior felt more intimacy than the other participants who performed with a different professor, and this might result in a dilution of statistical significance within the Japanese data.

Third, there is another culture-specific factor that native speakers of Japanese might more heavily rely on compared to native speakers of Korean particularly concerning use of honorifics. Ogino and Hong (1992) conducted a questionnaire survey on what cues Japanese people would make use of when judging the level of politeness. This survey reported that a Japanese person would mostly rely on the appropriateness of the speaker's use of honorifics, followed by facial expressions, tone of voice, gaze,

gesture and attire. Even though this study cannot fully explain what verbal strategies at the lexical level contribute to the perception of politeness, it still strongly alludes that use of honorifics is one of the most reliable and decisive criteria to judge politeness in Japanese. Thus, the necessity to manipulate the use of lexical items other than honorifics could be marginal in Japanese.

In addition to the relatively heavy reliance on honorifics within the Japanese context, we can find another cause for the difference between Korean and Japanese speakers from the level of speech act beyond the level of lexemes and lexicons. As Brown and Levinson (1987) point out in their monograph, indirect speech acts have been considered to correlate to politeness particularly in Japanese. For example, Dunn (2011) stated that Japanese speakers turn imperatives into interrogatives or add negation on the sentence as verbal strategies of politeness. Moreover, different request strategies including imperatives, affirmative questions, negative questions, expressions of desire and the like are selectively employed according to the intimacy and relative status within interactions in Japanese (see Okamoto, 1992). Thus, these preceding studies indicate a possibility that the Japanese participants of the present study might concentrate more on utterance-level verbal strategies, which cannot be quantitatively measured at the lexical level.

Also, it is possible that Japanese speakers may be particularly more dependent on other types of modality to mark deference such as nonverbal expressions including physical movements, facial expression, and prosodic elements rather than using certain lexical items. For instance, Ofuka et al. (2000) explored potential acoustic cues of politeness, and the result of production and perception tests revealed that pitch of F0 movement in the final part of utterance and speech rate have an influence on judgment of politeness. Furthermore, Hasada (1997) stated that avoidance of eye-contact and smiling are particular politeness strategies in Japan. Thus, employing nonverbal expressions might override providing different quantity of lexical information in deferential situations of this study. Lastly, the limited amount of Japanese data could lead to the cultural difference. The number of the Japanese participants reached only half of the Korean data, so it might be challenging to obtain results as salient as the Korean data. Therefore,

follow-up experiments with a larger size of samples should be conducted to clarify the impact of the sample size on the result of the present study.

4.5. Conclusion

This chapter examined how politeness could be associated with quantity of particular lexical items through statistical analysis. The results revealed that an increase in lexical information is not always directly correlated with politeness as hypothesized based on prior studies, even though use of honorific forms and lexicons was quantitatively differentiated in formal and informal conditions. The findings of the study thus imply how a particular lexical item is relevant to the given context should be examined because normative expectations concerning the lexical item cannot be fully reflected in a quantitative means. In other words, this study advocates the perspective which sees polite behaviors as social actions in both quantitative and qualitative ways. Finally, further investigations are necessary in order to explain the statistically insignificant findings. For example, this could include any aspects of (im)politeness involving lexical choices, pronunciation, body language, voice quality which may lead to relevant cognitive effects on politeness as Escandell-Vidal (1998) proposed.

CHAPTER V

NONVERBAL EXPRESSIONS OF POLITENESS

5.1. Introduction

All human interactions are interwoven with a variety of social variables such as power relation, social distance, context, gender or sex, socioeconomical class, educational background, and so on. However, when it comes to politeness research, as mentioned in the seminal work of Brown and Levinson (1987), relative power, social distance between interlocutors and ranking of imposition have been treated as some of the most indispensable interpersonal variables; as the effect of those variables increases, the level of politeness also ascends. Nonetheless, many studies have not consistently supported the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson. Goldsmith (2007: 227) stated that power in interpersonal relations has proven to be strongest predictor of politeness level while distance has been found problematic in a number of studies on requests (e.g., Holtgrave, 1992). For example, Holtgraves and Yang (1992) tested the three interpersonal variables of politeness advocated by Brown and Levinson through examining request strategies in American English and Korean. Even though all the three variables were found to correlate with politeness to some extent, power was revealed to be the most significant predictor of politeness in Korean, e.g. Korean participants more actively manipulated the use of negative adjuncts according to the power relation compared to the American participants. Therefore, the present research particularly aims to investigate the influence of power relation between interactants on the politeness level.

What makes this study qualitatively different from other politeness research focusing on the dimension of interpersonal power relationship is that the analysis concentrates on physical elements of (im)politeness. Insofar as the majority of politeness research have done, the focus has been concentrically put on the verbal forms and strategies in the studies of politeness-related phenomena, whereas the other modalities of politeness have been understudied. There is a large volume of research on nonverbal

communication of interpersonal relations in the field of social psychology, but on the contrary, it would not be an exaggeration to state that examinations of nonverbal behavior in politeness-related phenomena are in the relatively incipient stage. In particular, studies of human relationships often incorporate the concepts of power and dominance. In spite of enduring debate over decades, power is generally defined as one's capacity or potential to influence on other's behavior (see Burgoon and Dunbar, 2006; Dunbar, 2004), while dominance can be conceptualized as "an enduring individual trait that designates one's characteristic temperament and behavioral predispositions" (Burgoon and Dunbar, 2006: 280). Although the two terms may be found somewhat analogous and interchangeable since they are intertwined with one's position or status, they differ in their presentation in communication: while power is rather something latent, dominance is a route that people make use of in order to obtain or exert power. Thus, displays of dominance are something that can be articulated by the actor according to the context and situation. In addition to power and dominance, intimacy or affiliation has been also reported as a prime dimension underlying nonverbal communication (Guerrero and Floyd, 2006: 23).

As these concepts primarily constitute interpersonal relationships, there is abundant evidence showing the correlation between nonverbal cues and displaying dominance/submission and intimacy. A large number of studies relevant to nonverbal communication have repetitively revealed that body movement, posture, elevation, relaxation, gestures, facial expressions, eye gaze and other evident kinetic cues are important indicators of dominance (Dunbar and Burgoon, 2005b). For example, Burgoon and Dunbar (2006) associated dominance with more energetic and animated behavior such as high-pitched voice, quick movement, frequent and broad gestures, shaking and nodding, erect posture, heavy steps, hands away from body, etc. Specifically, in terms of body movement, it has been reported that dominant people's features were found to be more expressive and active than non-dominant people, i.e., those having more dominance more frequently move their body with a wider range of motion compared to less dominant ones (Dunbar and Burgoon, 2005a; Burgoon and Dunbar, 2006; Jayagopi et al., 2009).

Moreover, Brown and Winter (2019) revealed that the dominant person has "the prerogative" to initiate reciprocating actions and move around, whereas the inferior's freedom is limited. In addition to these dominance cues, it has been also proposed that particular interpersonal behaviors can correlate with demonstrating and manipulating intimacy. These behaviors of intimacy involve narrowing conversational distances, a direct body orientation towards the interlocutor, matching the physical plane such as interactants' both sitting or standing (Andersen, Guerrero and Jones, 2006). Additionally, physical touch among the interlocutors or haptics, smiling, more facial expressions, maintaining eye contact, and frequent productions of gesture were also found as marks of intimacy (Guerrero and Floyd, 2006: 87-88).

According to Argyle and Dean's (1965) affiliative conflict theory, both approach and avoidance forces influence on controlling the level of intimacy in interpersonal encounters. Approach forces corresponds to the conception including one's desire to receive social feedback and the gratification of affiliative needs, whereas avoidance forces are a notion encompassing fear to be disclosed for scrutiny and rejection. Argyle and Dean (1965) suggest that people attempt to keep an equilibrium level of intimacy or the level leading to the reciprocal comfort between interactants via various immediacy behaviors such as physical proximity, eye contact, and smiling. A number of empirical studies have advocated this model. For instance, Coutts and Schneider (1976) tested the affiliative conflict theory by pairing up female subjects with a friend and a stranger. The result revealed that friends exchange more individual and mutual gaze with more time to smile than did strangers.

These previous studies on nonverbal behavior and human relations imply the necessity to incorporate an analysis of visual modality into politeness research. However, one issue could be brought up whether these dominance and intimacy cues are culture-specific or universal. Therefore, the present study examines whether this nonverbal politeness-related behavior could be applied to two Asian languages – Korean and Japanese. Specifically, this research focuses on the nonverbal strategies of politeness and intimacy identified in the study of Brown and Winter (2019) which investigated body position/orientation, facial expressions, manual gestures, and physical touches found in

Korean TV shows. Based on the preceding findings, it is expected that each category of kinetic cues will be more frequent as the difference in social status and social distance with the interactant becomes smaller. As the means of analysis, the present study coded every physical movement of the main participants which could possibly be related to performing politeness.

5.2. Methodology

5.2.1. Data

The source of data is equivalent to that used in the previous chapter. Fourteen Korean students (seven male and seven female) and seven Japanese students (three female and four male) completed three different tasks: (1) the movie task; (2) the narrative task (or Tweety Bird task); and (3) the role-play task. They repeated these tasks with binary conditions – with the professor (asymmetric power and low intimacy) vs. with the friend (symmetric power and high intimacy). All the interactions were video- and audio-taped for multimodal analyses.

5.2.2. Gesture Coding and Statistical Analysis

The present paper largely refers to the studies of Brown and Winter (2019) and Burgoon and Dunbar (2006) in order for its gesture coding. Thus, this study primarily scrutinizes manual gesture, head movement (nodding and shaking), body movement (straightening, constraining, etc.), eye contact (maintaining and avoiding) and physical contact. Although a direct body orientation was identified as a significant signal of both intimacy and deference depending on culture and context, it had to be necessarily excluded since the chairs, where the participants were sitting on, were fixed on the floor and they kept facing toward their interlocutor throughout the experiment. The current research uses ELAN in order to code all the kinetic cues of politeness. Since this software allows one to add annotations on the timeline, every movement was first selected from the start point through the end of each stroke, and then relevant information was recorded

in the field of annotation. Notably, although only the strokes or the peaks of effort in the gesture accompanied with speech were counted for the frequency of gesture in the field of gesture study (McNeill, 1992), the present study did not follow the convention since polite demeanor does not necessarily co-occur with speech. Therefore, seven tiers (head nods, head shaking, straightening body, avoiding eye contact, self-touch, haptics and manual gesture) were created in order to examine the frequency of the kinetic cues, and the order of occurrence was coded in the annotation field.

In detail, first of all, the number was merely coded in the annotations of head nods and head shaking. As for the category of straightening body, 'erect' was coded if the subject straightened his or her back. In terms of avoiding eye contact, the direction of eye gaze including 'up', 'down', 'right', 'left' and the like were written. For the tier of self-touch, the kinds and the hand(s) used for movement, e.g. 'touching hair with left hand' and 'scratching face with right hand'. The tier of haptics follows the same coding rule for self-touch that the types and the hand(s) used for the physical contact were noted. Furthermore, on the tier of manual gesture, similarly to self-touch and haptics, the kinds of gesture and the hand(s) used were coded, e.g. 'pointing towards the partner with right index finger', 'tapping with both hands'. Also, right hand was coded as 'RH' and left hand was coded 'LH'. The frequency of each nonverbal cue was counted and divided by the total time length of interaction (per second). Then, the values were again converted to percentile to facilitate the statistical tests. As for a statistical analysis, dependent observation *t*-tests were chosen to in order to make a comparison between the frequency of each kinetic cue in two distinct types of interactions.

5.2.3. Hypothesis

First, it was expected that more frequent manual gesture, nodding, head-shaking and self-touch in the interaction with a lack of unbalanced power than a presence of unbalanced power since dominance is associated with activeness and expressiveness. Second, avoiding eye contact would be more likely to be observed in the condition with the status-superior than the status-equal as eye contact is correlated to intimacy. Third,

more frequent physical contacts are expected in the interaction with the status-equal than the status-superior because proxemics is considered to reinforce intimacy. Lastly, if one straightened his back which is a non-relaxing and erect position, the distance between interactants become larger. Thus, it would be expected that participants straighten their body at a higher frequency when interacting with a professor compared to a friend for the relation between proxemics and intimacy.

5.3. Results

5.3.1. General Findings

Table 9 below presents the results of *t*-tests comparing the effect of interaction type on production of each kinetic cue in Korean interactions. In general, production of nonverbal cues of dominance and intimacy such as manual gestures, head-shakes and self-touch increased, while production of other cues related to submission such as back-stretches and avoiding eye contact increased. However, production of nods increased unlike the hypothesis and haptics rarely observed.

Table 9. Production of nonverbal cues in Korean

Types of nonverbal cues	Direction	*p*-value
Manual gestures	Negative	$p = 0.002$
Nods	Positive	$p < 0.001$
Head-shakes	Negative	$p = 0.010$
Back-stretches	Positive	$p = 0.002$
Self-touches	Negative	$p = 0.004$
Haptics	-	-
Avoidance of eye contact	Positive	$p = 0.481$

Following Table 10 illustrates the results of *t*-tests comparing the effect of interaction type on production of each kinetic cue in Japanese interactions. As found in the Korean interaction, Japanese speakers reduced production of nonverbal cues of

dominance and intimacy such as manual gestures, head-shakes and self-touch, whereas they increased production of back-stretches which is associated with submission. In addition, production of nods increased as in the Korean data. However, Japanese speakers less frequently avoided eye contact in the deferential condition in contrast with the hypothesis, and haptics did not occur in any condition. The following sub-sessions present detailed descriptive statistics and visual examples.

Table 10. Production of nonverbal cues in Japanese

Types of nonverbal cues	Direction	*p*-value
Manual gestures	Negative	$p = 0.300$
Nods	Positive	$p = 0.720$
Head-shakes	Negative	$p = 0.040$
Back-stretches	Positive	$p = 0.006$
Self-touches	Negative	$p = 0.152$
Haptics	-	-
Avoidance of eye contact	Negative	$p = 0.468$

5.3.1.1. Frequency of Manual Gestures

The frequency of manual gesture was divided by the entire time length of conversation or the total seconds. The frequency in the two different conditions driven by social variables was compared with a dependent observation *t*-test. The descriptive statistics of manual gesture of Korean participants are reported in Table 11. In terms of the Korean participants, the frequency of manual gesture was more frequently produced in interaction with a friend ($M = 0.174$, $SD = 0.075$) compared to the interactions with a professor ($M = 0.133$, $SD = 0.066$), $t(13) = 3.78$, $p = .002$, 95% CI [0.018, 0.065].

Table 11.

Descriptive Statistics for the Frequency of Manual Gesture per Second in Korean Data

Type of interlocutor	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Friend	14	0.174	0.075
Professor	14	0.133	0.066

For example, Participant 5 (P5) pointed to both the right and left sides to describe a cat and a bird living in apartments facing one another when he was with his friend as illustrated in Figure 1 below, while he did not make any gesture to account for the same scene when having the status-superior as his interlocutor as seen in Figure 2.

