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Abstract

As a means of investigating evaluative behavior, this study employed a panel of six native speakers of Japanese to assess the deviations from politeness norms made by two non-native speakers of Japanese who were performing the role of tour guides. In the analysis, the deviations were broadly divided into those concerned with honorific style and those which involved other politeness deviations. Overall, it was found that the most severe negative evaluations tended not to concern the honorific style, but involved the management of the speech acts of apology, compliment and request. A serious problem with the control of content rules was also identified. Variation was found in the assessments made by the native speakers and some reasons for this are given.

1. Introduction

For the first time in 1990 the number of Japanese tourists to travel abroad in any one year exceeded ten million and this figure is projected to surpass twenty million per year by the end of the decade. A small, but growing proportion of these outbound Japanese tourists visit Australia. However, from the Australian perspective, the Japanese currently are, and, furthermore, are expected to remain the largest group of overseas visitors. The proportion of Japanese tourists rose from a mere 5% in 1980 to over 25% of the overseas tourists within approximately a decade, totaling 629,900 in 1992, and the number is expected to reach 1.4 million by the year 2000 (Thirlwell 1992).

The spectacular increase in the importance of the Japanese tourism market in Australia has led to various responses in terms of linguistic and cultural adjustments within the tourism industry. However, different sectors of the industry have responded in different ways and in different degrees. Most conspicuous is the provision of tour guiding services where the language code employed is Japanese. The Japanese language is also used fairly extensively within the part of the retail sector which specializes in goods for Japanese
tourists, and to a lesser degree in other areas relating to transportation and accommodation (cf. Marriott 1989, 1991).

The increased use of Japanese within the tourism industry has revealed an acute shortage of Japanese-speaking personnel. This feature, however, also characterizes many other overseas countries to which Japanese tourists travel in large numbers (Travel Journal 1990, 1991). In the case of Australia, personnel are recruited from among four sources: Japanese native speakers who are permanent residents, young Japanese visiting Australia under the Working Holiday Scheme, young Australians who possess varying degrees of competence in Japanese (Tourism Training Australia 1992), and, in addition, staff who are sponsored from Japan under a special employment scheme. While recently there have been some politically and economically motivated moves to increase the proportion of Japanese-speaking Australians who are employed in tourism-related positions (Riko 1992; Thirlwell 1992), a number of problems are associated with their employment as tour guides. Attempts are now being made to develop a national Japanese tour-guiding course as a means of improving training, and special testing instruments are also being developed as an aid in the recruitment of guides (Australia-Japan Research Centre 1992; Brown 1993).

It follows from the above that situations involving interaction between native Japanese and non-native speakers of Japanese in a host-client relationship in the tourism domain have become a significant category of intercultural contact in Australia. Accordingly, research into the types and extent of communication and sociocultural problems is of crucial importance. Any acquisition planning should begin with the situations of actual language use within any society and proceed to the design and implementation of training programs based upon research (cf. Cooper 1989). In fact, as Neustupný (1988: 2) has argued, such planning should start not only from our beliefs about interaction, but from the consideration of language problems as they appear in discourse.

Communicative behavior can be broadly divided into generative or productive behavior - the main focus of linguistic enquiry to date – and evaluative behavior. Here, evaluative behavior refers to the labeling or evaluation made by participants in any encounter either about their own verbal or non-verbal conduct, or about the conduct of other participants. As evaluative behavior is not generally expressed on the discourse level, there is some difficulty in investigating it because, even when interviews are used, participants may be able to report only on some conscious aspects of their conduct, other aspects remaining unconscious. Despite this difficulty, there is a need to closely examine this major component of communicative behavior.

Evaluative behavior is particularly important in relation to the communication of politeness. Within the broad scope of evaluative behavior, devia-
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tions from politeness norms constitute a frequently occurring process, particularly within intercultural contact situations. Here we assume that norms, in other words, expected behavior, account for the whole process of evaluation.

2. The communication of politeness and evaluative behavior

Politeness can be defined as a system composed of three sub-systems or sectors, following Neustupný (1968, 1978b):

1. An Honorific system, which is found in some languages, is very extensive in the case of Japanese. It consists of the grammatical encoding of verbal and other lexical elements.

