

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

(Im)politeness: Language Socialization

Haruko M. Cook (University of Hawaii at Manoa)

Matthew Burdelski (Osaka University)

1. Introduction

This chapter discusses (im)politeness from the perspective of language socialization.

While politeness has been conceptualized in a number of ways (e.g., Brown & Levinson,

1987; Lakoff, 1973; Leech, 1983), language socialization views politeness as an

‘affective stance,’ defined as “mood, attitude, feeling, and disposition, as well as

degrees of emotional intensity vis-à-vis some focus of concern” (Ochs, 1996: 41). A

polite affective stance may be a display of respect, modesty, kindness, good manners,

appropriateness, empathy, courtesy, consideration, and the like, depending on the

participants, setting, and culture (e.g., Pizziconi, 2007). Thus, language socialization

considers politeness not as a static category, but as a dynamic concept that is

socio-culturally variable and reflects and constructs ‘context’ (Duranti & Goodwin,

1992). In societies across the globe, more competent members socialize novices to

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

social and communicative norms that constitute politeness in ways understood and recognized by other members. In this way, the process of language socialization is related to ‘politeness practices,’ or communicative norms that are understood and used by members of a social group and subject to reflexive evaluation (Eelen, 2001; Watts, Ide & Ehrlich, 1992). Research on politeness and research on language socialization have tended to investigate different areas of concern (but see, Lo & Howard, 2009). Language socialization research focuses on the process of novices’ linguistic and sociocultural development, whereas politeness research tends to focus on theoretical issues (cf. Leech & Terkourafi; Mills, this volume). Moreover, language socialization research rarely links up its findings to a theory of politeness, and politeness research seldom examines the process of how novices learn to speak politely—or impolitely—in culturally specific ways. This chapter demonstrates ways in which language socialization and (im)politeness are intertwined. More specifically, it argues that language socialization entails learning (im)politeness, and learning (im)politeness is embedded in the process of language socialization. In these ways, it attempts to provide an alternative perspective on (im)politeness theory and research.

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

The chapter is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses language socialization and key concepts. Section 3 provides a critical overview of the research. Section 4 presents two case studies of L1 (first language) child and adult socialization to politeness. Section 5 summarizes the discussion and provides directions for future research.

2. Key concepts and theories

Language socialization theory considers language as embedded in cultural practice and acquired together with sociocultural knowledge (e.g., Duranti, Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012; Garrett & Baquedano López, 2002; Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, 1986b). Language socialization occurs in unequal relationships (expert-novice) with respect to sociocultural knowledge. In becoming a competent member of a social group, children and other relative novices are socialized into a range of communicative and social norms, including (im)politeness. As in some other frameworks concerned with (im)politeness in human interaction (e.g., Culpeper, 2011; Watts, 2003), language socialization regards politeness as a dimension of ‘face,’ or the orientation of social actors in interpersonal relations to what others

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

think of them (Goffman, 1967). Goffman proposes that this orientation is the underpinning of ‘face-work,’ or the use of communicative strategies in managing face in interaction. As politeness is not the only type of face-work social actors perform (Haugh, 2013), it can be argued that politeness is also deployed for a range of other interactional functions. The process of language socialization thus involves learning communicative norms of politeness to engage in face-work and other ends. Novices are not passive recipients of this socialization, but active agents who align or do not align with acts of socialization, use language in prescribed and novel ways, and socialize others in various ways.

Central to the process of language socialization is the notion of ‘indexicality,’ which refers to the capacity of language to point to and evoke aspects of the social context. According to Silverstein (1976), two types of indexes are: 1) ‘referential index’ that contributes to the propositional content of an utterance (e.g., deictic words such as “here,” and pronouns such as “I”), and 2) ‘non-referential index’ that does not contribute to the propositional content but points to or evokes social, cultural, and/or affective meaning (e.g., honorifics, sentence final particles). In relation to

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

non-referential indexes, language features, including phonology, morphology, lexicon, speech acts, and register, index various socio-culturally meaningful realities, such as identities, social actions, stances, and activities. Ochs (1992, 1996) argues that there are few cases of a one-to-one mapping between a particular linguistic form and a social category. She asserts that language features directly index affective stance, and affective stance indirectly indexes other social categories such as identity, social acts, and activities. For example, the Japanese sentence-final particle *wa* may directly index a delicate affective intensity and indirectly index female gender, which is mediated by the language ideology that women have a delicate disposition (Ochs, 1992). From this perspective, politeness is directly indexed through various linguistic features (e.g., prosody, grammatical markers, address terms, formulaic expressions, honorifics), and politeness indirectly indexes a range of other socio-cultural meanings. Thus, the process of language socialization involves learning to understand and use language as an index of politeness in relation to identities, actions, and activities, among others.

Kulick (2003) proposes that language is endowed with a ‘dual indexicality’ in which features of language “manifest both their surface propositional content and the

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

simultaneous inverse of that content” (Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004: 358). For example, when caregivers explicitly instruct children how to speak politely (e.g., saying the word “please” when making a request) they implicitly convey to them what counts as being impolite (e.g., not saying the word “please” when making a request). This suggests that in learning to associate language features with politeness (e.g., being respectful, well-mannered, appropriate), novices also come to associate the nonoccurrence of such features with impoliteness (e.g., being rude, disrespectful, inappropriate).