Figure 1. P5 producing a deictic gesture to describe two buildings facing each other in a non-deferential situation (Narrative Task)

Figure 2. P5 producing no gesture to describe the same scene as in Figure 1 in a deferential situation (Narrative Task)

Table 12 describes the statistic results of the frequency of manual gesture produced by Japanese participants. Although Japanese participants decreased gesture productions in deferential situations compared to intimate situations, the difference failed to reach the statistically significant level. Furthermore, gender was not a factor to lead to

a difference in use of manual gesture. Therefore, it might be hard to say that speakers of Japanese manipulate the frequency of manual gesture to show their politeness.

Table 12.

Descriptive Statistics for the Frequency of Manual Gesture per Second in Japanese Data

Type of interlocutor	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Friend	7	0.111	0.060
Professor	7	0.090	0.068

5.3.1.2. Frequency of Nods

In order to make a comparison between two types of interaction, the frequency of nods was obtained by dividing the sheer number of nods by the entire seconds equivalent to the time duration of interaction. Dependent observation *t*-tests were conducted to compare the mean frequency of distinct interaction types. The mean frequency of nods produced by the Korean subjects and further statistic results can be seen in Table 13, and the statistics for the Japanese data is reported in Table 14.

The result of *t*-test revealed that the Korean participants more frequently nodded when interacting with the status-superior ($M = 0.112$, $SD = 0.031$) than with the status-equivalent ($M = 0.062$, $SD = 0.029$), $t(13) = -5.67$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [-0.069, -0.031]. With respect to particular contexts where head nods frequently appeared, nodding was accompanied with an oral response to a question, an agreement statement and backchannelling.

Table 13.

Descriptive Statistics for the Frequency of Nods per Second in Korean Data

Type of interlocutor	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Friend	14	0.062	0.029
Professor	14	0.112	0.031

On the other hand, no significant contrast was found in the Japanese data, although Japanese subjects generally produced more nods compared to the Korean participants. Nevertheless, Japanese speakers nodded in more various contexts than Korean speakers. They nodded at the semantic and syntactic boundary of utterance in addition to when they said 'yes' and made backchannels regardless of the relation with the interactant.

Table 14.

Descriptive Statistics for the Frequency of Nods per Second in Japanese Data

Type of interlocutor	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Friend	7	0.144	0.082
Professor	7	0.156	0.076

5.3.1.3. Frequency of Head-shakes

As with how the frequency of nods was calculated, the frequency of head-shakes was determined by dividing the total number of head-shakes by the total seconds of the conversation. The mean values of each interaction type were compared by dependent observation *t*-tests. Following Table 15 and Table 16 respectively show the descriptive statistic information of the Korean and Japanese data.

In the Korean data, it was confirmed that the participants more frequently shook their head when they worked on the tasks with their friend (M = 0.008, SD = 0.008) compared to when working with the professor (M = 0.003, SD = 0.003), $t(13) = 3.02$, p = .010, 95% CI [0.002, 0.009]. However, any similar significant difference was not found in other tasks.

Table 15.

Descriptive Statistics for the Frequency of Head-Shakes per Second in Korean Data

Type of interlocutor	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Friend	14	0.008	0.008
Professor	14	0.003	0.003

In the Japanese data, the Japanese subjects produced more head-shakes at a significantly higher frequency when interacting with the status-equal (M = 0.004, SD = 0.003) compared to when interacting with the status-superior (M = 0.001, SD = 0.001), $t(6) = 2.61$, p = .040, 95% CI [0.000, 0.005].

Table 16.

Descriptive Statistics for the Frequency of Head-Shakes per Second in Japanese Data

Type of interlocutor	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Friend	7	0.004	0.003
Professor	7	0.001	0.001

5.3.1.4. Frequency of Back-stretches

In order to examine whether politeness features stiff and erect body posture, the frequency of stretching back was counted and divided by the entire time length to facilitate the comparison between distinct types of interaction. Figures 3 and 4 show the same participant (P4) maintaining a slouched posture with the status-equal and an erect posture with a back-stretch with the status-superior respectively.

Figure 3. P4 with a slouching back in an interaction with a status-equal (Role-play task)

Figure 4. P4 with a stretched back in an interaction with a status-superior (Role-play task)

A dependent observation *t*-test was carried out to identify any possible difference in the mean frequency. Table 17 displays the descriptive statistic values of the Korean data. The test revealed that the Korean participants more frequently straightened their back when interacting with the professor (M = 0.012, SD = 0.009) compared to when interacting with their friend (M = 0.002, SD = 0.003), $t(13) = -3.96$, p = .002, 95% CI [-0.015, -0.005].

The following Table 18 describes the statistic result of the Japanese data. Through the dependent observation *t*-test, it was found that as the Korean participants did, the Japanese participants also more frequently stretched their back when performing with the status-superior (M = 0.004, SD = 0.003) compared to the conversation with the status-equal (M = 0.001, SD = 0.001), $t(13) = -4.22$, p = .006, 95% CI [-0.005, -0.001].

Table 17.

Descriptive Statistics for the Frequency of Back-Stretches per Second in Korean Data

Type of interlocutor	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Friend	14	0.002	0.003
Professor	14	0.012	0.009

Table 18.

Descriptive Statistics for the Frequency of Back-Stretches per Second in Japanese Data

Type of interlocutor	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Friend	7	0.001	0.001
Professor	7	0.004	0.003

5.3.1.5. Frequency of Self-touches

The frequency of touching the speaker's own body per second was used to make a comparison between the interaction with the status-superior and with the status equal. The statistical analysis was conducted with dependent observation *t*-tests, and the descriptive statistics of the Korean data is reported in Table 19 and the Japanese data in Table 20.

A significant difference was found between deferential and intimate situations such that the Korean subjects more frequently touched their body when interacting with the status-equal ($M = 0.054$, $SD = 0.023$) compared to when interacting with the status-superior ($M = 0.037$, $SD = 0.022$), $t(13) = 3.50$, $p = .004$, 95% CI [0.005, 0.006]. Nonetheless, this significant distinction was not found in the task of conversation on movies and role play.

Table 19.

Descriptive Statistics for the Frequency of Self-Touches per Second in Korean Data

Type of interlocutor	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Friend	14	0.054	0.023
Professor	14	0.037	0.022

As for Japanese speakers, the Japanese participants more frequently touched their body when performing with their friend compared to the performances with the professor across all the tasks, but the difference failed to reach the statistically significant level.

Table 20.

Descriptive Statistics for the Frequency of Self-Touching per Second in Japanese Data

Type of interlocutor	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Friend	7	0.036	0.028
Professor	7	0.016	0.012

5.3.1.6. Frequency of Haptics

Unlike the finding of Brown & Winter (2019) in which Koreans often make physical contacts with their intimate interactants, only two male Korean participants touched their friend in the performance of the role play task. However, these only added up to individual three occurrences (M = 0.00129, SD = 0.003625) which is insufficient to conduct a statistical test. On the other hand, none of the Japanese participants made a physical touch with their interactant regardless of the interactive type.

5.3.1.7. Frequency of Avoidance of Eye Contact

The sheer number of avoiding eye contact was divided by the entire length of interaction to obtain the standardized frequency and the mean values were compared with dependent observation *t*-tests. The summary of statistic values in the Korean and Japanese data is presented in Table 21 and Table 22 respectively.

Table 21.

Descriptive Statistics for the Frequency of Avoiding Eye Contact per Second in Korean Data

Type of interlocutor	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Friend	14	0.137	0.045
Professor	14	0.142	0.040

Table 22.

Descriptive Statistics for the Frequency of Avoiding Eye Contact per Second in Japanese Data

Type of interlocutor	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Friend	7	0.137	0.062
Professor	7	0.119	0.052

As for the Korean participants, a significant difference between deferential and non-deferential situations was not found even though they more frequently avoided eye contact with the status-superior than with the status-equal. On the other hand, Japanese

speakers more frequently avoided eye contact when interacting with the status-equal compared to when interacting with the status-superior. However, the dependent observation *t*-test found no statistically significant difference over all tasks in the results of Japanese interactions.

5.3.2. Effect of Task

This section reports the effect of task on nonverbal behaviors in deferential and non-deferential situations. When there is a statistically significant difference in the frequency of producing a particular nonverbal behavior between deferential and non-deferential contexts, the task is marked with a circle in Table 23 below.

Table 23. Significant difference in production of nonverbal expressions in each task

	Korean			Japanese		
	Movie	Narrative	Role play	Movie	Narrative	Role play
Manual gesture		○				
Nods	○	○	○			
Head-shakes			○			
Back-stretches	○	○	○	○		○
Self-touch			○	○		
Haptics						
Avoiding eye contact	○					

As for Korean, first, Korean participants produced more nods and more back-stretches, and avoided eye contact more frequently during the movie task in the deferential condition. Decrease in occurrences of manual gestures and increase in occurrences of nods and back-stretches were found to be significant during the narrative task with the deferential condition. For the role-play task, interactions with a superior who is featured frequent nods, frequent back-stretching, infrequent head shaking and

infrequent self-touching. In sum, frequent nodding and erect body posture were found to be significant for doing deference in Korean.

In Japanese, participants more frequently stretched their back and less frequently touched their body during the movie task to demonstrate their deference. The erect body posture was also correlated to doing deference for the role-play task as well. However, none of the nonverbal cues to demonstrate deference for the narrative task were found to be statistically significant.

5.4. Discussion

5.4.1. General Findings

To summarize the findings, the participants of this study in general tended to refrain from employing nonverbal markers of casualness or intimacy when doing deference. It was found that politeness in Korean is correlated with a decline in the production of manual gestures, head-shaking and self-touch, an increase in the production of nods and back-stretches, and an increased frequency of avoiding eye contact. Except for nodding and physical contacts, the results identified in the hypotheses were found to be true. In terms of the Japanese data, on the other hand, politeness was correlated with a decline in the production of head shaking and self-touch, and an increased production of back-stretching. Thus, less than half of the findings that were hypothesized were supported by the Japanese subjects. However, putting all the kinetic cues that were revealed to be significant together, when the participants are in a socially inferior position, they in general move less and keep their body more rigid compared when they are interacting with someone close. With these findings, this section specifically attempts to explain in what ways these results are consistent or inconsistent with preceding findings on nonverbal behavior that express deference and what possibly led such difference or comparability.

Particularly comparing these results with Brown and Winter's (2019) previous research analyzing Korean television dramas, it was commonly found that a decreased frequency of gesture production was an indicator of deference. Doing deference in Korean also featured erect body position in Korean dramas, and this is consistent with the present study's observation of frequent back-stretches in deferential situations in both Korean and Japanese. In terms of self-touching, Brown and Winter (2019) failed to see statistical significance, but the present study revealed that Korean speakers more frequently touch part of their body in deferential situations at a statistically reliable level. In addition, Brown and Winter (2019) proposed a connection between head nods and both intimacy and deference, whereas head nods are more frequently observed in deferential situations in the current study. This study further made a new finding related to head movement which was not examined in the previous research, that is, speakers of Korean and Japanese less frequently shake their head in deferential situations. In contrast to Brown and Winter's (2019) observation where the inferior gazed at the superior for a longer time, this study found that Korean speakers kept shorter eye contact with the superior, although Japanese speakers showed a similar tendency with Brown and Winter's finding. Meanwhile, whereas haptics which are more likely to be used by superiors as observed by Brown and Winter (2019), no haptics were observed in deferential situations by the present study.

The analysis revealed that a decrease in nonverbal behavior in terms of animatedness and activeness was a reflection of doing deference in general, while such tendency was not salient in the performances of intimacy. This is meaningful because it implies that what Brown and Winter (2019) observed in TV drama data is consistent with actual human behavioral patterns of politeness. When the participants of the present study interacted with the status-higher, they were more likely to restrain their body movements through producing fewer manual gestures, less headshaking, and fewer self-touches. Moreover, in terms of animatedness, both the Korean and Japanese participants kept their back stretched and erect longer in deferential situations. This reduction in activities can be interpreted as the reflection of "physical potency" (Burgoon and Dunbar, 2006). Burgoon and Dunbar (2006: 287-289) argue that people signify dominance through

threat-like behaviors, activities showing physical strength and bigger size, and energetic movements at a high degree. For example, staring at the other is also an intimidating action, thus, a lower frequency of eye contact could be interpreted as a signal of politeness. Indeed, the Korean participants avoided direct eye contact when interacting with the superior. Thus, the findings of the present study indicate that dominance or submission in interpersonal relationships is associated with not only verbal strategies but also nonverbal displays of deference.

On the other hand, intimacy between speakers was particularly correlated with animatedness and relaxation. Compared to the deferential interactions, both Korean and Japanese subjects of the current research more freely and frequently used their body in non-deferential situations. For example, they more actively gestured to explain the story of the Tweety Bird episode to their friend. Furthermore, they also tended to lean against the wall of sound booth or the back of a chair and touched their body more frequently. This slouched body posture particularly made the distance between interlocutors' legs closer as opposed to when they maintained rigid and erect body posture in the interaction with a superior. In sum, the results of analysis were compatible with the precedent set by social psychological research which has focused on dynamics of power and intimacy in interpersonal relations.

This study also disclosed nonverbal behaviors that either countered those proposed in the hypotheses which were established based on the previous studies or have not been reported to date. In addition, a number of significant indicators of nonverbal behavior related to performing intimacy and deference were not consistently observed across different types of tasks. In order to explain this incongruence with the previous literature, we should get back to the notions of power and dominance. Even though the concept of power in this study is mostly based on the social hierarchy involving exclusively age and occupations, it is not difficult observe that power appears and influences interpersonal relations in a more complicated way. Burgoon and Bacue (2003: 200) define power as "the potential to influence others by virtue of actual or implied authority, expertise, capacity to bestow rewards, capacity to withhold or apply punishments, persuasive abilities, or possession of interpersonal qualities with which

others may identify." In other words, power could be conceptualized as something situational and contextual. Consequently, dominance as the means to exert power inevitably represents multilateral and dynamic features of power.

For example, the female Japanese professor in the present study asked students for movie recommendations since she had not watched any movies for a while. In the case of Participant 15 and 16, the power relation between the professor and a student is inverted due to the student's higher level of expertise related to movies. In particular, Participant 15 mentioned that he is taking a cinema class in the experiment, so he watches movies in the class. In fact, the nonverbal behaviors of the two Japanese students who interacted with the female professor were quite divergent from the other students who performed with another Japanese professor, e.g., nodding and gesturing less frequently than the other students. In terms of interactions in Korean, the Korean male professor mentioned that he has offered courses related to English and American movies and, consequently, frequently watches movies. Even though there are some Korean students who were taking a cinema class at the time of data collection, their nonverbal behavior was less associated with power than the professor. This might have resulted from the Korean professor's apparent expertise on movies. According to Burgoon et al. (2009), credibility is one prerequisite element of power. Burgoon and her colleagues (Burgoon et al., 1990) also confirmed that credibility is comprised of five different components such as trustworthiness, competence/expertise, composure, sociability/likability and dynamism. Thus, this study's findings demonstrate well how expertise in a particular field can be considered as source of power and affect nonverbal communications.