2. Respect Speech/Polite Language (also commonly referred to as [Linguistic] Politeness in the literature) is the linguistic sector which has received most attention in the politeness studies undertaken for languages such as English. Brown and Levinson (1978) demonstrated the breadth of the politeness sector and an application of the rules of communication as delineated by Hymes (1972) and Neustupný (1978b) allows us to further extend the limits of the Polite Language sector. Rules relating to paralinguistics, network, variety, message, setting, personnel, frame and content are relevant to an investigation of this politeness sector (cf. Marriott 1993).

3. Etiquette/Courtesy is the sub-system which covers non-verbal communicative behavior and includes rules of precedence, gift-giving patterns, dress rules, table manners and ritualized events.

Comparative research on Japanese and English has sometimes focused upon the Japanese honorific system (and equivalent English expressions) (cf. Hori 1986; Ide et al. 1986; Ogino 1986), and some comparative work has been undertaken on speech acts (cf. Nomura and Barnlund 1983; Barnlund and Araki 1985; Barnlund and Yoshioka 1990; Daikuhara 1986; Yokota 1986; Nakada 1989). Although there exist a number of useful accounts of the Japanese Polite Language sector (cf. Kindaiichi 1964; Neustupný 1968, 1974, 1978a, 1978b; Minami 1974, 1987; Mizutani and Mizutani 1987), there are still too few empirical treatments of the communication of politeness in intercultural situations, despite the existence of many problems.

This paper reports on some findings which pertain to the Honorific and the Polite Language sectors, the first two categories mentioned above, in naturally occurring intercultural contact situations in the tourism area. However, instead of the division between the Honorific system and Respect Speech / Polite Language, this paper employs a division between the honorific style, incorporating the Honorific sector as described above, together with other grammatical elements such as contractions and final particles which can be
classed as grammatical components of the Polite Language Sector on the one hand, and, on the other, other politeness features belonging in the Polite Language Sector like speech acts, paralinguistic and non-verbal features of communication.

So far, there have been a few attempts to theoretically conceptualize problems relating to deviations from politeness norms. For instance, Lakoff (1989: 103) distinguishes three kinds of politeness: (a) 'polite' utterances, where the speakers adhere to the rules of politeness, whether expected or not; (b) 'non-polite' behavior that does not conform to politeness rules where conformity is not expected; and, (c) 'rude' behavior that does not utilize politeness strategies where these would be expected and which consequently can be seen to be intentionally and negatively confrontational.

Kasper (1990: 208–9) further distinguishes between motivated and unmotivated rudeness. In motivated rudeness where the speaker intends to be heard as rude, Kasper identifies three sub-categories: rudeness due to lack of affect control, strategic rudeness and ironic rudeness. Unmotivated rudeness, on the other hand, refers to the violation of the norms of polite behavior – socially sanctioned norms of interaction – because of ignorance. In support of her claim that rudeness constitutes an important area for politeness studies, Kasper quotes some of the well-known analyses on cross-cultural and intercultural communication, such as Gumperz (1982), Thomas (1983), Wolfson (1989), and Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) as having been concerned with deviations resulting from participants' unfamiliarity with culturally appropriate forms of polite behavior and its linguistic encodings. Despite contributions from Lakoff, Kasper and others, there remains a need to extend the way in which we conceptualize deviations from politeness norms, particularly in view of the range of effects, apart from communication breakdown, which such behavior causes (cf. Watts et al. 1992: 14).

This paper draws upon Neustupný's (1985a, 1985b, 1988) model of general language management and applies it specifically to politeness behavior. Neustupný's model allows us to rigorously examine deviations from the norm and the ways in which these deviations are treated, either by the participant who commits the deviation or by others in the situation. The model is depicted in Figure 1 below.

According to the model, deviations can remain unnoted. If noted, they can attract a neutral or negative evaluation, or, on occasions, a positive rating. Following the evaluation stage, selection of an adjustment program may occur, and this may, or may not be subsequently implemented at the final stage. In the analysis to follow, the focus is upon the stages of noting and evaluation.
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In relation to politeness in intercultural situations, a study of evaluative behavior is productive for a number of reasons. Firstly, it enables us to assess whether deviations are evaluated neutrally, negatively or positively by an addressee. Secondly, a study of evaluative behavior will allow us to observe how deviations are ranked in terms of their seriousness. Thirdly, this study will assist us in determining which norm or norms are considered appropriate by one or both parties in the interaction, and it will also show us what accommodating adjustments are made to establish certain norms as appropriate for the situation. Fourthly, an examination of evaluative behavior should show where, due to conflicting communicative or sociocultural norms, norm dissonance remains. Fifthly, this type of study will provide us with insights into identifying the input features to politeness which differ cross-culturally. Finally, we can become more aware of how evaluative behavior varies not only cross-culturally but also idiosyncratically among intracultural participants.