A central concern of language socialization is on “how cultures organize children of different ages as speakers, particularly as authors of utterances” (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1995: 176). This includes how they position novices as speakers of social and communicative norms. Previous research draws upon Goffman’s (1981) more refined notion of speaker in his essay on ‘footing,’ in which he describes a ‘participation framework’ consisting of various kinds of speakers and hearers. In relation to the speaker, Goffman proposes a ‘production format’ of an utterance consisting of four roles: (i) ‘animator’ (i.e., one who physically produces the sounds of language), (ii) ‘author’ (i.e., one who originally selects the words or ideas), (iii) ‘principal’ (i.e., one

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

who is responsible for the words), and (iv) ‘figure’ (i.e., character in a described scene).

While a speaker can occupy all of these roles at once, in many cases the production format is split into two or more roles. For example, in explicitly instructing children in norms of linguistic politeness (e.g., Say, “thank you”), the caregiver is the author, and the child is positioned as the animator. Participation frameworks vary widely among communities and settings. Among Tzotzil Mayans, Kaluli of Papua New Guinea, and Samoans, children are positioned in multiparty interaction from infancy, as addressed recipient, unaddressed recipient, or overhearer (e.g., de León, 2012; Ochs, Solomon & Sterponi, 2005). The ways children are organized in participation frameworks contributes to cross-cultural differences with respect to socializing (im)politeness.

Although language socialization typically occurs when there is an asymmetry in knowledge between participants, this process is not unidirectional, as the roles of expert and novice can shift in interaction. For example, when the topic of conversation turns to technology, older children may take on the role of expert (e.g., Heath, 2012). Also, in heritage language settings, children may display expertise in the mainstream language (e.g., Mexican children living in the United States) by serving as translators in assisting

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

parents in matters outside the home (e.g., García Sánchez, Orellana & Hopkins, 2011).

All aspects of language socialization, including actions, activities, identities, and stances are co-constructed between parties, and thus the process of socialization depends on various factors including the agency of the novice.

Although early research primarily focused on L1 caregiver-child interaction, language socialization is not limited to childhood but is a lifelong process (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008). Recent research explores a variety of settings and novices learning a L1, L2 (second language), and heritage language. In particular, several studies have examined workplaces, in which L1 or L2 adults are socialized into social and communicative norms of a business and professional community (Duff, Wong & Early, 2000; Dunn, 2011, 2013; Jacobs-Huey, 2003, 2007; Li, 2000; Roberts, 2010; Sarangi & Roberts, 2002). Members of a social group may be socialized into politeness (and impoliteness) when learning to take on new roles and participate in new activities across the lifespan.

3. Critical overview of research

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

This section provides an overview of three major areas of language socialization research that directly relate to socialization to (im)politeness, namely interactional routines, requests and directives, and honorifics.

3.1. Interactional routines

Language socialization research in a variety of settings and cultures has focused on ‘interactional routines’ (e.g., Kanagy, 1999; Ohta, 1999; Peters & Boggs, 1986; Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986), or conventional and formulaic expressions for performing social actions (cf. Kádár & Terkourafi, this volume). Such routines are typically composed of adjacency pairs, or social actions produced by separate actors in succession, such as a request-compliance, apology-acknowledgement, or greeting-greeting exchanges (e.g., Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Interactional routines are an important means for managing face-work among parties, and thus are often modeled and explicitly instructed by more expert members (e.g., Gleason, Perlmann, & Grief, 1984). For instance, among the Basotho of South Africa, Demuth (1986) shows how mothers and older siblings instruct children to say, “thank you’s, greetings, respect to elders, and proper terms of address” (pp. 62-63). Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo (1986)

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

examine how Kwara're caregivers instruct children to ask and answer questions, make requests, say greeting and leave-takings, and respond when food is offered. As in some other Caribbean communities (Paugh, 2012), Tessonneau (2005) observes that Guadelope caregivers explicitly instruct children in greetings as a display of respect and deference towards elders. Similarly, Japanese caregivers socialize children to carry out greetings and leave-takings, expressions of appreciation, apologies, and requests, by speaking for pre-verbal children and prompting children what to say to third parties (Burdelski, 2012, 2013a). In these ways, adults in various societies and communities teach children interactional routines in encouraging them to display other-orientation, including attentiveness to their social surroundings beyond their immediate desires and concerns. Also, in the Japanese case, caregivers encourage children to say certain formulaic expressions not only to other human interlocutors, but also to animals, and religious, natural, and inanimate objects. For instance, Burdelski (2009) shows that when a mother directed a two-year old child to take a stone out of his mouth and the child responded by throwing the stone onto the ground, the mother prompted the child to apologize to the stone (e.g., *ishi ni gomennasai tte dekiru* 'Can you say, "I'm sorry"')

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

to the stone?’). In Japanese, such explicit instruction in interactional routines is linked to ‘empathy training’ (Clancy, 1986).

Studies of children’s interactions among siblings and peers show that children socialize other children into interactional routines, such as expressions of apology (Kampf & Blum-Kulka, 2007; Burdelski, 2013a). Also, children may use certain formulaic expressions that are normatively associated with politeness in novel ways. For example, Reynolds (2007) shows how children in an Antoneo Mayan community used the Spanish formulaic expression *Buenos días* ‘Good day,’ with a military salute, among peers and siblings for performing ritual insults.

Research on language socialization into interactional routines is not limited to children. For instance, in a study of L2 Japanese language socialization, Cook (2011) shows how in Japanese families serving as hosts to college-aged students from the United States host mothers prompted students at mealtime to make and align with assessments (e.g., *oishii* ‘delicious’) of the food the mothers had made by using *desho*, an epistemic stance marker similar to the English tag question ‘isn’t it?’ (This is delicious, *desho?*). Similar to Clancy’s observations of Japanese caregiver-child

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

interaction, Cook's analysis suggests that in encouraging students to make assessments of the food, adults socialize them to enact a role of a 'polite diner' (Clancy, 1986: 236).