Intimacy is in line with the notion of power and dominance in terms of its contextualized disposition. According to Burgoon and Hale (1984), showing a high level of immediacy, involvement, affection, depth, and trust reflects interpersonal intimacy. Prager (2000: 231) further argued that sharing particular knowledge with others leads to experience of intimacy and the feeling of being "liked, accepted, understood, cared for, or loved". Since human emotion is not something fixed to one specific moment, but is rather something pliable, feeling and expressing intimacy is inevitably interdependent with context and situation. Even in the interaction with a close friend, thus, a speaker can keep

switching his or her affiliative attitude. For instance, a Korean subject (P14) folded his arms and stared at a wall when he introduced a movie which his partner had not watched, whereas he frequently moved his hands and head when talking about a movie that he found his interlocutor likes as he does. Therefore, this inconsistent use of kinetic cues of dominance or intimacy can be understood as a representation of situational power shifts or emotional and attitudinal shifts to affiliate oneself with the other.

As Brown and Winter (2019) revealed, head nods were more frequently used in performance of intimacy in Korean. Although Brown and Winter (2019) found no statistical association, the present study identified a statistical significance of head nods in the situation of doing deference – the Korean participants more frequently nodded when interacting with the status-superior. However, head nods were even a significant indicator of deference in the Japanese dataset. One plausible explanation for this result can be the multiple communicative functions of nodding. In fact, it is not uncommon that a single nonverbal kinetic cue indicates manifold meanings. Burgoon and Le Poire (1999: 107), for instance, state that direct eye contact can be an indicator of intimacy, but it can be also interpreted as a sign of intimidation or anger. This implies that head nods are not just a nonverbal strategy of displaying deference, but it could deliver other pragmatic meanings as well. Previous research on functions of head movements have revealed that moving the head can appear in context of regulating turn-taking (Duncan, 1972), marking semantic and syntactic boundaries of co-occurring speech (Kendon, 1972), signaling agreement or attention (Dittmann and Llewellyn, 1968), backchanneling (Duncan, 1972; Maynard, 1987; Yngve, 1970) and so forth. Therefore, the quantitative analysis of head nods might fail at capturing the contextualized meaning.

In the Korean data, the Korean students generally nodded when responding to the interactant's questions, displaying an agreement, and backchanneling. However, the Japanese students frequently moved their head not only in the situations in which the Koreans nodded, but also in the semantic and syntactic boundaries at a higher frequency than the Korean participants. This tendency was found in both the interaction with the status-superior and the status-equal in the Japanese data. Maynard (1987) investigated various communicative functions of speakers' head nods in Japanese, and the findings of

her study are in line with the current study. Maynard (1987) analyzed head nods based on their locations related to "Pause-bounded Phrasal Units (PPUs)" or the co-occurring speech units. Maynard reported that successive speaker head nods taking place away from the PPU boundary serve as rhythm-taking device, while head nodding plays a role to emphasize when it co-occurs with a stressed mora. In addition, a speaker head nod occurring with the final mora of speech marks either a clause boundary or turn completion, and head nods also serve to fill a turn-transition pause or to claim the next tern when it occurs during a pause between PPUs. Moreover, Kita and Ide (2007), who analyzed *aizuchi* (backchannel in Japanese), nodding, and sentence-final particles, found that Japanese people more frequently produce the three types of responses compared to other community members such as speakers of English. They attributed this finding to the ideology to emphasize one's consideration (*omoiyari*) and cooperation with the interactant in the Japanese society. Thus, demonstrating a cooperative attitude of the speaker via nodding might be an important kinetic cue of politeness in Korean, while that kind of function was diluted with other pragmatic meanings in Japanese. This relation between cooperative or accommodating nonverbal behavior and politeness can be reinforced by another nonverbal cue – head shaking. Shaking the head was generally used in the context of disagreement or a negative response to a question, and it was significantly abstained of by both the Korean and Japanese participants in deferential situations. In other words, forbearing nonverbal uncooperative attitude seems related to doing deference in Korean and Japanese.

In addition to head nods, haptics was not employed at different level of frequency in each type of interaction in both the Korean and Japanese datasets in contrast with Brown and Winter's (2019) finding. This incongruity with the previous studies does not necessarily mean that the kinetic cue is not an important indicator of (im)politeness. Although Brown and Winter (2019) used TV dramas as their datasets, they were able to observe that haptics frequently appeared in interactions with friends. However, the setting of the current study restrained body movements of the participants since they were instructed to stay on their chair during the experiment. Major (1981) mentioned this kind of methodological difficulty in examining touch in a controlled setting to explain a

scarcity of excellent studies on touch. Major argued that participants would not touch their interactant unless they were explicitly given permission to do so in the laboratory. Thus, an alternative way to induce the use of haptics in an authentic and natural context should be considered in order to study the reliability of haptics as a dominance or intimacy cue in Korean and Japanese.

5.4.2. Effect of Task

Use of distinct nonverbal cues across different tasks would show contextual features of (im)politeness. In Korean, manipulating the frequency of nods, back-stretches and avoidance of eye contact was related to doing deference during the movie task. While the frequency of gesturing, nodding and stretching back was found significant in the narrative task, production of head nods, head-shakes, back-stretches and self-touch were important nonverbal cues of politeness for the role-play task. Although there were task-specific factors, it is noticeable that nodding and making erect body posture are consistently found to be significant to do deference in Korean. As for the results in Japanese, on the other hand, production of back-stretches and self-touch were correlated with politeness for the movie task, whereas stretching back was the only significant indicator of deference during the role-play task. However, no kinetic cue was found significant for doing deference for the narration task in Japanese. This result indicates that there might be nonverbal cues which are less likely to be influenced by context-related factors.

In the previous chapter, it was revealed that the number of lexical items managed for each task differ. For example, while Korean speakers rely on 11 lexical items to express deference in the narrative task, only 6 lexical items were significantly manipulated by them in the movie task. Nonetheless, such discrepancy across the tasks was not found in the analysis of kinetic cues. This indicates that a particular context where the speaker controls a greater number of lexical items to express politeness does not necessarily require controlling a larger number of nonverbal cues. In other words, the extent to rely on certain verbal and nonverbal cues of politeness is not compatible. That

may explain the reason why Korean speakers, who controlled the largest number of lexical items for the narrative task, did not make use of the greatest number of nonverbal cues for the same task. With regard to one's individual potential or ability to contribute to a group's task performance in an effective way postulated by group members is related to nonverbal indicators of status (Berger et al., 1980; Burgoon and Dunbar, 2006; Ridgeway and Walker, 1995). Depending on one's role and ability to complete a particular task, power or dominance to control the interaction would be dynamically changed. Burgoon et al. (2009: 339-340) also argue that task-oriented interaction is unlikely to lead to intimacy in the same way social-oriented interaction does. Therefore, kinetic cues of power and dominance can be influenced not just by task type itself but also individual orientation to the task.

5.4.3. Cross-cultural Difference

Even if the contextual and situational characteristic of power and intimacy exerts an effect upon nonverbal cues of doing deference and performing intimacy, there is still an apparent dissimilarity between the findings in Korean and Japanese. In general, less kinetic cues were employed across two distinct interactive types by the Japanese subjects compared to the Korean subjects. Although it could be interpreted that the Japanese people more actively and frequently attempted to affiliate with the professor, some may ask for another plausible explanation related to this result. An alternative interpretation is that native speakers of Japanese are less likely to rely on kinetic cues than other linguistic or paralinguistic cues. Ogino and Hong (1992) conducted a questionnaire survey on what cues Japanese people would use to evaluate the level of politeness of the speaker. The result of the survey demonstrated that a Japanese person would mostly rely on the appropriateness of the speaker's use of *keigo* or honorifics followed by facial expressions, tone of voice, gaze, gesture and clothes or shoes. The analysis of the previous chapter of this research supports Ogino and Hong's (1992) finding, that is, the both Japanese and Korean subjects manipulated the quantity of honorifics. Moreover, as Ogino and Hong (1992) confirmed, there is a possibility that the Japanese might more

heavily rely on facial expressions, which were not included in the analysis of the present research, than the Korean. However, an analysis of facial expression by the Japanese and the Korean should be required.

A social change could be also another explanation of this cross-cultural difference. In order to account for the avoidance of "power posing" by the status-superior in Korea, Brown and Winter (2019) quoted Kim-Renaud's (2001) argument that being power-conscious, obedient or modest has been less favored by the younger generation of Koreans, and "friendlier" and "nicer" mode of politeness has replaced the conventional display of deference. Therefore, linguistic modernization might attribute to the avoidance of nonverbal deference cues in Korea. In regard to Japanese, of course a perspective which views symmetrical non-use of honorifics as modern in Japanese society exists as Koyama (2004) argues. However, the current study's findings cannot fully contribute to an argument that Japanese speakers prefer such modernized linguistic behavior to express deference due to different experimental settings between Korean and Japanese including using two Japanese superiors with the opposite sex. Moreover, performing less nonverbal deferential cues may simply be the nature of deference in Japan as mentioned above.

In addition, the predictive factor of levels of politeness could affect the cross-cultural discrepancy found in this research. According to Eo (2008), Koreans are likely to rely on hierarchical social status in order for deciding levels of politeness while *uchi-soto-kankei* (inside/outside relations) and (un)familiarity exert more influence on the decision of politeness level in Japanese. In terms of the present study, the data collection in Japanese was carried out in the United States unlike the Korean data which was conducted in Korea. Consequently, the sense of inside/outside group membership might arise in a way diverged from the typical way which is particularly found in Japan. In the overseas context, the identical national identity of participants potentially militated for closing distance among them. If the Japanese subjects participated in the experiment in their own university, the distance from the status-superior could be larger and they accordingly increased the use of nonverbal cues of politeness.

Lastly, distinct degrees of participation in the deferential situations might lead to the underuse of kinetic cues by the Japanese students. In the performance with the status-superior, the Korean participants occupied 55.60 percent of the entire utterance turns on average whereas the Japanese participants shared 50.75 percent of the whole utterances. Even though the Korean subjects more actively produced utterances than the Japanese subjects, the gap between these figures is not straightforwardly correlated with the levels of participation. That is because they cannot reflect the proportion of short sentences such as simple yes-or-no answers and exclamations. Therefore, it is helpful to consider the proportion of backchannels since they generally constitute small number of morphemes. While 24.79 percent out of the entire utterances on average included backchannels in the Japanese data, the only 14.40 percent of the entire utterances involved backchannels in the Korean data. This indicates that the Japanese status-superior more frequently and actively led the conversation, and the Japanese main participants more passively produced utterances with concrete contents compared to the Korean main participants. Thus, it is possible that the analysis could not find as many nonverbal cues of deference in Japanese as in Korean due to the inactive participation of the Japanese students. To summarize, there are multiple possible factors which affect the cross-cultural difference between the Japanese and Korean data, and this should not be interpreted that one of them was the only factor, but they were possibly intertwined.

5.4.4. Indexicality of Nonverbal Politeness

The results of the present research illustrate that some nonverbal dominance cues could be possibly used to signal the (im)polite modality. If this is true, some might wonder about the relationship between dominance and politeness. Dillard et al. (1997) explain that politeness may be strongly affected by dominance for its capability to threaten both positive and negative face that are politeness-related concepts popularized by Brown and Levinson (1987). The positive face refers to the desire to be liked by others and the negative face is the desire to be unimpeded by others. Dillard and colleagues further assert that all interpersonal relationships could be assessed with

affiliation and dominance, and they are parallel to the notion of positive and negative face. However, actors do not concurrently ponder both affiliation and dominance in order to act, rather focusing on one of them leads to reduced attention on the other. This argument of Dillard et al. (1997) may be able to account for the inconsistency of this study that certain nonverbal cues are found to be more or less salient in a particular task or language.

In fact, this kind of shifting back and forth between politeness and impoliteness has been frequently reported in studies on verbal politeness when accounting for the indexicality of polite or impolite speech styles. Cook (1998), for example, analyzed use of different speech levels of Japanese in a TV interview program and a neighborhood quarrel, and found shifts between the plain form and the politeness form were not infrequent. First, the interviewer of the TV show flexibly switches his speech style to the plain form for summarizing, assessing and repeating the interviewee's speech while he generally sticks to the polite form throughout the entire show. In terms of the quarrels taken place in the neighborhood, a landlord continues to use the plain form during the dispute, whereas a tenant promptly shifts his speech style from the plain form to the polite form when he recognizes that the person to whom he was talking to was his landlord. Cook (1998) concludes that the mixed use of the polite and plain forms in the identical discourse does not automatically index a status difference per se, but such shifts can index situational meaning derived from co-occurring contextual features. Thus, this study implies that the indexicality of the polite and plain forms is not always bound to the given holistic social context including power difference or demonstration of (im)politeness, but also correlates with the on-going malleable stance of speaker. Indexicality is a notion referring to "the capacity of linguistic signs to 'invoke' some other object, while not explicitly describing or referring to it" (Pizziconi and Christie, 2017). Ochs (1988, 1990, 1996) proposes two indices to "capture the fluidity and multiplicity of indexical meanings" (Cook, 2013: 180): (1) direct index, act or stances expressed through linguistic forms; and (2) indirect index, situational meanings further expressed by those forms. In sum, the present study primarily suggests that the situational and contextual indexicality of politeness is not connoted merely via linguistic forms but

through nonverbal forms as well. In addition, the use of dominance cues or proxemics could directly index impolite stance, but may indirectly index situational intent to affiliate with the interlocutor when an asymmetry of social power exists in the interaction. Lastly, gender identity can be also indexed through nonverbal behavior in both deferential and intimate situations.

5.5. Conclusion

It should be acknowledged that the results of the current study may have been influenced by several factors involving the sample size of data and formal research environment (e.g., a sound booth, existence of experimenter, and specific tasks) other than the interactive attitude of the participants and interlocutors, culture-specific factors and the participants' gender. However, the statistical analyses still sufficiently demonstrated the necessity of studies on kinetic cues of politeness and intimacy as there are significant difference between two conditions encompassing different social power and social distance. In general, the Korean and Japanese participants avoided using dominance cues and proxemics in order to signal politeness, although not all measured nonverbal cues were found to be important. Also, the findings showed a decision of utilizing particular nonverbal cues may depend on the situational and contextual stance of the speaker as the way in which verbal cues are used as a symbol of politeness and impoliteness. Therefore, the present investigation indicates that politeness can be expressed via nonverbal cues. Yet, we do not know how these visual cues can be simultaneously incorporated with other cues such as verbal cues and prosodic variations, and on what cue we are more likely to rely. Consequently, further research is required in order for understanding politeness as a multi-modal phenomenon.

Examinations on facial expressions should be particularly conducted since the current study captured only the side face of the participants, so that it was difficult to identify what facial expressions are correlated with politeness. Moreover, a perception test should be carried out since previous studies have revealed a discordance between nonverbal behaviors that are rated to be dominant by the actual users and observers'

rating. For example, Gifford (1994) reported that observers saw that headshaking and direct body orientation towards the interactant correlate with dominance, whereas the senders of dominance cues self-reported that those behaviors aimed to show dominance. Therefore, through perception research we could find out whether Korean and Japanese people can distinguish polite occasions from impolite ones when only kinetic cues are available. In sum, more attention should be given to the kinetic politeness cues and also other modalities as well because we can obtain various hints contributing to apprehending multi-modal communicative models of human interactions.

CHAPTER VI

GESTURAL SPACE AND POLITENESS

6.1. Introduction

Over several decades, there has been a large volume of studies on nonverbal behavior as cues of dominance in various fields such as anthropology, sociology, ethology, psychology, biology and so forth. For instance, in the psychological test by Schwartz, Tesser, and Powell (1982), American undergraduate students were requested to mark whether two figures in a set of illustrations is dominant or not. In the study, six different factors were manipulated including the posture of two figures (sitting or standing), sitting on right side or left side, sex of two figures, elevation of person (higher or lower), and precedence of person (in front of or behind the interactant). Schwartz and his colleagues found that the higher elevation, standing posture, precedence (being in front of the interactant), and laterality (being on the right side) are the signifiers of dominance. In a similar vein, Burgoon and Dunbar (2006) also mentioned that power or dominance could be physically conceptualized in the forms of threat, size or strength, and expressivity. These precedent studies on a presentation of dominance via nonverbal behavior have commonly and consistently proposed that the person holding more power uses his or her body in a wider space than the subordinate.

Indeed, this relation between dominance and body mass is not sensational. In the animal kingdom, it is not difficult observe that the bigger and older male animals are more likely to fight competitors for mating and food. For example, if you had a dog, you would have seen that dogs bristle hair up when fighting with or threatening another dog, or lie down on the floor showing their abdomen to signal a surrender. Thus, leaving the body mass aside, animals generally control their body size in order to display predominance or submission. Then, we could possibly hypothesize that this physical dominance signifier can be applied to human relations as well. Actually, there is an approach associating human body mass with dominance in the linguistic field. The

Frequency Code (Ohala, 1994) primarily poses that larger animals are more likely to have a bigger vocal track which can lead to a lower-pitched voice compared to their smaller competitors or preys, and this tendency is also observed in the humankind. For example, women or children having a relatively smaller vocal track which causes a high-pitched voice are possibly more associated with images of submissiveness, helplessness, femininity and the like than adult males. From this point of view, we can suppose that small body expressions may be related to politeness in the context of asymmetrical social power.

There have been a series of studies supporting the relation between power/dominance and nonverbal behaviors. Carney et al. (2005) systematically investigated how seventy distinct types of nonverbal behaviors are associated with power which is a concept based on both one's personality and status. What Carney and her colleagues identified specially related to body size was more frequent open postural behaviors and gestural expressiveness from high power individuals. Brown and Prieto (2017) and Brown and Winter (2019) reported similar findings that hand gestures often occupied a relatively larger gesture space in interactions with the intimate or the subordinate. However, it might be difficult to make a direct connection between power and large gesture space which are particularly created using both hands in Korean and Japanese societies due to culture-specific polite rituals. Park (1990), for example, states how deference is expressed by providing an example of a gift giving ritual in Korean and Japanese, that is, gifts should be taken with both hands especially when the gift giver is a social superior. Another famous ritual using both hands to show deference in East Asian countries would be business card exchanges as Hooker (2012) introduces.

The present study therefore aims to test the foregoing findings related to nonverbal behavior taking place in a relatively large space and, if possibly, add new empirical evidence that indicates a strong correlation between size of nonverbal cues and (im)politeness. In terms of the focus of the study, particularly, even though there are various kinds of nonverbal cues likely to be scrutinized, the setting of interaction in the present study constrains few body movements, e.g., participants stayed sitting down on a chair and kept the same physical distance throughout the experiment. Consequently, the

present chapter exclusively examines the size of manual gestures as a cue of politeness since movements of hands are the most free and visible among several physical movements in the given datasets.

6.2. Methodology

6.2.1. Data

As used in the studies of preceding chapters, the same Korean and Japanese datasets were employed for the study of the current chapter. The data is particularly from interactions including fourteen Korean university students and seven Japanese university students. They respectively performed tasks with two different interlocutors, a professor and a close friend, in order to control the degree of social power and social distance. With two different interactants, the subjects separately completed three tasks in a row: (1) the movie task, talking about movies that the participants had recently watched at the time of the data collection; (2) the narrative task, explaining the plot of an animation which the participant watched before performing the task; and (3) the role-play task, doing a role play in the context of apologizing to the interlocutor. All the interactions were video-taped and the gestures were coded with ELAN.

6.2.2. Analysis

To begin, the definition of ‘size’ should be defined. Although this research adopts the term ‘size’ for its quantitative analysis, what it actually measures is how large a space a stroke of manual gesture or a position of gesture takes. A stroke is the peak of gesture, and it usually appears in the central gesture space (McNeill, 1992: 83). Therefore, each gestural peak was recorded and coded as either ‘Big’ or ‘Small’. In terms of the justification of the dichotomous categorization, even though the present study employs the coding convention for gesture space which is introduced in the work of McNeill (1992: 86-89), modification was made for the experimental setting and data size of the present study. The gesture transcription of McNeill is based on a system of concentric

squares: (1) the Center-Center, the sector directly in front of the gesturer's chest; (2) the Center, the square surrounding the sector of Center-Center in which the vertical boundary reaches the height of shoulders and the lower part of the abdomen and the horizontal boundary reaches the width of both shoulders; (3) the Periphery, the square surrounding the sector of Center in which the vertical boundary reaches the gesturer's forehead and bottom of body and the horizontal boundary reaches the width of both armrests of chair; and (4) the Extreme Periphery, the space between the outer limit and the Periphery.

Unlike McNeill's division of gestural space into four different categories, the current study simplified the transcript code of gesture space with two sectors: (1) Big, the sector above the Center-Center in the vertical dimension and beyond the Center in horizontal dimension; and (2) Small, the sector below the Center-Center in the vertical dimension and inside the Center in horizontal dimension. In addition, the transcriptional system of gesture space by McNeill is for when the transcriber looks at the gesturer from the direct front. However, the depth of gesture or the front-back dimension is available since the visual information in the data captured the side profile of participants. Thus, if the peak of gesture crossed the midpoint of two participants, it is considered as Big, and Small if not. To summarize, this study measures the gestural size in three different dimensions: vertical, side-to-side, and front-back dimensions.

Based on the spatial categories of manual gesture, all gestures were transcribed as 'B' standing for 'Big' or 'S' standing for 'Small' with ELAN as utilized for the analysis on general nonverbal cues of dominance and intimacy in the previous chapter. In order to identify how differently the Korean and Japanese participants manipulate the size of their manual gesture under the binary interactive types associated to power relation, the proportion of big gesture to the total occurrences of manual gesture was calculated by dividing the frequency of big gesture by the total number of manual gestures in each task, and the value was all converted into a percentage to facilitate a statistical analysis. In addition to coding size according to three different dimensions, the proportion of using of 'both hands' in the total number of manual gestures with each distinct interactional type was also compared because gesturing with both hands could be associated to both big physical size and deference. In the process of coding by ELAN, if both hands were

employed, it was coded as ‘Y’ or ‘N’ if not. Moreover, in regard to the size of manual gesture, the proportions of ‘big’ gestures and the proportion of using both hands in the total frequency of manual gesture were compared with dependent observation *t*-tests.

6.2.3. Hypothesis

Based on the precedent studies on nonverbal behaviors of dominance and power (e.g., Brown and Prieto, 2017; Brown and Winter, 2019; Carney, Hall and LeBeau, 2005), first, it is expected that the main participants would less frequently produce large-size gestures with an open position across all the three dimensions in the interaction with the status-superior compared the interaction with the status-equal. With regard to the use of both hands, it has been consistently reported that both hands are preferred to one hand in the deferential situations (e.g., Brown and Winter, 2019; Dennison and Bergen, 2010). Therefore, the second hypothesis is that the participants are more likely to use both hand than one hands in the performance with the status-superior than the performance with the status-equal.

6.3. Results

6.3.1. General Findings

This section reports the findings of *t*-tests comparing effect of interaction types on use of gestural spaces. First, the first column of Table 24 and 25 presents three different dimensions where big-size manual gestures appear and use of both hands that the current study particularly focuses on. The second column presents whether the use of a particular gestural space increases or not in the deferential condition. ‘Positive’ direction indicates that participants’ production of big-size gestures increase in the corresponding gestural space, while ‘negative’ direction means the opposite pattern. The third column presents whether the difference between the mean value in deferential and non-deferential interactive conditions was statistically significant or not.

Table 24 below illustrates that production of big-size manual gestures by Korean subjects generally decreased across the three dimensions in the deferential condition. In addition, they produced more gestures with both hands in the same condition. On the other hand, following Table 25 shows that use of gesture spaces by Japanese subjects is not compatible with the Korean data. While they are unlikely to produce vertically big gestures in deferential situations, use of laterally big gestures increased in the same type of interaction even though the statistical significance is not robust. Also, use of both hands to produce gestures decreased unlike Korean data. The following sections explain the statistical analysis in detailed with descriptive statistics and visual examples.

Table 24. Use of gestural spaces by Korean speakers

Gesture space	Direction	*p*-value
Vertical dimension	Negative	$p = 0.082$
Lateral dimension	Negative	$p = 0.025$
Front-back dimension	Negative	$p = 0.074$
Both hands	Positive	$p = 0.002$

Table 25. Use of gestural spaces by Japanese speakers

Gesture space	Direction	*p*-value
Vertical dimension	Negative	$p = 0.085$
Lateral dimension	Positive	$p = 0.674$
Frontal-back dimension	-	-
Both hands	Negative	$p = 0.917$

6.3.2. Vertical Dimension

The proportion of big gestures in the vertical dimension corresponds to the frequency of big gesture out of the total frequency of manual gesture. The proportion of gesture that reached the space above the subject's chest in the two different conditions

driven by social variables was compared with a dependent observation *t*-test. The descriptive statistics of vertically big gestures produced by the Korean participants are reported in Table 26. A statistically significant difference was not found between deferential and non-deferential interactions, even though they more frequently produced big gesture when performing with a friend compared to the performance with a professor. However, use of a vertically big gestural space decreased at the statistically significant level when performing the movie task. This is noteworthy since the number of lexical items manipulated for the movie task was the least as Chapter IV shows.

Table 26.

Descriptive Statistics for the Proportion of Vertically Big Gesture in the Korean Data

Type of interlocutor	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Friend	14	70.83	16.57
Professor	14	59.88	28.46

For example, Participant 1 (P1) raised both hands above the chest level and waved her right hand explaining that a movie's contents are not as good as its computer graphics when interacting with her friend as in Figure 5 below, while she raised her right hand below the chest level talking about the same movie and its visual in the interaction with the professor as in Figure 6. However, this kind of disparity was not earned from other tasks. Thus, the result shows that the Korean subjects of the current data used a larger space to produce their gesture with their friend than with a professor when they describe a story.

Figure 5. P1 praising computer graphic works of a movie when interacting with a status-equal (Movie task)

Figure 6. P1 praising the same content as in Figure 5 when interacting with a status-superior (Movie task)

On the other hands, the descriptive statistics of the Japanese data is reported in Table 27. The Japanese speaker more frequently produced vertically large gestures in intimate situations than deferential situations, but the difference was not statistically significant thought it was close to the significance level ($t(6) = 2.06$, $p = .085$).

Table 27.

Descriptive Statistics for the Proportion of Vertically Big Gesture in the Japanese Data

Type of interlocutor	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Friend	7	55.99	30.60
Professor	7	41.71	32.62

6.3.3. Side-to-side Dimension

The proportion of big gestures in the side-to-side dimension is also obtained from the proportion of big gestures to the total frequency of manual gesture. The mean values of the two different types in interactions were compared by dependent observation *t*-tests and the statistical information of the Korean and Japanese data is described in Table 28

and Table 29 respectively. In terms of the Korean college students, they generally utilized a laterally larger space in the non-deferential situations (M = 21.11, SD = 16.66) than the deferential situations (M = 13.45, SD = 13.20), $t(13) = 2.54$, $p = .025$, 95% CI [1.15, 14.18].

Table 28.

Descriptive Statistics for the Proportion of Laterally Big Gesture in the Korean Data

Type of interlocutor	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Friend	14	21.11	16.66
Professor	14	13.45	13.20

As an example, in the narration task, Participant 10 (P10) placed his right hand on the right side of his body and raised his hand to describe how a cat climbs up inside a drainpipe when the interlocutor was his friend as in Figure 7, whereas the same gesture appeared in front of his body when the interlocutor was a professor as in Figure 8.

Figure 7. P10 describing an animation character climbing inside drainpipe in a non-deferential situation (Narrative task)

Figure 8. P10 describing the same character's action as in Figure 5 in a deferential situation (Narrative task)

On the other side, the statistic result determined that there was no statistically meaningful distinction between the interaction with the status-superior and the status-equal in the Japanese data. If taking a look at the average proportion of laterally large gesture in Table 29, the Japanese participants rather generally took up a bigger space for gesture when interacting with the status-superior than when interacting with the status-equal over all the three tasks.

Table 29.

Descriptive Statistics for the Proportion of Laterally Big Gesture in the Japanese Data

Type of interlocutor	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Friend	7	13.52	12.58
Professor	7	16.27	22.23

6.3.4. Front-back Dimension

The proportion of big gesture in the front-back dimension is equivalent to the proportion of the big gesture to the total number of manual gestures. In order to make a comparison between the mean values of different interaction types, a dependent observation *t*-test was undertaken. The statistic values of the Korean data are reported in Table 30.

Table 30.

Descriptive Statistics for the Proportion of Frontally Big Gesture in the Korean Data

Type of interlocutor	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Friend	14	1.58	2.87
Professor	14	0.06	0.24

Even though Korean students more frequently gestured in front of themselves in a larger space in intimate situations than deferential situations in general, the difference between the two interactive types ended in failure to reach the statistically significant level due to the limited occurrences of large gestures.

6.3.5. Use of Both Hands

The proportion of using both hands is corresponding to the percentage of the use of both hands in the total frequency of manual gesture. Dependent observation *t*-tests are carried out to compare the mean values of two kinds of interaction. The descriptive statistics for the Korean data are reported in Table 31. The Korean subjects more frequently used both their hands when interacting with the professor (M = 47.41, SD = 24.77) compared to when interacting with the friend (M = 33.28, SD = 16.61), $t(13) = -3.76$, $p = .002$, 95% CI [-22.25, -6.02]. Particularly, an increase in the use of both hands was statistically robust for both the movie task and the narrative task.

For example, in the first task with the status-equal, Participant 9 (P9) pointed toward the interlocutor with his left hand asking about movies which his partner had recently watched as Figure 9 demonstrates below, while he pointed the interlocutor with both hands when asking the same question in the interaction with the status-superior as seen in Figure 10.

Table 31.