3.2. Requests and directives

Language socialization research and related approaches such as discourse analysis of family interaction (Blum-Kulka, 1997; Tannen, 2004) have examined requests and 'directives,' or communicative behaviors "designed to get someone else to do something" (Goodwin, 1990: 67). In Brown and Levinson's (1987) model of politeness, requests are 'face-threatening acts,' or ones that violate another's 'negative face wants' (i.e., desire to be free from imposition). Thus, such social actions are often mitigated with 'negative politeness strategies' in order to lessen their illocutionary force so as to maintain face and interpersonal harmony. For instance, in North American White middle-class households, parents address children using polite formulas, such as 'please' and 'thank you,' and instruct children to say such formulas to family members and others, such as when making a request (e.g., Gleason, 1980). Moreover, when making requests to children, US parents use endearments, impersonal pronouns, passive voice, and inclusive constructions (e.g., "Let's sit down" = "You sit down") (Blum-Kulka

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

1997: 147). Similarly, Japanese caregivers address children using polite requests (using *X-te kudasai* ‘please do X’), and also prompt them to say such requests to adults and children (e.g., to adult guest: *doozo, suwatte kudasai tte* ‘Say, “Please sit down”’) (Burdelski, 2006, 2010). In these ways, many caregivers instruct and provide a model to children on how to make requests as an index of politeness.

A central focus of analysis in studies on requests and directives is indirectness (Searle, 1975), in which a speaker does not go on record as issuing an imposition. The use of indirectness with children varies across cultures. In a study of an Athabaskan community, Scollon (1982) observes that adults pose questions to children as a directive (e.g., “Where’s your pencil?”), which provides a model to them on preferred indirectness in this community. Scollon also observes that children pose questions to adults in attempting to obtain permission or requesting things (e.g., “You got what you call? Ruler”), which suggests they acquire linguistic means of indirectness from a young age. In Japanese, Clancy (1986) points out that indirectness is a central feature of communicative style, and shows how children are socialized to indirectness from a young age. She finds that in issuing directives to two-year old children, mothers often

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

use hints, questions, appeals to feelings, and reported speech. Moreover, Clancy observes that the mothers often paired an indirect form (such as a hint) with a direct form (such as an imperative) in order to convey to children the communicative intent of the indirect form. Similarly, Takada (2013) shows that Japanese caregivers use various kinds of indirectness with children, for instance by reporting the imagined speech of third parties who cannot ostensibly speak, such as infants (including those soon to be born). In some languages such as Korean and Japanese, adults attempt to control children's actions by encouraging them to consider the adult's or another's feelings. For instance, Lo (2009), shows how a teacher in a Korean as heritage language classroom in the United States urged the children to work harder in their schoolwork by referring to the teacher's *maum* 'seat of emotion' (Teacher: '...because you never keep up with class, when I leave here after class, I feel bad [lit. my *maum* hurts]'). In research in Japanese preschools, Hayashi, Karasawa and Tobin (2009) observe that in encouraging children to eat all the food on their plate, teachers evoked the feelings of the non-eaten food ('Poor Mister Carrot!...Don't you think he feels lonely?'). In these ways, adults

around the globe often use various means for controlling children in non-imposing and indirect ways.

Several studies have also shown how adults socialize children to indirectness by speaking (or encouraging children to speak) *through* others, including children and animals. For instance, in a Navajo community, Field (2001) shows that teachers and parents engage children in triadic directive-giving exchanges with others, which socializes them into the communicative practice of making requests through third parties. Also, in a discourse analytic study of four middle-class families in the United States, Tannen (2004) shows how a mother ventriloquized the speech of the pet dogs in indirectly encouraging a child to pick up and put away his toys (e.g., Mother speaking in an extra high pitch to the dogs: “We’re naughty, but we’re not as naughty as Jason, he’s naughtiest”). In a language socialization of seven two-year old Japanese children, Burdelski (2012) observes that when a family was visiting the home of the paternal grandparents, the mother prompted a two-year old child what to say to the grandmother (her mother-in-law) (Mother to child: *Baaba, mukoo de kudasai tte* ‘Say to granny, please look at [your newspaper] over there), which he contends functioned as an

indirect request from the mother to the grandmother, as the child was not expected to (and did not subsequently) repeat the prompted expression. In these ways, caregivers in diverse societies employ a range of strategies in modeling to children and instructing them in preferred ways of issuing requests and directives in indirect ways. Such strategies convey norms of politeness in relation to managing face concerns among parties and construct relationships.

3.3. Honorifics

Language socialization research has also examined honorifics in various societies.

Although in Brown and Levinson's politeness theory honorifics are a negative politeness strategy (i.e., to avoid offence by showing deference), honorifics do more than index negative politeness. As Agha (1998: 153) observes, "[h]onorific speech is not used only for paying respect or conferring honor; it serves many other interactional agendas, such as control and domination, irony, innuendo, and masked aggression, as well as other types of socially meaningful behaviors..." This suggests that honorifics are used not only in relation to politeness, but also for acts that may be interpreted as impolite. As described in this section, language socialization research shows how

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

children are socialized to and acquire various meanings of honorifics, both polite and impolite.