Descriptive Statistics for the Proportion of Using Both hands in the Korean Data

Type of interlocutor	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Friend	14	33.28	16.61
Professor	14	47.41	24.77

Note. The distributions of the proportion of using both hands by tasks and interlocutors were all unimodal and approximately symmetrical with no severe skew and outliers.

Figure 9. P9 pointing the interactant when asking about movies in a non-deferential situation (Movie task)

Figure 10. P9 pointing the interactant when asking about movies in a deferential situation (Movie task)

On the other hand, the descriptive statistics for the Japanese data is summarized in Table 32. Unlike the Korean data, a significant distinction was not found between the different interaction types in the uses of both hands by the Japanese participants.

Table 32.

Descriptive Statistics for the Proportion of Using Both Hands in the Japanese Data

Type of interlocutor	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Friend	7	44.51	9.72
Professor	7	42.32	12.77

Note. The distributions of the proportion of using both hands by tasks and interlocutors were all unimodal and approximately symmetrical with no severe skew and outliers.

6.4. Discussion

To summarize the results, first, the Korean students more frequently produced manual gestures in a vertically and horizontally smaller space when they were in a socially inferior position. This inclination is more evident among the female participants than male participants. In addition, the Korean subjects were also more likely to gesture with their both hands rather than one hand when interacting with the status-superior. In this case, female participants more frequently employed both-handed gestures even when performing with the status-equal. Therefore, the findings from the analysis supported the previous research on gestural size and gesture space. On the other hand, in terms of the Japanese participants, it is turned out that they did not particularly differentiate the size of gesture even with an asymmetry in social power. However, the female Japanese participants more frequently used their both hands when interacting with the status-superior as observed in the Korean data. In this section, feasible factors leading to these results will be considered.

To begin with, attention should be given to the results of the Korean data since the Korean subjects distinctly controlled the size of manual gesture or gesture space in order to signal submissiveness or intimacy. This implies a possibility that the Koreans were more sensitive to hierarchical power than the Japanese in regard to determining the level of politeness (Tamaoka et al., 2010), and thereby are more likely to employ or avoid the dominant nonverbal behaviors. In the deferential situations, the smaller the space a particular physical movement occupies, the more the level of politeness increases. However, this correlation was observed only in the dimensions of verticality and laterality from the Korean data, but not in the frontal dimension in both Korean and Japanese data. There might be various factors underlying this inconsistency in the use of gestural space, and the nature of research setting could be attributable to it.

As the process of data collection in Korean was conducted in a sound booth, the space the participants could make use of was somewhat constrained. Then, it is reasonable to surmise that the distance between the main and subsidiary participants was not sufficiently large enough to signify politeness or impoliteness due to the concept of personal distance. According to Proxemic Theory (Hall, 1966), intimacy is correlated to interpersonal distance and sensory exposure including visual, tactile, auditory, and olfactory stimulation. Hall (1966) suggests four classifications of informal spacing distances among Americans: intimate, personal, social, and public distance in the front-back dimension. Specially, Hall (1966) defines that 'intimate distance' is a distance from touching to eighteen inches with poor vision and perceptions of heat and olfaction at an increased level, and 'personal distance' is interaction at approximately length of one's arm with non-blurry vision and increased vocalizations. Even though some of following studies (e.g. Baldassare and Feller, 1975; Sussman and Rosenfeld, 1982; Gillespie and Leffler, 1983) proposed cross-cultural differences in proxemic behavior, if Hall's (1966) categories of distance were applied to the Korean data of the present study, the distance between two interlocutors' legs was in 'intimate distance' in general. Since the Korean participants were not allowed to move their chair, and there were walls behind them, they lacked the means to increase the interpersonal distance to show their politeness. Furthermore, they did not need to produce big-size manual gestures in order to signal

intimacy with their friend because the front-back distance is already close enough. In addition to the Korean data, the Japanese students also did not differentiate the gesture space to signal intimacy. However, it is unclear whether this correlation between immobility of the laboratory setting and a lack of intimacy signals is due to the duplication of the methodology adopted for the Korean data or other factors such as cultural or intrapersonal variations. Thus, a follow-up investigation providing more personal distance or allowing to control interpersonal distance is required in order to prove the association between politeness and big-size gesture in the front-back dimension.

In addition to the spatial size of gesture, use of both hands was found as an indicator of deference in the analysis of the Korean data. In South Korea, giving and receiving an object including alcohol with both hands have been reported as a sign of deference (see Brown and Winter, 2019; Dennison and Bergen, 2010). Moreover, when exchanging business cards in business meetings, Koreans present and receive the cards with both hands (Lee, 2012). This ritual of using both hands seems to be acquired in an early age in Korean culture. Shin (2010: 105) argues that it is considered rude to take something that is considered important or passed from the hands of adults with one hand. Thus, Korean caregivers or teachers of institutions discipline if their children fail to receive anything given by adults with both hands. These previous studies indicate a culture-specific custom that dictates that the use of both hands is required in formal contexts or interaction with the status-superior. In the work of Mehrabian (1968), it is stated that hand relaxation is associated to relatively greater status, and “hands in motion” is classified as a “very tense” gesture. In the case of Korean culture, thus, nonuse of both hands could be a signal of dominance or intimacy, while other cultures may take their own peculiar forms of hand relaxations as a dominance cue.

The inconsistency between two different language groups could call upon other plausible explanations. Firstly, the sample size of data might not be sufficiently large enough to lead to clear-cut results. Especially, some might ascribe the reason as to why the gestural space did not appear to be significant in the Japanese data to the limited size of data. Nevertheless, in the previous chapter on the lexical density dealing with the same

Japanese data, the effect of social power and social distance between interactants were found in various lexical items and proven by a statistic analysis. Therefore, in spite of a probability to earn a different result with bigger size of data, we could also consider the possibility that speakers of Japanese may just rely more on other linguistic expressions such as verbal expressions, tone of voice, or manipulating size of other nonverbal expressions not covered in the present study.

For example, Winter and Grawunder (2012) investigated the phonetic properties of formal and informal speech registers in Korean by examining F0, intensity, voice quality, speaking rate. The researchers found that when speaking in a formal speech register, Korean male and female speakers generally lowered their average pitch, and a decrease in the variation of range in fundamental frequency and intensity was also found. Furthermore, formality occasioned the breathiness-related changes, slower speech rate and frequent non-lexical fillers. The findings suggest that a variety of different means of vocal expression play an important role in signaling formality in Korean. While Winter and Grawunder (2012) conducted a production research, Brown et al. (2014) conducted a perception test to confirm whether Korean and American listeners can distinguish the intended honorific level of Korean utterance from phonetic information alone without morphological and lexical marking. They found that American and Korean listeners both performed above chance although the English listeners were worse than Koreans. The results indicate that even though phonetic cues are considered as secondary, there may be specific contexts in which their role supersedes that of morphological and lexical forms. These studies on Korean strengthen the possibility that Japanese might be dependent on other modalities to determine and evaluate politeness.

Secondly, it should be acknowledged that the results could have arisen due to influence from the research setting. The participants were all college students who are not familiar with research environments involving a laboratory of linguistic studies, a sound booth, video cameras, microphones and the like. Consequently, they might feel pressure from the unnatural circumstance to behave in a way how they normally do because their interactions were all video-taped in real time. In other words, there could be a possibility that the participants consciously controlled their body movements. Nonetheless, it is not

rare, but not familiar either, for college students to visit an office of a professor or an instructor in order for asking questions related to class or consulting about academic career. Although it is apparent that the setting of the present study could be unnatural to interact with a friend to what extent, the formality and unfamiliarity for interacting with a professor would not differ from the real interaction with professors. Thus, we can suppose that the participants of the current study were likely to act in a similar way as they would in authentic interactions to demonstrate their politeness to the status-superior.

In addition to the experimental circumstance, the given context for each task such as talking on specific topics (movies and a story of animation) and apologizing might not be a sufficiently strong or ideal speech act to result in a behavioral contrast in performing politeness or impoliteness. However, the present study's analysis showed that vertically small gesture space and use of both hands were the feature of doing deference particularly in the movie task. This task-specific characteristic could be related to the speakers' verbal strategies of politeness. In Chapter IV, it was found that the least number of lexical items were manipulated to do deference for the movie task by Korean speakers, while there was no big difference between the narrative task and the role-play task in terms of change in the quantity of lexical items. Conversation about movies is qualitatively different to story-telling and role-play since the goal of the movie task is less constrained and more casual than the other two, subsequently, speakers have more chances to socialize and affiliate with their interactant. Thus, controlling gestural size might be a way to offset the relatively less polite verbal expressions by Koreans. On the other hand, Korean participants more frequently utilized both hands for the narrative task with a statistical significance as well. Although they expressed politeness by manipulating the greatest number of lexical items among the three tasks, there might be inevitable moments to use big-size gestures when explaining location and movement of main characters and shape of items at a higher frequency than that for the other tasks in order to enhance the addressee's understanding. Then, using both hands would be more effective to show the speaker's deference than shrinking gestural space because it is the more visually salient.

Then, why did this study fail to observe this kind of balancing between use of verbal and nonverbal cues in Korean? We could come up with two plausible accounts in terms of the Japanese data; the size of gesture is not the predominant cue of politeness, or the size of gesture matters in other contexts. In order to test the latter, a follow-up experiment could be conducted with different speech contexts. As another possible reason relevant to the research setting, the criteria for big-size gesture should be brought up. Since the methodology employed to analyze the Japanese data was duplicated from the one for the Korean data, it might not be sufficient enough to draw the line between politeness and impoliteness, though the biggest point of gestural stroke in the Japanese data did not differ from the Korean data. Thus, the binary distinction of gestural space, big or small, can be replaced with finer categories such as big, medium or small for the future follow-up research. Lastly, the gender of the interlocutor would be another factor affecting the Japanese data. Unlike the Korean data having a male professor as the status-superior, two professors with different sex participated in the Japanese group. If the interactant's gender were a strong factor to cause a difference in nonverbal behavior in Japanese, it would be less possible to identify a uniform tendency. A compatible study should be followed in order to confirm this possibility.

6.5. Conclusion

It was revealed that manipulating the size of gestural space in the vertical and side-to-side dimensions and using both hands are substantially correlated to politeness in Korean, while such correlation is not significant in Japanese. This result could be supportive evidence to propose that politeness is embodied in different modalities across different cultures, e.g. a visual modality in Korean. In order to confirm this argument, a perception test on the relation between the gesture size and the degree of politeness would be required. For example, playing video clips with no sounds showing only the main participants producing different size of gestures and having participants evaluate the degree of politeness would help us figure out whether the size of gesture is a primary or secondary indicator of politeness. Also, with the same methodology, other modalities,

such as an increase or a decrease in pitch, volume of voice, or speech rate, could be tested to identify the significance as an indicator of politeness. In conclusion, the present study demonstrated that politeness is a multimodal phenomenon, and it reinforces the necessity to examine various modalities of politeness.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

7.1. Summary of the Main Findings and Points

This dissertation explored diverse ways in which politeness is both verbally and nonverbally expressed by native speakers of Korean and Japanese by drawing a comparison between deferential and intimate situations. This study distinguishes itself from other research undertaken into politeness in its methodological approach, even though the theoretical approach is aligned with other recent investigations such as discursive approaches which emphasize the situated and context-based features of politeness, but prefer micro qualitative methods. The quantitative analysis of this study indeed added evidence to the socio-cultural view that politeness is closely associated with social norms providing rationality of a particular social behavior.

Chapter IV focused on selections of lexical items and the quantity of lexical information in deferential situations. Previous studies such as Winter and Grawunder (2011) observed that utterances produced in the formal speech register are denser compared to those in informal speech in terms of the number of words. However, those observations have not led to finer examinations on what contributes to the increased density, and failed to explain whether the change in lexical density causes any difference in the actual amount of lexical information which the addressee can access. Moreover, the extent of reliance on honorifics to do deference has not been not statistically examined, although use of honorifics has been consistently viewed as a politeness strategy in Korean and Japanese. Thus, I first confirmed the actual quantity of honorifics in a deferential context, and then tested whether the entire amount of general lexical information and particular lexical items related to (in)formality differ in deferential and non-deferential conditions. The analysis statistically supported the conventional one-to-one mapping between politeness and the polite speech style in Korean and Japanese which has been often brought up in research on politeness. However, it should not be

interpreted that use of honorifics exclusively alludes to politeness, but we should see the result that honorifics are employed under a range of social norms, even though it can index different social meanings according to contexts. The results further demonstrated that the total number of morphemes declined in deferential situations, but the number of content words which are directly related to the lexical density rose in interactions in Korean, while the direction of change is completely the opposite in Japanese. In terms of other lexical items, the quantity was varied in frequency within deferential and non-deferential situations. In sum, the quantitative analysis of this chapter indicates that use of particular lexical items including honorifics are determined by social norms to some extent which can be seen from the statistics, and such social expectations are not just context-specific but also culture-specific.

This chapter also looked at effect of task types on the quantity of lexical information. The findings indicated that task types affected the manipulation of the quantity of lexical information as well. In both Korean and Japanese, use of honorifics is significantly frequent in deferential situations, even though using other formality-related words is different depending on the task type. As for the quantity of general lexical information, Korean speakers especially relied on the general lexical information for the narrative task, whereas Japanese speakers managed the lexical density for the role-play. The findings related to task types imply that individual speakers delicately manage their verbal production to index a specific social meaning in distinct contexts.

Chapter V examined multimodal indexicality of politeness by looking at nonverbal behavior which has been emphasized in research of politeness phenomena as Brown and Winter (2019: 26) point out. The theoretical approach of this chapter was established based upon the literature of social psychology which concentrates on manifestation of power in nonverbal communication. Preceding studies on interpersonal relationships with asymmetrical power revealed that those holding greater power more frequently move their body and use wider space for it compared to less dominant ones (cf. Burgoon and Dunbar, 2006; Dunbar and Burgoon, 2005; Jayagopi et al., 2009). As for the methodological approach, this study selected a number of particular nonverbal behavior referring to the categories in Brown and Winter's (2019) research: manual

gesture, head movement (nodding and shaking), body movement (straightening, constraining, etc.), eye contact (maintaining and avoiding) and physical contact. The frequency of each nonverbal expression found respectively in intimate and deferential situations was statistically compared in this chapter. It was observed that there was a decrease in the frequency of manual gesture, head-shaking, and self-touchless and an increase in the frequency of nods, back-stretches and avoidance of eye contact within the deferential condition in Korean. On the other hand, less head shaking, less self-touch, and more frequent back-stretching were characteristics of deferential situations in Japanese. This result demonstrated how politeness can be systemically expressed by nonverbal means beyond the verbal dimension, and cross-cultural difference implies there is a culture-specific nature to the multimodality of politeness.

Chapter VI also forms its theoretical base from social psychological studies that deal with nonverbal dominance cues characterized by larger gestural space. Referring to the convention of gesture transcription by McNeill (1992), the gesture space was divided into big and small in vertical, lateral and frontal dimensions. In addition to the physical size of gesture, the use of both hands is directly related to gesture space. The frequency of gesture taking up the big gesture space in deferential and non-deferential situations was statistically compared. The analysis found that Korean speakers more frequently produced manual gestures in vertically and horizontally smaller space to express politeness, while Japanese speakers did not differ in size of gesture within different types of interactions.

7.2. Contribution to the Field and Directions for Future Research

The analysis presented in this dissertation contributes largely to our understanding of (1) the relation between the quantity of lexical information and politeness and (2) nonverbal practices of politeness. In particular, quantitative analysis proved (im)politeness is comprised of sets of sophisticated verbal and nonverbal systems. Every speaker of a particular society or community holds a general idea of what verbal and nonverbal expressions are polite or not, for example, young people should address the

elderly by using polite words such as honorifics and bowing is a polite behavior and so on in Korea and Japan. This general knowledge about (im)politeness prevalent in the society has been buttressed by a number of studies with numerous concrete examples. However, one issue which has seldom brought up to the surface by researchers is that we do not know to what extent we actually rely on such linguistic devices in order to express politeness. An argument which recent politeness studies commonly make is that (im)polite verbal and nonverbal expressions are used to determine the relation between the speaker and the addressee, rather than directly index (im)politeness. Speech style shifting between the polite and non-polite forms in the same interaction is often taken as supportive evidence of such argument. Although the way of presenting politeness is dependent upon individual strategies, we do have so-called social norms which underlie demeanor of members of the society. In other words, individual politeness strategies are carried out in the boundary of social norms on most of the occasions. Then, is there any means to figure out when a certain verbal or nonverbal politeness strategy can be considered as one of the social norms? One of the most crucial contributions of this study to the field of politeness research is that the statistical analysis can reveal what particular verbal and nonverbal behaviors are part of social norms.

Even though there were a variety of uncontrollable factors which could have affected the speaker's choice of verbal and nonverbal behavior including topics, personality, distance with the interactant, expertise in particular fields and so forth in the experiments of the current study, it was revealed that speakers of Korean and Japanese did have certain behavioral patterns. In other words, this finding implies that there exist social norms and people follow them to a statistically significant extent. Due to the preference for qualitative analysis of conversation to capture the contextual features of politeness, arguments with respect to politeness phenomena have been not statistically substantiated so far. However, the current study demonstrated that quantitative evidence can reinforce the socio-cultural perspective of politeness which views politeness as a social action. Especially, cross-cultural analysis further showed how each social group has distinct social norms.

The other significant contribution is seen in the providing of new evidence of the multimodal nature of (im)politeness which is examined with actual interactions. This study is not the first attempt to examine paralinguistic components of politeness, but prior studies on multimodality of politeness in Korean and Japanese had many limitations in terms of the source and quantity of their data. In addition, whereas verbal strategies of politeness have been investigated in depth even by dealing with different speech acts, it is not too much to say that the research on nonverbal politeness is at its incipient stage. This study did not simply duplicate the analytical method employed by previous studies such as Brown and Prieto (2017) and Brown and Winter (2019), but made several improvements by controlling interactional setting for comparing behaviors in deferential and non-deferential situations, examining new nonverbal behaviors such as head shaking and measuring size of gestural space. Therefore, this dissertation proposed at direction in which studies on multimodal aspects of politeness can move forward, and how to design and conduct experiments for systematic analysis.

This dissertation also showed how nonverbal cues that have been particularly employed to explain dominance, submission, and intimacy in interpersonal relationships mainly by social psychology literature can also be used to interpret a speaker's doing deference. This implies that (im)politeness is a concept which is closely tied to interpersonal power. There are other social factors influencing nonverbal behavior to express power relations between interactants such as familiarity and mental/physical distance, and studies examining correlations between such factors and particular modalities of nonverbal communication in different disciplines including psychology, sociology, and anthropology as well. Thus, the present research demonstrates the necessity of a multilateral and interdisciplinary approach in terms of the methodological and analytical facets of politeness studies.

By controlling the experimental conditions, the current study attempted to reveal the influence of various social factors such as age, power relation, task types and cultural specificity. First, effect of task type was also confirmed, that is, speakers employ distinct verbal and nonverbal cues of deference and intimacy for each task. What is inferable from the results is that a speaker's decision to use specific verbal and nonverbal cues of

(im)politeness is determined by contextual factors to a certain degree. In particular, it was revealed that the extent which speakers rely on verbal and nonverbal cues is not always compatible. In other words, a certain task does not necessarily require an increase in both verbal and nonverbal polite expressions. Second, there was apparent cross-cultural difference between Korean and Japanese. In general, Korean speakers used more various multimodal cues of politeness than Japanese speakers. Therefore, this study displayed how closely and diversely social factors are intertwined with (im)politeness in a particular culture.

In addition, this book has important educational implications for teaching pragmatic competence in second language (L2). As Cook (2008) and Brown (2010) point out, model dialogues of recent Japanese and Korean textbooks tend to lack authentic interactive features including speech style shifts and backchannels. In spite of the importance of acquiring L2 pragmatic competence in order to be ready for interacting with speakers of the target language in a more native-like way, the pedagogical emphasis has been placed mainly on the polite speech styles such as honorifics in the classes of Korean and Japanese. My analysis is helpful not just for teachers of foreign languages but also for L2 learners to deepen their insight into actual language use and nonverbal behavior in the contexts to do deference and perform intimacy. This can be achieved by providing authentic data showing how verbal and nonverbal behaviors are flexible and change with the speaker's choice to present a specific emotional and attitudinal stance from moment to moment and how much they are susceptible to the situational and contextual elements. Specifically, my studies demonstrate the necessity of developing multimodal competence in the L2 along with general pragmatic competence.

This study has its limitations as it looked at only three types of contexts: talking about movies, describing scenes from an animation clip, and role-playing. Chapter IV shows the influence of task on the speaker's manipulation of the quantity of lexical information even in the limited number of contexts. Conducting additional analysis examining other interpersonal and interactive contexts will therefore offer further evidence to support the correlation between multimodal expressions and situational factors.

In addition to investigating diverse situational and contextual factors, finer qualitative, and quantitative as well, analysis of nonverbal cues of (im)politeness should be further necessary. Brown and Winter (2019) found that pointing gesture and waving hand(s) are related to performing intimacy. This does not simply mean that politeness and intimacy are expressed with (in)frequent production of manual gesture, but there is a more sophisticated system of using hands to index different social meanings. In terms of how to analyze the use of hands, it is possible to attempt to analyze gesture with McNeil's (2008) gesture categories such as iconic, metaphoric, deictic, and beats. This will deepen our understanding regarding what types of gestures are preferred in expressing (im)politeness in a particular social context since each category represents distinct social meanings and functions.

According to Andersen et al. (2006), narrowing conversational distance and direct body orientation are associated with performing intimacy. However, the present study discussed interactions where interpersonal distance and orientation had been set by the experimenters. This might have influence on the nonverbal behavior even though the position of subjects was determined through reference to the previous literature. If the participants had control in the placement of their chair, we may be able to observe a different use of body expressions and gestural space. That could be the reason why the results of this study's analysis differ from prior studies such as Brown and Winter (2019). Therefore, follow-up experiments that give participants more freedom in their body movement and position will be helpful to draw a comparison with the present study. Moreover, further improvement in the experimental setting can be taken into consideration due to the camera angle which shows participants only in profile, not their full faces. If a pair of cameras are utilized to take both the full face and profile of the participant, we will be able to obtain more various nonverbal information such as facial expressions, lateral space of gesture, body orientation and the like.

APPENDIX

DESCRIPTIC STATISTICS FOR THE LEXICAL INFORMATION

Table 1.

Descriptive Statistics for the quantity of honorifics in Korean

Type of interlocutor	Deferential situation			Non-deferential situation		
	n	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Honorific lexemes	14	6.12	1.91	14	0.32	0.15
Honorific endings	14	4.62	1.35	14	0.17	0.62

Note. The distributions of the quantity of honorifics were all unimodal and approximately symmetrical with no severe skew and outliers.

Table 2.

Descriptive Statistics for the quantity of general lexical density in Korean

Type of interlocutor	Deferential situation			Non-deferential situation		
	n	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Utterances	14	162.79	43.64	14	197.07	60.95
Morphemes	14	1015.00	289.93	14	1199.86	347.90
Content words	14	36.22	1.81	14	35.56	1.41

Note. The distributions of the quantity of general lexical density were all unimodal and approximately symmetrical with no severe skew and outliers.

Table 3.

Descriptive Statistics for the quantity of other lexical items in Korean

Type of interlocutor	Deferential situation			Non-deferential situation		
	n	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Formal datives	14	0.12	0.13	14	0.00	0.00
Formal comitatives	14	0.04	0.06	14	0.01	0.03
Particles ellipsis	14	0.09	0.03	14	0.19	0.05
Mimetics	14	0.23	0.28	14	0.54	0.46
Sino-Korean words	14	12.59	1.42	14	9.92	2.01
Pronouns	14	2.37	1.16	14	4.61	1.23
Fillers	14	39.54	10.26	14	22.60	8.13
Backchannels	14	14.40	5.10	14	9.30	5.95

Note. The distributions of the quantity of other lexical items were all unimodal and approximately symmetrical with no severe skew and outliers.

Table 4.

Descriptive Statistics for the quantity of honorifics in Japanese

Type of interlocutor	Deferential situation			Non-deferential situation		
	n	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Honorific lexemes	7	3.04	1.96	7	0.82	0.59
Honorific endings	7	4.15	0.82	7	0.45	0.38

Note. The distributions of the quantity of honorifics were all unimodal and approximately symmetrical with no severe skew and outliers.

Table 5.

Descriptive Statistics for the quantity of general lexical density in Japanese

Type of interlocutor	Deferential situation			Non-deferential situation		
	n	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Utterances	7	201.43	48.81	7	200.43	28.17
Morphemes	7	1139.00	264.26	7	1039.00	142.41
Content words	7	28.33	2.21	7	29.92	2.37

Note. The distributions of the quantity of general lexical density were all unimodal and approximately symmetrical with no severe skew and outliers.

Table 6.

Descriptive Statistics for the quantity of other lexical items in Japanese

Type of interlocutor	Deferential situation			Non-deferential situation		
	n	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Formal quotatives	7	0.74	0.43	7	0.61	0.31
Particles ellipsis	7	8.90	3.25	7	18.76	4.94
Mimetics	7	0.04	0.09	7	0.26	0.21
Sino-Japanese words	7	6.17	1.48	7	6.38	1.28
Pronouns	7	1.06	0.41	7	1.57	0.94
Fillers	7	26.24	8.84	7	25.19	12.80
Backchannels	7	24.79	10.31	7	19.29	7.25

Note. The distributions of the quantity of other lexical items were all unimodal and approximately symmetrical with no severe skew and outliers.

REFERENCES CITED

Chapter I

Brown, L., & Winter, B. (2019). Multimodal indexicality in Korean:"doing deference" and "performing intimacy" through nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Politeness Research, 15*(1), 25-54.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.

Kádár, D. Z., & Haugh, M. (2013). *Understanding politeness*. Cambridge University Press.

Kádár, D. Z., & Mills, S. (2011). *Politeness in East Asia*. Cambridge University Press.

Winter, B., & Grawunder, S. (2011). The polite voice in Korean: searching for acoustic correlates of contaymal and panmal. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics, 19*, 419-431.

Winter, B., & Grawunder, S. (2012). The phonetic profile of Korean formal and informal speech registers. *Journal of Phonetics, 40*(6), 808-815.

Chapter II

Arundale, R. B. (2010). Relating. In: M. A. Locher and S. L. Graham (eds.) *Interpersonal pragmatics*. Mouton de Gruyter, 137-166.

Bargiela-Chiappini, F. (2003). Face and politeness: new (insights) for old (concepts). *Journal of pragmatics, 35*(10), 1453-1469.

Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied linguistics*, *5*(3), 196-213.

Brown, L. (2010). Observations on Korean and Japanese speech style shifting. *Journal of Korean Culture*, 14, 65-102.

Brown, L. (2011a). *Korean honorifics and politeness in second language learning* (Vol. 206). John Benjamins Publishing.

Brown, L. (2011b). Korean honorifics and 'revealed', 'ignored' and 'suppressed' aspects of Korean culture and politeness. In *Politeness across cultures* (pp. 106-127). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Brown, L. (2015a). Honorifics and politeness. In L. Brown and J. Yeon (eds.) *The handbook of Korean linguistics*, John Wiley & Sons. 303-319.

Brown, L. (2015b). Revisiting "polite"–yo and "deferential"–supnita speech style shifting in Korean from the viewpoint of indexicality. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 79, 43-59.

Brown, L., & Winter, B. (2019). Multimodal indexicality in Korean: "doing deference" and "performing intimacy" through nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Politeness Research, 15*(1), 25-54.

Brown, L., Winter, B., Idemaru, K., and Grawunder. S. (2014). Phonetics and Politeness: Perceiving Korean Honorific and Non-Honorific Speech through Phonetic Cues. *Journal of Pragmatics, 66*, 45-60.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.

Carney, D. R., Hall, J. A., & LeBeau, L. S. (2005). Beliefs about the nonverbal expression of social power. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 29(2), 105-123.

Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mounton de Gruyter.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. MIT press.

Cook, H. M. (1996). Japanese language socialization: Indexing the modes of self. *Discourse Processes, 22*(2), 171-197.

Cook, H. M. (1997) The role of the Japanese masu form in caregiver-child conversation, *Journal of Pragmatics, 28*, 695-718

Cook, H. M. (1998). Situational meanings of Japanese social deixis: The mixed use of the masu and plain forms. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 8*(1), 87-110.

Cook, H. M. (2011). Are honorifics polite? Uses of referent honorifics in a Japanese committee meeting. *Journal of Pra*gmatics, *43*(15), 3655-3672.

Cook, H. M. (2013). A scientist or salesman? Identity construction through referent honorifics on a Japanese shopping channel program. *Multilingua-Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication, 32*(2), 177-202.

Culpeper, J. (2011). It's not what you said, it's how you said it!": Prosody and impoliteness. *Discursive approaches to politeness*, 57-83.

Culpeper, J., & Haugh, M. (2014). *Pragmatics and the English language*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Dunn, C. D. (1999). Public and Private Voices. *Languages of sentiment: Cultural constructions of emotional substrates, 18*, 107.

Dunn, C. D. (2011). Formal forms or verbal strategies? Politeness theory and Japanese business etiquette training. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(15), 3643-3654.

Dunn, C. D. (2013). Speaking Politely, Kindly, and Beautifully: Ideologies of Politeness in Japanese "Business Manners" Training. *Multilingua, 32*(2): 225-245.

Eelen, G. (2001). *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. St Jerome Publishing.

Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2007). Putting communities of practice in their place. *Gender & Language*, *1*(1).

Fukada, A., & Asato, N. (2004). Universal politeness theory: application to the use of Japanese honorifics. *Journal of pragmatics*, *36*(11), 1991-2002.

Fukushima, S. (1996). Request Strategies in British English and Japanese. *Language Sciences*, *18*(3): 671-688.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Prentice-Hall.