In comparison to the T-V (informal *tu* and formal *vous*) distinction in many Indo-European languages, some Asian languages have a more elaborately developed system of honorifics, and children are attuned to them from an early age. In languages such as Korean (Song, 2009), Thai (Howard, 2009), and Japanese (Morita, 2003), in which cultural meanings related to politeness are encoded in person reference and address terms, children are socialized to use appropriate terms in referring to and addressing persons, such as those of higher rank and social status (e.g., grandparents, teachers, older siblings). In a study of Korean as a heritage language in the United States, Song (2009) shows how mothers socialize children to refer to and address older peers using honorific kinship terms (e.g., *nuna* 'elder sister,' *hyeng* 'elder brother'). For instance, when a child (Joonho, five-years old) was recalling to his mother an event of the school day involving an older male friend (Sicheol, six-years old) using the friend's first name (as is the norm in English), the mother corrected his utterance to include the Korean honorific kinship term *hyeng* 'older brother' (Mother: *Sicheol hyenga maliya?*

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sicheol hyengaka way wulessnuntye? ‘You mean *Sicheol hyeng*? Why did *Sicheol hyeng* cry?’). Similarly, Japanese caregivers socialize children to use appropriate reference and address terms that index social hierarchy. For instance, when speaking to children, teachers and caregivers refer to themselves and other adults using the honorific term the child is expected to use (e.g., *okaasan* ‘mother,’ *sensei* ‘teacher’) (Morita, 2003).

Socialization to honorifics also occurs among children themselves. For instance, in a study in a Northern Thai community, Howard (2007) observes that when older siblings seek compliance from younger siblings, or when younger siblings seek benefits from older siblings, they employ the hierarchical terms of person reference ‘elder sibling’ and ‘younger sibling’ in invoking relationships and “mutual feelings of dependence, love, and respect” (p. 205). Thus, in some Asian societies and communities children are socialized to understand that person reference terms “do more than just refer,” rather they “instantiate and stabilize culture-specific views of the person” (Enfield, 2007: 97).

Honorifics are also encoded in a range of other language features such as grammar and pragmatic particles. In Japanese and Korean, there is typically a choice between a

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

non-honorific and honorific predicate and formulaic expressions (e.g., Japanese: *ohayoo-gozaimasu* ‘Good morning +/- HONORIFIC). Children are sensitized to these choices in relation to the addressee and setting. Park (2006), who conducted a study of Korean-American children’s language socialization, shows how caregivers instruct children to use honorifics in uttering requests and greetings to grandparents, which socializes them to display respect and deference to elders. For instance, when a grandmother was leaving the family house, the mother instructed the child what to say to her using the honorific marker *-yo* from the child’s perspective (*Danyeo ose-yo geureoneun geoya* ‘You should say, “Go and return”’). In another study, Shohet (2013) observes that Vietnamese caregivers instruct children to use an honorific particle when addressing elders such as upon leaving the home. Also, in research in a Northern Thai elementary classroom, Howard (2009) shows how children are socialized to speak politely and show respect to teachers. For instance, when a teacher asked the class if they wanted to study and the children responded that they did without using the honorific marker *kha*, the teacher instructed the children to repeat the answer using this honorific marker (‘ah [we] want to study *kha*. Do it again. Answer again’). In these

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

ways, Korean, Thai, and Vietnamese caregivers socialize children to use honorifics to display respect and deference to others within a social hierarchy.

Research also shows that children use honorifics in their peer groups in both prescribed and novel ways. For instance, in terms of novel use, Burdelski (2013b) observes that when two female children (three-years old) were riding in a rowboat in the classroom and an older boy (five-years old) asked them if he could ride in it with them, the girls used addressee honorifics (*-masu* form) in refusing his request (*aitemasen* ‘This seat isn’t open’; *noremasen* ‘You can’t ride’) and in providing a reason for the refusal (*omoi desu* ‘You’re heavy’). As these children typically spoke to each other in the plain form (non-honorifics), this episode suggests that Japanese children may use addressee honorifics to index social distance in excluding peers from play (cf. García-Sánchez, 2012), as a form of impoliteness.

Although socialization of honorifics begins in childhood, in some societies such as Japan and Korea this socialization continues beyond the home and formal schooling when learning to take on new roles and activities. As Brown (2012) observes in relation to Korean, socialization to honorifics extends into adulthood because, “what constitutes

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

appropriate use [of honorifics] continues to change as the speaker advances in age and status and operates in different social environments” (p. 93). In Japanese, which has two types of predicate honorifics (addressee and referent), while addressee honorifics are used and acquired early through role plays and other activities in the home and school (Burdelski, 2013b; Cook, 1996a, 1996b, 1997; Fukuda, 2005; Nakamura, 1996), referent honorifics are acquired much later as they are challenging not only for children (see Section 4.1.2), but also for adults (see Section 4.2.2). Thus, it is perhaps not surprising to find that adults are socialized into honorifics when entering the business world in which appropriate language use becomes linked to being a representative of an institution. For instance, in a linguistic anthropological study of interaction in a business manners training course, Dunn (2011, 2013) observes that instructors explicitly teach referent honorifics and formulaic expressions to adult trainees by having them fill out worksheets and perform model dialogs, as part of socialization to etiquette and presentation of a public self. In these ways, in some languages such as Japanese, socialization of honorifics and other forms of politeness are socialized across the lifespan as adults enter new communities of practice.

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

As the above studies suggest, more competent members use a variety of strategies in socializing novices to understand and use linguistic resources that index politeness, including deference, respect, consideration, kindness, appropriateness, empathy, and manners. Such use of language is important for socializing novices in how to maintain face and do face-work in interaction, and is tied to socializing a range of other socio-culturally meaningful realities, including identities, social actions, and activities.

4. Case studies: Indirectness, attentiveness, and honorifics in Japanese language socialization as an L1

This section draws upon two case studies of Japanese language socialization in order to illustrate how researchers may go about examining (im)politeness from a language socialization perspective. The first study focuses on L1 children (Burdelski), whereas the second study focuses on L1 adults (Cook). Each analysis first briefly introduces the data and methods.

4.1. Children in and around the home

The first case study is based on a longitudinal and ethnographic study of seven Japanese families with a two-year old child (four boys and three girls) residing in urban areas in the Kansai (Western) region of Japan. Children were audio-visually recorded over six months as they interacted with family members and other adults and children in and around the household.

4.1.1. Indirect requests and directives

As mentioned earlier, an important focus of children's language socialization in Japanese is empathy training (Clancy, 1986). In particular, children are encouraged to interpret others' needs, wants, and desires often based on their minimal and non-verbal verbal cues and silence as forms of indirectness. Japanese caregivers socialize children to indirectness from a young age in various ways. They not only speak to children in ways that urge them what to do/say in subtle and non-imposing ways (e.g., providing hints), but also encourage them how to interpret *others'* indirect utterances and non-verbal behaviors as a request for the child's action (Burdelski, in press). Both of these strategies are illustrated in (1). Here, a male focal child (Ken) holds the ball of a child (Ami) on a playground in front of their home.

(1) [Ken – male, 2;2, Dad – Taka’s father, Ami – female, 5;5]

1 → Dad: *Ken chan* (0.6) *Ami chan no daro?*

‘Ken-*chan* (0.6), it’s Ami’s (ball), right?’

(0.4)

2 Dad: *na.* (.)

‘Right.’

(0.2)

3 → Dad: [*Ami chan no na n decho?*]

‘It’s Ami-*chan*’s (ball), right?’

4 Ami: [AMI CHAN KAE]RU WA::.

‘Ami-*chan* is (=I am) going home.’

5 (0.2)

6 → Dad: *mo kaeru tte.* [*hora.* ((guide Ken’s body towards Ami))

‘(She) says, “(I)’m going home already.” Look.’

7 Ken: (((walking away)))

8 Dad: ((clears throat, 0.8))

9 Dad: [*hai Ken chan.*] ((puts hand on the ball in Ken's hand))

'Okay, Ken-*chan*.'

10 Ken: [()]

11 → Dad: [[*hai. (>oide. kaeshite.<)=*]]

'Okay, >come, return it<.'

12 Ami?: [[()]]

13 → Dad: =*doozo shite*.

'Do, "Here you are".'

14 Ken: ((walking out of park, 0.8))

15 → Dad: *doozo shite, Ken chan.*

'Do, "Here you are, Ken-*chan*.'

At the beginning of this excerpt, Ken's father points out to Ken (using the diminutive – *chan* to address him as Ken-*chan*) the ownership of the ball (lines 1 and 3), which functions as a hint to return the ball to its owner (Ami). Then, when Ami announces that she is going home (line 4), Ken's father repeats a version of this utterance as reported speech (line 6: '[She] says, "[I]'m going home already"). While Ami's original

utterance is an announcement of her impending action, by repeating a version of it as reported speech the father directs Ken to interpret it as a request to return to the ball to her. Similar to Clancy's (1986) analysis of directives in caregiver speech, here Dad's directive (as a hint) does not explicitly indicate to Ken what to do next. Rather, he uses touch (from behind) to orient Ken's attention by physically guiding his body towards the quoted speaker (Ami). Previous studies on caregiver-child interaction have also discussed the importance of both verbal and non-verbal means in orienting children's attention towards other people and relevant entities in the social world so as to direct their actions (e.g., Brown, 2011; Cekaite, 2015). Here, in using talk and touch, Dad encourages Ken to interpret Ami's utterance not simply as an announcement, but also as a request to have her ball returned to her (an indirect speech act). This interpretation is not necessarily based on the reported speaker's (Ami's) actual intentions, and as such can be considered a 'cultural gloss' (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1995), as originally described by Scollon (1982) in relation to Athabaskan caregivers. According to Scollon (1982), in glossing a child's utterance, a caregiver provides "interpretations based on her own sense of the situation" (p. 91). Here, when Ken does not orient to the next expected

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

social action (returning the ball to Ami), Dad reformulates the reported speech in a more direct way, by telling Ken what to do (line 11: *kaeshite* ‘return it’) and then prompting him what to say (lines 13 and 15: ‘Do, “Here you are”’). In comparison to the pairing of direct and indirect forms observed in dyadic mother-child interaction (Clancy, 1986), this excerpt shows that Japanese caregivers also socialize children to indirectness in triadic interaction by encouraging them how to interpret *others’* verbal behavior as indirect requests. Such practices socialize children to politeness in relation to respecting others’ desires and interactional needs, such as having their possessions returned to them in a timely manner.

4.1.2. Honorifics

In addition to indirectness, an important aspect of politeness in Japanese is honorifics. Japanese has a rich system of honorifics, which consists of a range of lexical and grammaticalized forms. Two main categories of honorifics are: 1) referent honorifics (REF HON), which includes: a) respectful language, b) humble/deferential language, and c) beautification language (see Pizziconi, 2011), and 2) addressee honorifics (ADD HON), which are understood by Japanese lay speakers as a *teinei* ‘polite’ form (Pizziconi,

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

2007). Japanese caregivers attune young children to honorifics (Clancy, 1986;

Nakamura, 2002), particularly addressee honorifics and on occasion reference

honorifics, in relation to social roles and setting. In these data, a frequent setting for this

attunement is role-play interaction (e.g., store, telephone, doctor). For instance, in

excerpt (2) a mother and father (who does not talk in this excerpt) are playing telephone

with the child (Taka) in which they enact various roles (e.g., the child's friend, a caller

from a company). Here, the mother enacts a caller from a company using addressee and

referent honorifics.