Geyer, N. (2008). Interpersonal functions of style shift: The use of plain and masu forms in faculty meetings. *Style Shifting in Japanese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 39-70.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays in face to face behavior*. AldineTransaction.

Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Harvard University Press.

Halliday, M. A. (1970). Language structure and language function. *New horizons in linguistics*, *1*, 140-165.

Haugh, M. (2010). When is an email really offensive?: Argumentativity and variability in evaluations of impoliteness. *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture*, *6*(1), 7-31.

Haugh, M., & Bargiela-Chiappini, F. (2009). Face and interaction. *Face, communication and social interaction*, 1-30.

Hill, B., Ide, S., Ikuta, S., Kawasaki, A., & Ogino, T. (1986). Universals of linguistic politeness: Quantitative evidence from Japanese and American English. *Journal of pragmatics*, *10(3)*, 347-371.

Ide, S. (1982). Japanese sociolinguistics politeness and women's language. *Lingua, 57(2-4)*, 357-385.

Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua-journal of cross-cultural and interlanguage communication, 8(2-3)*, 223-248.

Kádár, D. Z. (2019). Introduction: Advancing linguistic politeness theory by using Chinese data. *Acta Linguistica Academica*, 66(2), 149-164.

Kádár, D. Z., & Haugh, M. (2013). *Understanding politeness*. Cambridge University Press.

Kádár, D. Z., Haugh, M., & Chang, W. L. M. (2013). Aggression and perceived national face threats in Mainland Chinese and Taiwanese CMC discussion boards. *Multilingua*, *32*(3), 343-372

Kádár, D., & Márquez-Reiter, R. (2015). (Im) politeness and (im) morality: Insights from intervention. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 11(2), 239-260.

Kita, S. and Ide, S. (2007). Nodding, aizuchi, and final particles in Japanese conversation: How conversation reflects the ideology of communication and social relationships. *Journal of Pragmatics, 39*(7): 1242-1254.

Kuno, S. (1973). *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. MIT Press.

Lakoff, R. T. (1973). The logic of politeness: Minding your p's and q's. In: C. Corum, T. Smith-Stark and A. Weiser (eds.) *Papers from the Nineth Regional Meeintg of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. *Chicago Linguisitc Society*, 292-305.

Lakoff, R. (1977). What you can do with words: Politeness, pragmatics and performatives. In *Proceedings of the Texas conference on performatives, presuppositions and implicatures* (pp. 79-106). Center for Applied Linguistics Washington, DC.

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Harlow: Longman.

Locher, M. A., & Watts, R. J. (2005). Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of politeness research, 1*, 9-33.

Martin, S. (1964). Speech levels in Japan and Korea. *Language in culture and society*, 407, 415.

Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of pragmatics, 12*(4), 403-426.

Matsumoto, Y. (1989). Politeness and conversational universals–observations from Japanese. *Multilingua-Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication, 8*(2-3), 207-222.

Matsumoto, Y. (1993). Linguistic politeness and cultural style: observations from Japanese. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics, 2*, 55-67.

McKinnon, S., & Prieto, P. (2014). The role of prosody and gesture in the perception of mock impoliteness. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 10(2), 185-219.

Mills, S. (2011). Discursive approaches to politeness and impoliteness. In Linguistics Politeness Research Group (ed.), *Discursive Approaches to Politeness*, 167-188. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter.

Nadeu, M., & Prieto, P. (2011). Pitch range, gestural information, and perceived politeness in Catalan. *Journal of pragmatics*, 43(3), 841-854.

Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village* (Vol. 6). CUP Archive.

Ochs, E. (1990). Indexicality and socialization. *Cultural psychology: Essays on comparative human development*, 287-308.

Ochs, E. (1996). *Linguistic resources for socializing humanity*. Cambridge University Press.

Ofuka, E., McKeown, J. D., Waterman, M. G., & Roach, P. J. (2000). Prosodic cues for rated politeness in Japanese speech. *Speech Communication*, *32*(3), 199-217.

Okamoto, S. (1999) Situated Politeness: Manipulating honorific and non-honorific expressions in Japanese conversations, *Pragmatics*, *9*(1), 51-74, International Pragmatics Association

Payà, M. (2003). Politeness strategies in spoken Catalan: when prosodic and non prosodic elements don't match. In 6th NWCL International Conference: Prosody and Pragmatics, Preston (UK).

Payrató, L. (2002). L'enunciació i la modalitat oracional. Gramàtica del català contemporani, 2, 1149-1220.

Pizziconi, B. (2007). The lexical mapping of politeness in British English and Japanese. *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture*, *3*(2), 207-241.

Pizziconi, B., & Christie, C. (2017). Indexicality and (Im) politeness. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im) politeness* (pp. 143-170). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Saito, J (2010). Subordinates' use of Japanese plain forms: An examination of superior–subordinate interactions in the workplace, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Volume 42, Issue 12, pp. 3271–3282.

Sherr-Ziarko, E. (2018). Prosodic properties of formality in conversational Japanese. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association*, 1-22.

Shibatani, M. (1990). *The language of Japan*. Cambridge University Press.

Tsuji, A. (2004). The case study of high pitch register in English and in Japanese: Does high pitch register relate to politeness. *Seijo English Monographs*, 37, 227-260.

Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.

Watts, R. J. (2005). Linguistic politeness research: Quo vadis. *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory and practice, 2*.

Watts, L. J., Ide, S., and Ehilich, K. (1992). Introduction. In: R. J. Watts, S. Ide and K. Ehlich (eds.) *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice*. Mouton de Gruyter, 1-17.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge University Press.

Wilson, T. P. (1970). Conceptions of interaction and forms of sociological explanation. *American sociological review*, 697-710.

Winter, B., & Grawunder, S. (2012). The phonetic profile of Korean formal and informal speech registers. *Journal of Phonetics*, *40*(6), 808-815.

Yeon, J., & Brown, L. (2013). *Korean: A Comprehensive Grammar*. Routledge.

Yoon, K. J. (2004). Not just words: Korean social models and the use of honorifics. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *1*(2), 189-210.

Chapter III

Alibali, M. W., & Don, L. S. (2001). Children's gestures are meant to be seen. *Gesture*, *1*, 113–127.

Anderson, A. H., Bader, M., Bard, E. G., Boyle, E., Doherty, G., Garrod, S., Isard, S., Kowtko, J., Mcallister, J., Miller, J., Sotillo, C., Thompson, H. S., & Weinert, R. (1991). The HCRC map task corpus. *Language and speech*, *34*(4), 351-366.

Beaulieu, C. (2004). Intercultural study of personal space: A case study. *Journal of applied social psychology*, 34(4), 794-805.

Boyle, E. A., Anderson, A. H., & Newlands, A. (1994). The effects of visibility on dialogue and performance in a cooperative problem solving task. *Language and speech*, *37*(1), 1-20.

Brown, G., Anderson, A., Yule, G., & Shillcock, R. (1983). *Teaching Talk*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, L. (2011). *Korean honorifics and politeness in second language learning* (Vol. 206). John Benjamins Publishing.

Brown, L., & Prieto, P. (2017). (Im) politeness: Prosody and Gesture. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im) politeness* (pp. 357-379). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Brown, L., & Winter, B. (2019). Multimodal indexicality in Korean: "doing deference" and "performing intimacy" through nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Politeness Research*, *15*(1), 25-54.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.

Forsyth, R., Clarke, D. D., & Lam, P. (2008). Timelines, talk and transcription: A chronometric approach to simultaneous speech. *International journal of corpus linguistics*, *13*(2), 225-250.

Hall, J. A., Coats, E. J., & LeBeau, L. S. (2005). Nonverbal behavior and the vertical dimension of social relations: a meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, *131*(6), 898.

Halliday, M . A . K . (1985). *Spoken and written language*. Geelong Vict.: Deakin University.

Johansson, V. (2008). Lexical diversity and lexical density in speech and writing: a developmental perspective. Lund University, Dept. of *Linguistics and Phonetics Working Papers*, 53, 61-79.

Kita, S. (2000). How representational gestures help speaking. *Language and gesture*, *1*, 162-185.

Kita, S., & Özyürek, A. (2003). What does cross-linguistic variation in semantic coordination of speech and gesture reveal?: Evidence for an interface representation of spatial thinking and speaking. *Journal of Memory and language*, *48*(1), 16-32.

Lickley, R. J., & Bard, E. G. (1998). When can listeners detect disfluency in spontaneous speech?. *Language and speech*, *41*(2), 203-226.

McNeill, D. (2005). *Gesture and thought. Chicago*: University of Chicago Press.

McNeill, D., & Duncan, S. (2000). Growth points in thinking-for-speaking. *Language and gesture*, (1987), 141-161.

Tamaoka, K., Yamaguchi, H. L., Miyaoka, Y., & Kiyama, S. (2010). Effects of gender-identity and gender-congruence on levels of politeness among young Japanese and Koreans. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 20(1), 23-45.

Ure, J. (1971). Lexical density and register differentiation. In J.E. Perren & J.L.M. Trim (Eds.), *Applications of linguistics* (443–452). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Winter, B., & Grawunder, S. (2012). The phonetic profile of Korean formal and informal speech registers. *Journal of Phonetics*, 40(6), 808-815.

Chapter IV

Brown, L. (2008). Contrasts Between Korean and Japanese Honorifics. *Rivista degli studi orientali*, *81*(Fasc. 1/4), 369-385.

Brown, L. (2010). Observations on Korean and Japanese speech style shifting. *Journal of Korean Culture*, *14*, 65-102.

Brown, L. (2013). “Mind your own esteemed business”: sarcastic honorifics use and impoliteness in Korean TV dramas. *Journal of Politeness Research*, *9*(2), 159-186.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.

Byon, A. S. (2006). The role of linguistic indirectness and honorifics in achieving linguistic politeness in Korean requests. *Journal of politeness research: language, behavior, culture, 2*. 247-276.

Cook, H. M. (2008). *Socializing identities through speech style: Learners of Japanese as a foreign language* (Vol. 32). Multilingual Matters.

Crookes, G., & Rulon, K. A. (1985). *Incorporation of corrective feedback in native speaker/non-native speaker conversation* (No. 3). Center for Second Language Classroom Research, Social Science Research Institute, University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Dunn, C. D. (1999). Public and Private Voices. *Languages of sentiment: Cultural constructions of emotional substrates, 18*, 107.

Dunn, C. D. (2011). Formal forms or verbal strategies? Politeness theory and Japanese business etiquette training. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(15), 3643-3654.

Eo, S. (2008). Nikkan no daigakusei no keigo koudoo ni mirareru danjosa [Gender differences in politeness behaviors among Japanese and Korean university students]. *Nihon Daigaku Bunri Gakubu Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyuusho Kenkyuu Kiyoo* [Bulletin of the Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences at the College of Humanities and Sciences, Nihon University], *75*, 39–53.

Escandell Vidal, V. (1998). Politeness: A relevant issue for relevance theory. *Revista alicantina de estudios ingleses, 11*, (pp. 45-57).

Geertz, C. (1960). The religion of Java. Glencoe, Ill.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In Peter Cole and Jerry Morgan, eds., *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 2: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press. 41-58.

Hartmann, R. R. K., & Stork, F. C. (1972). *Dictionary of language and linguistics*. London: Applied Science Publishers.

Haugh, M. (2010). When is an email really offensive?: Argumentativity and variability in evaluations of impoliteness. *Journal of Politeness Research, 6*, 7-31.

Hill, B., Ide, S., Ikuta, S., Kawasaki, A., & Ogino, T. (1986). Universals of linguistic politeness: Quantitative evidence from Japanese and American English. *Journal of pragmatics, 10*(3), 347-371.

Janney, R. W., & Arndt, H. (1992). Intracultural tact versus intercultural tact. In *Politeness in Language. Studies in its History, Theory and Practice* (pp. 21-41). Berlin: Mouton-De Gruyter.

Jary, M. (1998). Relevance theory and the communication of politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics, 30*(1), 1-19.

Jo, C-G. (2005). How to teach onomatopoeia and mimetic words. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, 13(3), 61-84.

Johansson, V. (2009). Lexical diversity and lexical density in speech and writing: A developmental perspective. *Working Papers in Linguistics*, *53*, 61-79.

Kageyama, T., & Kishimoto, H. (Eds.). (2016). *Handbook of Japanese lexicon and word formation* (Vol. 3). Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.

Kádár, D. Z., & Haugh, M. (2013). *Understanding politeness*. Cambridge University Press.

Kádár, D. Z., Haugh, M., & Chang, W. L. M. (2013). Aggression and perceived national face threats in Mainland Chinese and Taiwanese CMC discussion boards. *Multilingua*, *32*(3), 343-372.

Kim, Y-T., Yang, M-S., & Lim, W-J. (2014). The effect of the language education using onomatopoeia and mimetic words for the development-delayed children's expressive language. *Korean Journal of Early Childhood Special Education*, 14(4), 195-219.

Kita, S. and Ide, S. (2007). Nodding, aizuchi, and final particles in Japanese conversation: How conversation reflects the ideology of communication and social relationships. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *39*(7): 1242-1254.

Lakoff, R. (1975). Language and woman's place. Language in society, *2*(1), 45-79.

Makino, S., & Tsutsui, M. (1996). *A dictionary of intermediate Japanese grammar*. Japan Times.

Martin, S. (1964). Speech levels in Japan and Korea. *Language in culture and society, 407*, 415.

Maynard, S. K. (1997). Analyzing interactional management in native/non-native English conversation: A case of listener response. IRAL, *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *35*(1), 37.

Morand, D. A. (2000). Language and power: An empirical analysis of linguistic strategies used in superior–subordinate communication. *Journal of organizational behavior*, *21*(3), 235-248.

Ofuka, E., McKeown, J. D., Waterman, M. G., & Roach, P. J. (2000). Prosodic cues for rated politeness in Japanese speech. *Speech Communication*, *32*(3), 199-217.

Ogino, T., & Hong, M. (1992). Nihongo onsei no teineisa ni kansuru kenkyuu (A study on politeness in Japanese speech). In *Nihongo intonation no jittai to bunseki (The State-of-the-art and Analysis of Japanese Intonation)*. (pp. 215-258). Monbushou, Tokyo.

Okamoto, S. (1992). Expressions of request in the Japanese language: Requesters' considerations for requestees' costs. *The Japanese Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 31*(3), 211-221.

Okano, E., & Brown, L. (2018). Did Becky really need to apologise? Intercultural evaluations of politeness. *East Asian Pragmatics, 3*(2), 151-178.

Pizziconi, B., & Christie, C. (2017). Indexicality and (Im)politeness. In *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im) politeness*. (pp. 143-170). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Schegloff, E. A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of 'uh huh'and other things that come between sentences. *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk, 71*, 93.

Sclafani, J. (2009). Martha Stewart behaving Badly: Parody and the symbolic meaning of style 1. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 13*(5), 613-633.

Shin, S. (2005). *Grammaticalization of politeness: A contrastive study of German, English and Korean*. University of California, Berkeley.