(2)¹ [Taka – male, 2;5, Mom – Taka's mother]

1 Taka: *MOSHIMO:SH.*

‘Hello.’

2 → Mom: *a, Arakawa Taka kun desu ka[:?]*

‘Ah is [ADD HON] this Taka Arakawa-*kun*?’

3 Taka: [n.:]

‘Mm.’

4 (0.3)

¹ This excerpt (a longer version) is also analyzed in Burdelski (2013b).

5 → Mom: *anoo kochira kaisha na n desu keredomo::,*

‘Um, this is [ADD HON] the company calling but,’

6 → *otoosan ka okaasan wa irasshaimasu ka:::?*

‘is [REF HON + ADD HON] your father [REF HON] or mother [REF HON] there?’

7 (1.0)

8 Taka: *irasshaimasu yo.*

‘(They) are (here) [REF HON + ADD HON].’

9 (0.3)

10 → Mom: *n ja chotto otoosan ka okaasan ni kawatte moraemasu ka?*

‘Well then, could (I) have (you) [ADD HON] put your father [REF HON] or mother [REF HON] on a bit?’

11 Taka: *n::*

‘Mm.’

12 (4.1)

13 Taka: *ii desu.*

‘It’s good [ADD HON].’

14 Mom: *hai*.

‘Yes.’

In this telephone call, the mother uses addressee honorifics (lines 2, 5, 6, and 10) to index her social role and relationship to the child as an unknown recipient. At the opening of the call, in addition to addressee honorifics, the mother addresses the child using his full name (and the diminutive *-kun* for boys and male subordinates, as in excerpt 4 below). The child also uses addressee honorifics throughout the role-play, which suggests that by the age of two and a half, Japanese children are able to use addressee honorifics in response to others’ use of them in indexing fictive social roles and relationships. The mother (in her role as caller) also uses referent honorifics, but to a lesser degree. In particular, she uses the person reference terms *otoosan* ‘father’ and *okaasan* ‘mother’ (lines 6 and 10) and the other-elevating verb *irassharu* ‘to be’ (line 6) when referring to the child’s parents, as an index of respect and out-group relationships. In response to the mother’s use of the other-elevating referent honorific verb *irassharu* in referring to the child’s parents, the child repeats the verb *irassharu* also in referring

to his parents (line 8: '[They] are [here] [REF HON + ADD HON]'), and thus misuses referent honorifics. In Japanese, other-elevating verbs are not used to refer to in-group members (such as family members). An adult speaker would be expected to choose either the neutral verb *iru* 'to be' or the self- and in-group-lowering referent honorific verb *oru* 'to be'. Although the mother does not correct the child's mistake, this excerpt suggests that role-play interaction is an important context for children's socialization to addressee and referent honorifics in indexing politeness.

As illustrated in the above excerpts, Japanese children are socialized from an early age to understand and use various language features to index polite affective stances, which in turn index identities, social actions, and activities. In the next section, we illustrate how politeness is socialized much later in life, as L1 Japanese-speaking adults enter full-time employment upon completing their formal education.

4.2. Adults in the business world

The second case study is based on audio-visual recordings of new employee orientation sessions (25 in total) at a small-scale IT company (18 employees) in Tokyo. The sessions took place almost daily for 30 minutes to an hour over four months. The

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

participants are two male superiors (Iino, in his 30s, who holds a managerial position, and Hata, in his 20s, who has worked for two years as a programmer) and four new employees, who are recent college graduates (Kato: male, Nishi: male, Sato: female, Waki: male). The goals of the orientation are to improve new employees' communication skills and to ensure that they act politely as company representatives at the place where they will be sent to work as IT specialists. Here, we examine the process of socializing these new college graduates into being competent members of a business community, by focusing on two areas: 1) attentiveness to others' needs, and 2) honorifics.

4.2.1 Attentiveness to others' needs: kikubari

Displaying *kikubari* 'attentiveness to others' needs' is considered to be a polite act and important in developing and maintaining good interpersonal relationships in Japanese society (Fukushima, 2004, 2011, Fukushima & Haugh, 2014; Lebra, 1976, 2004).

Fukushima (2011: 550) describes *kikubari* as "a demonstrator's pre-emptive response to a beneficiary's verbal or non-verbal cues or situations surrounding a beneficiary and a demonstrator, which takes the form of offering." *Kikubari* is interlinked with *omoiyari*

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

‘empathy’ and *sasshi* ‘anticipatory inference’ (Fukushima & Haugh, 2014:166). As discussed earlier (Section 4.1.1), Japanese children learn to feel what others are feeling and empathize with them from a very early age (e.g., Clancy, 1986; Burdelski, 2009, 2013a). They are socialized to paying attention to the feeling and needs of the addressee and/or the third party even when they are not making an explicit request or verbally expressing their needs. Although college-aged students understand the importance of displaying attentiveness (Fukushima, 2011; Fukushima & Haugh, 2014), attention to others’ needs is still an important topic in the new employee orientation in Japanese companies. In general, attentiveness to others’ needs is ideologically a moral issue, but in the business context, it is reframed as an issue of business productivity. It is this new ‘frame’ (Goffman, 1981) that makes the lesson of attentiveness to others’ needs an important component of the new employee orientation. In (3a), the superior, Iino, explains how *kikubari* can be applied to the business context. Just prior to this excerpt, Hata told the new employees to always ask themselves what others are intending in order to pick up on their unspoken needs.

(3a) [Iino – superior, Kato – new employee]

1 → Iino: *eeto koo iu koto o yatte hoshii to iwareta toki ni*

‘Well, when (you) are told (by a customer), “(I) want (you) to do this”,’

2 → *sore de owari na no ka na tte iu no o kangaete hoshii to iu koto na n desu*

yo.

‘it is that (we) want (you) to think, “Is that all (I need to do)?”.’

3 *ano kiita koto aru to omou n desu kedo*

‘Uh (I) think (you)’ve heard this before, but’

4 *iwareta koto dake yatte ireba ii ka doo ka tte iu hanashi kiita koto nai?*

‘Haven’t (you) heard whether or not it is OK to do just what you are told to do?’

5 Kato: *sonna arimasu ne [h h h h*

‘(I) have heard such a thing h h h h.’

6 Iino: *[h h h h*

7 *tte koto o koko wa iitai n desu yo*

‘In this part (of the orientation session) (we) want to say this (act proactively).’

8 Kato: *hai*

‘Yes.’

9 → Iino: *ano: tabun shigoto o yaru ue de iwareta koto o yatte ireba ii baai mo mochiron arimasu.*

‘Well, perhaps there are certainty times when it is OK to just do what (you) are told to do in (your) work.’

10 Kato: *un*

‘Uh huh’

11 → Iino: *arimasu kedo sore o bakka zutto yatteru to soko de oshi- oshimai ni natte shimau.*

‘There are such times, but if you keep only doing so, you will come to a dead end.’

12 Kato: *hai*

‘Yes.’

13 → Iino: *hai sono saki o kangaete kudasai to*

‘Well, please think ahead of that (=Do more than what you are told).’

In creating a context in which a new employee has received a request from a customer to do something (line 1: “[I] want [you] to do to this”), Iino tells the new employees that he wants them to ask themselves whether just responding to the request is all they have to do (line 2: “Is that all [I need to do]?”). That is, he encourages them to interpret the request beyond what is verbally stated, and thus proactively attend to what the customer might also need (before he or she asks for it). Kato responds positively to Iino’s question (line 4) and laughs. His laugh suggests his critical stance toward Iino’s question (i.e., ‘Of course, we know we have to act proactively, so why are you asking this question?’). In response to Kato, Iino first asserts that although there are times when it is appropriate to do just what one is told to do (line 9), continuing to do so will lead to a ‘dead end’ (line 11), and then he emphasizes the importance to ‘think ahead’ (line 13). In this way, Iino conveys to the new employees the importance of discerning when to display *kikubari* in their work. In the workplace setting, socialization to politeness is a power-related practice. In (3b), Iino summarizes how attentiveness helps one’s job productivity.

(3b) [Iino and Hata – superiors]

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

1 → Iino: *umaku okyakusan no yooboo o kumitotte ageru koto ga dekiru yoo ni*

naru to dondon shigoto ni tsunagatte iku n desu ne

‘Once (you) become skillful in picking up what clients want, (you) will
get a lot of work.’

2 Hata: *soo desu ne*

‘That’s right.’

Ideologically *kikubari* is not directly linked to business profits. It is perhaps only in the business context in which *kikuburi* is discussed in terms of job productivity and profits. Iino’s reframing of attentiveness to others’ needs in terms of business productivity and profits in (3b) socializes the new employees to the new reality of the business community.

4.2.2. Honorifics

In addition to attentiveness, business etiquette training in Japan typically provides lessons on referent honorifics, as the appropriate use of referent honorifics is considered to be a critical skill in the business community (Dunn, 2011, 2013). These lessons

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

include worksheets and drills on the correct honorific verb forms, conversation practice (Dunn 2011), and known-answer questions. In this IT company, the superiors pose known-answer questions. As discussed earlier (Section 4.1.2), in Japanese other-elevating verbs are used to refer to out-group members. Because the categories *uchi* 'in-group' / *soto* 'out-group' are indexical (Wetzel, 1994), who constitutes the speaker's in- or out-group member changes from context to context. Thus, the appropriate use of referent honorifics entails an ability to determine whether the person being referred is within the speaker's in-group or out-group in relation to others. For instance, when a client calls the section head of a company while he is out of the office, his subordinate should treat him as an in-group member and not use an other-elevating verb to refer to him. Conversely, when the section head's family member calls him while he is out of the office, his subordinate should treat him as an out-group member and use an other-elevating verb to refer to him. As illustrated in (4), determining whether the person being referred is an in-group or out-group in a given context is still challenging for young adults. In (4), by providing a hypothetical situation in which his family member calls Section Head, Mr. Yamada who is currently out of the office, the

superiors (Hata and Iino) ask the new employees (Kato and Nishi) what they would say in this situation if they were Mr. Yamada's subordinates.

(4) [superiors – Hata and Iino; new employees – Kato and Nishi]

1 Hata: *ano miuchi no kata kara denwa dattara doo shimau?*

‘Um, what would you say if (Mr. Yamada’s) family member calls?’

2 → Kato: *Yamada buchou wa ima gaishutsu shite imasu.*

‘Section Head Yamada is [ADD HON] out of the office now.’

3 Hata: *e:: Nishi kun*

‘Uh:: Nishi-kun.’

4 → Nishi: *Yamada san wa ima gaishutsu chuu desu.*

‘Mr. Yamada is [ADD HON] out of the office now.’

5 → Hata: *ee (0.2) chigaimasu*

‘Uh (those answers) are wrong.’

6 (0.2)

7 → Hata: *kochira wa (.) ee keigo o tsukawanai to ikenai.*

‘This one (=situation) uh (you) have to use honorifics.’

8 Iino: *shasen de wa*

‘(when you talk) on the company phone.’

9 Hata: *Yamada buchō wa*

‘Section Head Yamada’

10 →Nishi: *°gaishutsu nasatte [imasu.]°*

‘is out of the office [REF HON] [ADD HON]’.