Sohn, H. M. (1999). *The Korean Language*. Cambridge University Press.

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). Relevance: Communication and cognition. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). Relevance: Communication and cognition. Second edition. Oxford: Blackwell.

Tamaoka, K., Yamaguchi, H. L., Miyaoka, Y., & Kiyama, S. (2010). Effects of gender-identity and gender-congruence on levels of politeness among young Japanese and Koreans. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 20*(1), 23-45.

Tottie, G. (1991). Conversational style in British and American English: The case of backchannels. In Aijmer, K. & Altenberg, B., eds., *English Corpus Linguistics*, Routledge.

Tokunaga, M. (1992). Dichotomy in the structures of honorifics of Japanese. Pragmatics. *Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA), 2*(2), 127-140.

White, S. (1989). Backchannels across cultures: A study of Americans and Japanese. *Language in Society 18*(1), 59-76.

Winter, B., & Grawunder, S. (2011). The polite voice in Korean: searching for acoustic correlates of contaymal and panmal. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics, 19*, 419-431.

Winter, B., & Grawunder, S. (2012). The phonetic profile of Korean formal and informal speech registers. *Journal of Phonetics, 40*(6), 808-815.

Yeon, J., & Brown, L. (2013). *Korean: A comprehensive grammar*. Routledge.

Yoshida, H. (2012). A cross-linguistic study of sound symbolism in children's verb learning. *Journal of Cognition and Development*, 13(2), 232-265.

Young, R. F., & Miller, E. R. (2004). Learning as changing participation: Discourse roles in ESL writing conferences. *The Modern Language Journal*, *88*(4), 519-535.

Chapter V

Andersen, P. A., Guerrero, L. K., & Jones, S. M. (2006). Nonverbal behavior in intimate interactions and intimate relationships. In *The Sage handbook of nonverbal communication*, 259-277. SAGE Publications Inc.

Argyle, M., & Dean, J. (1965). Eye-contact, distance and affiliation. *Sociometry*, 289-304.

Berger, J., Rosenholtz, S. J., & Zelditch Jr, M. (1980). Status organizing processes. *Annual review of sociology*, 6(1), 479-508.

Brown, L., & Winter, B. (2019). Multimodal indexicality in Korean: "doing deference" and "performing intimacy" through nonverbal behavior. Journal of *Politeness Research*, *15*(1), 25-54.

Burgoon, J. K., & Bacue, A. E. (2003). Nonverbal communication skills. In J. O. Greene & B. R. Burleson (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills*, 179-219. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Burgoon, J. K., Birk, T., & Pfau, M. (1990). Nonverbal behaviors, persuasion, and credibility. *Human Communication Research*, 17, 140–169.

Burgoon, J. K., & Dunbar, N. E. (2006). Nonverbal expressions of dominance and power in human relationships. *The Sage handbook of nonverbal communication.* Sage, 2.

Burgoon, J. K., Guerrero, L. K., & Floyd, K. (2016). *Nonverbal communication*. Routledge.

Burgoon, J. K., & Hale, J. L. (1984). The fundamental topoi of relational communication. *Communication Monographs*, *51*, 193–214.

Burgoon, J. K., & Le Poire, B. A. (1999). Nonverbal cues and interpersonal judgments: Participant and observer perceptions of intimacy, dominance, composure, and formality. *Communications Monographs*, *66*(2), 105-124.

Cheshire, J. (2002). 17 Sex and Gender in Variationist Research. In Chambers, J. K., Trudgill, P., & Schilling-Estes, N. (Eds.), *The handbook of language variation and change*, 423-443. Oxford: Blackwell.

Cook, H. M. (1998). Situational meanings of Japanese social deixis: The mixed use of the masu and plain forms. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 8(1), 87-110.

Cook, H. M. (2013). A scientist or salesman? Identity construction through referent honorifics on a Japanese shopping channel program. *Multilingua-Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 32(2), 177-202.

Coutts, L. M., & Schneider, F. W. (1976). Affiliative conflict theory: An investigation of the intimacy equilibrium and compensation hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *34*(6), 1135.

Dillard, J. P., Wilson, S. R., Tusing, K. J., & Kinney, T. A. (1997). Politeness judgments in personal relationships. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *16*(3), 297-325.

Dittmann, A. T., & Llewellyn, L. G. (1968). Relationship between vocalizations and head nods as listener responses. Journal of personality and social psychology, 9(1), 79-84.

Dunbar, N. E. (2004). Theory in progress: Dyadic power theory: Constructing a communication-based theory of relational power. *Journal of Family Communication*, *4*(3-4), 235-248.

Dunbar, N. E., & Burgoon, J. K. (2005a). Measuring nonverbal dominance. *The sourcebook of nonverbal measures going beyond words*, 361.

Dunbar, N. E., & Burgoon, J. K. (2005b). Perceptions of power and interactional dominance in interpersonal relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *22*(2), 207-233.

Duncan, S. (1972). Some signals and rules for taking speaking turns in conversations. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *23*(2), 283-292.

Duncan, S. (1974). On the structure of speaker–auditor interaction during speaking turns. *Language in society*, *3*(2), 161-180.

Eo, S. (2008). Nikkan no daigakusei no keigo koudoo ni mirareru danjyosa [Gender differences in politeness behaviors among Japanese and Korean university students]. *Nihon Daigaku Bunri Gakubu Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyuusho Kenkyuu Kiyoo [Bulletin of the Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences at the College of Humanities and Sciences, Nihon University]*, 75, 39–43.

Gifford, R. (1994). A lens-mapping framework for understanding the encoding and decoding of interpersonal dispositions in nonverbal behavior. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *66*(2), 398-412.

Goldsmith, D. J. (2007). Brown and Levinson's politeness theory. In B. Whaley, B. & Samter, W. (Eds.), *Explaining communication: Contemporary theories and exemplars*, 219-236. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Guerrero, L. K., & Floyd, K. (2006). *Nonverbal communication in close relationships*. Routledge.

Hall, J. A. (1984). *Nonverbal sex differences: Communication accuracy and expressive style*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Holtgraves, T. (1992). The linguistic realization of face management: Implications for language production and comprehension, person perception, and cross-cultural communication. *Social psychology quarterly*, 141-159.

Holtgraves, T., & Yang, J. N. (1992). Interpersonal underpinnings of request strategies: General principles and differences due to culture and gender. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *62*(2), 246.

Jayagopi, D. B., Hung, H., Yeo, C., & Gatica-Perez, D. (2009). Modeling dominance in group conversations using nonverbal activity cues. *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, *17*(3), 501-513.

Kendon, A. (1972). Some relationships between body motion and speech. *Studies in dyadic communication*, *7*, 177-210.

Kim-Renaud, Y. K. (2001). Change in Korean Honorifics Reflecting Social Change. In Thomas E. McAuley (ed.), *Language Change in East Asia*, 27–46. London: Curzon.

Kita, S. and Ide, S. (2007). Nodding, aizuchi, and final particles in Japanese conversation: How conversation reflects the ideology of communication and social relationships. *Journal of Pragmatics 39*(7): 1242-1254.

Koyama, W. (2004). The linguistic ideologies of modern Japanese honorifics and the historic reality of modernity. *Language & Communication*, *24*(4), 413-435.

Krauss, R. M., Garlock, C. M., Bricker, P. D., & McMahon, L. E. (1977). The role of audible and visible back-channel responses in interpersonal communication. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *35*(7), 523.

Labov, W. (1990). The intersection of sex and social class in the course of linguistic change. *Language variation and change*, *2*(2), 205-254.

Major, B. (1981). Gender patterns in touching behavior. In *Gender and nonverbal behavior* (pp. 15-37). Springer, New York, NY.

Maynard, S. K. (1987). Interactional functions of a nonverbal sign Head movement in Japanese dyadic casual conversation. *Journal of pragmatics*, *11*(5), 589-606.

McNeill, D. (1992). *Hand and mind: What gestures reveal about thought*. University of Chicago press.

Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village* (Vol. 6). CUP Archive.

Ochs, E. (1990). Indexicality and socialization. *Cultural psychology: Essays on comparative human development*, 287-308.

Ochs, E. (1996). *Linguistic resources for socializing humanity*. Cambridge University Press.

Ofuka, E., McKeown, J. D., Waterman, M. G., & Roach, P. J. (2000). Prosodic cues for rated politeness in Japanese speech. *Speech Communication*, *32*(3), 199-217.

Ogino, T., Hong, M. (1992). Nihongo onsei no teineisa ni kansuru kenkyuu (A study on politeness in Japanese speech). In: Kunihiro, T. (Ed.), *Nihongo intonation no jittai to bunseki (The State-of-the-art and Analysis of Japanese Intonation)*. Monbushou, Tokyo, pp. 215-258.

Prager, K. J. (2000). Intimacy in personal relationships. In C. Hendrick & S. S. Hendrick (Eds.), *Close relationships: A sourcebook* (pp. 229–242). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ridgeway, C. L., & Walker, H. A. (1995). Status structures. In K. S. Cook, G. A. Fine, & J. S. House (Eds.), *Sociological perspectives on social psychology* (pp. 281–310). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Takano, S. (1998). A quantitative study of gender differences in the ellipsis of the Japanese postpositional particles-wa and-ga: gender composition as a constraint on variability. *Language Variation and Change*, *10*(3), 289-323.

Woods, N. J. (1997). The formation and development of New Zealand English: Interaction of gender-related variation and linguistic change. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *1*(1), 95-125.

Yngve, V. H. (1970). On getting a word in edgewise. In Chicago Linguistics Society, 6th Meeting, 1970, 567-578.

Chapter VI

Baldassare, M., & Feller, S. (1975). Cultural variations in personal space. *Ethos*, 3(4), 481-503.

Balswick, J., & Avertt, C. P. (1977). Differences in expressiveness: Gender, interpersonal orientation, and perceived parental expressiveness as contributing factors. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 121-127.

Brown, L., & Prieto, P. (2017). (Im) politeness: Prosody and Gesture. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im) politeness* (pp. 357-379). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Brown, L., & Winter, B. (2019). Multimodal indexicality in Korean: "doing deference" and "performing intimacy" through nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Politeness Research*, *15*(1), 25-54.

Brown, L., Winter, B., Idemaru, K., and Grawunder. S. (2014). Phonetics and Politeness: Perceiving Korean Honorific and Non-Honorific Speech through Phonetic Cues. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 66, 45-60.

Burgoon, J. K., & Dunbar, N. E. (2006). Nonverbal expressions of dominance and power in human relationships. *The Sage handbook of nonverbal communication*. Sage, 2.

Carney, D. R., Hall, J. A., & LeBeau, L. S. (2005). Beliefs about the nonverbal expression of social power. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *29*(2), 105-123.

de Jong, K. J. (1995). The supraglottal articulation of prominence in English: Linguistic stress as localized hyperarticulation. *The journal of the acoustical society of America*, 97(1), 491-504.

Dennison, H. Y., & Bergen, B. K. (2010). Language-driven motor simulation is sensitive to social context. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society* (Vol. 32, No. 32).

Dunbar, N. E., & Burgoon, J. K. (2005). Measuring nonverbal dominance. *The sourcebook of nonverbal measures going beyond words*, 361.

Gillespie, D. L., & Leffler, A. (1983). Theories of nonverbal behavior: A critical review of proxemics research. *Sociological theory*, 120-154.

Gussenhoven, C. (2004). *The phonology of tone and intonation.* Cambridge University Press.

Hall, E. T. (1966). *The hidden dimension* (Vol. 609). Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Henley, N. M., & Kramarae, C. (2001). Gender, power, and miscommunication. *Feminism in the study of religion: A reader*, 34-60.

Hooker, J. (2012). 19 Cultural Differences in Business Communication. *The handbook of intercultural discourse and communication*, 29, 389.

Kendon, A. (2004). *Gesture: Visible action as utterance*. Cambridge University Press.

Lee, C. Y. (2012). Korean culture and its influence on business practice in South Korea. *Journal of International Management Studies*, 7(2), 184-191.

Mehrabian, A. (1968). Some referents and measures of nonverbal behavior. *Behavior Research Methods & Instrumentation*, *1*(6), 203-207.

Ohala, J. J. (1994). The frequency code underlies the sound symbolic use of voice pitch. *Sound symbolism*, ed. by Leanne Hinton, Johanna Nichols, and John J. Ohala, 325–47.

Ohara, Y. (2001). levels of L2 users. *Multilingualism, second language learning, and gender*, 6, 231.

Park, M. R. (1990). Conflict avoidance in social interaction: A sociolinguistic comparison of the Korean and Japanese honorific systems. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, 1, 111-127.

Schilling, N. (2011). Language, gender, and sexuality. In Mesthrie, R. (Ed.) *The Cambridge handbook of sociolinguistics*. 218-237. Cambridge University Press.

Schwartz, B., Tesser, A., & Powell, E. (1982). Dominance cues in nonverbal behavior. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 114-120.

Shin, S. Y. (2010). The functions of code-switching in a Korean Sunday school. *Heritage Language Journal*, 7(1), 91-116.

Sussman, N. M., & Rosenfeld, H. M. (1982). Influence of culture, language, and sex on conversational distance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42(1), 66.

Tamaoka, K., Yamaguchi, H. L., Miyaoka, Y., & Kiyama, S. (2010). Effects of gender-identity and gender-congruence on levels of politeness among young Japanese and Koreans. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 20(1), 23-45.

Winter, B., & Grawunder, S. (2012). The phonetic profile of Korean formal and informal speech registers. *Journal of Phonetics*, 40(6), 808-815.

Chapter VII

Andersen, P. A., Guerrero, L. K., & Jones, S. M. (2006). Nonverbal behavior in intimate interactions and intimate relationships. In *The Sage handbook of nonverbal communication*, 259-277. SAGE Publications Inc.

Brown, L. (2010). Questions of appropriateness and authenticity in the representation of Korean honorifics in textbooks for second language learners. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 23(1), 35-50.

Brown, L., & Winter, B. (2019). Multimodal indexicality in Korean: "doing deference" and "performing intimacy" through nonverbal behavior. Journal of *Politeness Research*, *15*(1), 25-54.

Burgoon, J. K., & Dunbar, N. E. (2006). Nonverbal expressions of dominance and power in human relationships. *The Sage handbook of nonverbal communication.* Sage, 2.

Cook, H. M. (2008). *Socializing identities through speech style: Learners of Japanese as a foreign language* (Vol. 32). Multilingual Matters.

Dunbar, N. E., & Burgoon, J. K. (2005). Measuring nonverbal dominance. *The sourcebook of nonverbal measures going beyond words*, 361.

Jayagopi, D. B., Hung, H., Yeo, C., & Gatica-Perez, D. (2009). Modeling dominance in group conversations using nonverbal activity cues. *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, *17*(3), 501-513.

McNeill, D. (1992). *Hand and mind: What gestures reveal about thought*. University of Chicago press.

Winter, B., & Grawunder, S. (2011). The polite voice in Korean: searching for acoustic correlates of contaymal and panmal. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, *19*, 419-431.