11 Hata: *[nasatte] imasu ga tadashii desu ne.*

“*nasatte imasu* [REF HON] [ADD HON]” is correct,

isn’t it?’

12 Nishi: *aa*

‘Ah.’

13 Hata: *aite gata ga (.) ((outward hand gesture)) uchi de wa naku soto*

‘the calling party (.) is not (your) in-group but out-group.’

14 *Yamada buchō wa ai- (.) miuchi no kata kara to Yamada buchō-*

‘Section Head Yamada (.) from his family Section Head Yamada

15 *miuchi- Yamada buchō ga soto de jibun ga uchi na n de*

‘family- Section Head Yamada is out-group and you are in-group so’

16 Nishi: *hai*

‘Yes.’

17 Hata: *soto ni taishite keii harawanakya ikenai.*

‘(You) have to show respect to an out-group member.’

18 Nishi: *aa*

‘Ah.’

In response to Hata’s question (line 1), Kato and Nishi answer by employing only addressee honorifics (lines 2 and 4), when the use of referent honorifics is expected.

Hata states that their answers are wrong and instructs them to use referent honorifics (line 5). Hata and Iino co-construct this instruction, as Iino conveys that honorifics must be used when talking on the company’s phone (line 6). Hata starts to provide a correct expression by saying *Yamada buchou wa* ‘Section Head Yamada’ (line 9). Then Nishi breaks in and starts to complete the sentence using the other-elevating verb (*nasatte* ‘do’) in a whispering voice (line 10). When Nishi utters the other-elevating verb *nasatte*, Hata completes his sentence by repeating *nasatte* (line 11), which confirms that Nishi’s

use of honorifics is correct. Apparently, the new employees are still struggling with identifying who is the in- or out-group member in a given context and the use of referent honorifics. Hata explains that an other-elevating verb is needed here because in this case Mr. Yamada and his family are out-group members from the speaker's point of view (lines 13-15), and so they must display *keii* 'respect' to Mr. Yamada (line 17).

Similar to the young child's use of honorifics in the role-play activity examined earlier (excerpt 2), the new employees incorrectly use honorific verbs in relation to in- and out-group distinctions. In the case of the child, he failed to come up with a neutral or self-lowering verb to index in-group membership (of his family members), whereas in the case of the new employees, they initially failed to come up with an other-elevating verb to index out-group membership (of the caller's family member).

While adults rarely correct young children's mistakes in the use of referent honorifics, this excerpt suggests that superiors provide new employees with metapragmatic comments on their honorific usages and give them opportunities to self-correct their misuse of honorifics in company training sessions. In this way, explicit socialization of referent honorifics is emphasized later in life in different ways, as young people enter

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

the business world. This is perhaps due to the fact that the appropriate use of honorifics is consequential not just for the individual but also for the social group, especially the company's image and profits. The socialization of honorifics as linguistic politeness is likely a lifelong endeavor.

5. Summary and future directions

This chapter has discussed language socialization in relation to (im)politeness. It has reviewed prior research related to language socialization and (im)politeness, and has drawn upon case studies among L1 children in and around the household and L1 adults in the business world in order to illustrate to researchers how to go about examining (im)politeness from a language socialization perspective. It has discussed and analyzed politeness as a kind of affective stance in displaying respect, deference, manners, kindness, consideration, empathy and the like, that is indexed by various linguistic features, which in turn index a range of socio-culturally meaningful realities including social actions, activities, and identities. The analysis has demonstrated how language socialization entails learning (im)politeness, and how learning (im)politeness is

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

embedded in the process of language socialization. It has thus provided an alternative perspective on (im)politeness theory and research.

The discussion and analysis reveal directions for future research. In particular, while many of the studies related to language socialization and (im)politeness focus on adult-child interactions, and this area should continue to develop in a range of societies and settings, more research is needed especially on: 1) children's interactions among peers and siblings, 2) adult socialization across the life span, and 3) technology as a tool of socialization. The findings that children use language features that are associated with politeness (e.g., formulaic greetings, honorifics) in both prescribed and novel ways (e.g., for insults, exclusion) suggest a need for more research on language socialization to (im)politeness within children's peers groups. Also, it would be helpful to have more research on language socialization of (im)politeness across the life span, especially on young and older adult interactions with family members in households and co-workers and superiors in workplaces. Finally, in an increasingly globalizing world, it would be beneficial to know how language socialization of (im)politeness is made possible through internet and web cameras (Sunakawa, 2015) in which speakers such as

extended family members who are located in different countries, regions, or towns rely on technology for communication across generations of speakers.

Appendix

The following transcription conventions are used:

- | | |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| [Wo]rd | Brackets indicate overlapping talk. |
| Wo::rd | Colon marks phonological lengthening (each colon is approx. 0.1 sec.). |
| Wo- | Hyphen indicates sound cutoff. |
| ((bows)) | Non-verbal actions and comments are shown in double parenthesis. |
| h | Ah h indicates laughter. |
| (1.2) | Number in parenthesis indicates silence in seconds/tenths of a second. |
| (.) | Period inside parenthesis indicates a micro-pause (less than 0.2 second). |
| >word< | Greater than signs mark fast-paced speech. |
| = | An equal sign indicates latching between turns. |
| . | Period marks falling intonation. |
| , | Comma marks a continuing intonation. |

(2017). In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 461-488). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

? Question mark indicates a rising intonation.

(Word) Word in parenthesis indicates transcriber uncertainty of hearing and a tentative reconstruction.

() Empty parenthesis indicates an inaudible word or words.

°Word° Circles around an utterance mark reduced volume.