This paper aims to introduce one methodological procedure for investigating evaluative behavior. Specifically, it offers a method for assessing the effect of non-native speakers’ deviations from politeness norms in Japanese tour guiding interaction. The objective is achieved by using a panel of raters to evaluate and comment upon norm deviations found in naturally occurring interaction recorded on video tape. Apart from increasing the reliability and validity of ethnographic descriptions of data, use of a rating panel enables us to increase our understanding of many aspects of evaluative behavior, as suggested above.

There already exists a body of studies which uses native speaker reactions to non-native discourse (cf. Johansson 1978; Chastain 1980; Piazza 1980; Eisentein 1983; Khalil 1985; Barbaux 1991; Hadden 1991). Some of these studies were interested in comparing the evaluations of teacher and non-
teacher judges, and student raters were used in others. Employing experimental studies as the main methodological procedure, most previous studies focused upon learners' deviations and, almost invariably, upon those of a grammatical nature. The present paper utilized a different approach. Firstly, video recordings of natural situations located within the transactional (work) domain were collected. Secondly, and even more importantly, a variety of adult raters were used to provide judgements and comments on the behavior of the guides, as found in the video recorded data. Valuable evidence about native speaker norms can be deduced from this second source of data.

The follow-up interview is another methodological procedure which can be used to obtain valuable data relating to norms. Neustupný's work (1988, 1990) has shown how this method can provide data on processes which are not visible in surface linguistic forms, such as avoidance of communication and evaluative aspects of behavior. The recording of natural interaction, particularly within the transactional domain, can be difficult to accomplish and similarly, obtaining the cooperation of interactants to participate in follow-up interviews is not always easily accomplished. Although the employment of a panel of raters provides us with data on cases when metalinguistic monitoring (noting) is systematically switched on, this may also occur in natural interaction, even if it is not very common. Despite this disadvantage, there are benefits to be gained in having multiple participants comment upon segments of a previously recorded interaction.

3. Tour-guiding discourse

The discourse examined in this paper is tour guiding discourse, as mentioned above. Spoken discourse of any kind can be categorized in a variety of ways, depending upon the criteria selected. In their consideration of the function of discourse, Brown and Yule (1983: 2–3), for instance, describe spoken discourse as either primarily transactional or primarily interactional in nature. According to their definition, transactional refers to the communication of factual, propositional information, which, in other words is primarily message-oriented. On the other hand, interactional discourse performs the function of expressing social relations and personal attitudes and is thus primarily interpersonal. Drawing upon this distinction, Kasper (1990) proposes that the discourse type influences the quality and quantity of politeness. Nevertheless, mixing of transactional and interactional goals exists in any discourse text and, furthermore, evidence that even discourse types which are transactionally-focused in their overall goals are characterized by an array of politeness patterns (Lakoff 1989; Kasper 1990) makes the usefulness of the broad distinction of two discourse types less than clear, even for a study of politeness...
in English. Nevertheless, use is made of the distinction in the present study, principally as a means of distinguishing between the monologic commentary delivered by the guide and the interactional discourse between the guide and tourists.

In the case of Japanese discourse, the selection of an appropriate honorific style is obligatory, with the choice being between the *da*-style, *desu-masu* style or the *gozaimasu* style. This is so, irrespective of the discourse being of a transactional orientation or an interactional orientation, as defined by Brown and Yule (1983). Furthermore, in Japanese there is a need to select neutral (e.g., *hanasu*) or honorific forms – either subject-honorific (e.g., *o-hanashi ni naru*) or object-honorific (e.g., *o-hanashi suru*) forms – for the *da*-, *desu-masu* and *gozaimasu* styles (Neustupny 1978a). A host-client relationship where the host is a service provider requires maximum expression of politeness in Japanese and, accordingly, appropriate honorific styles and honorific forms must be employed. The norm in Japanese tour guiding discourse seems to be use of the *desu-masu* style with some variation to include the *gozaimasu* style and, in certain environments, the *da*-style. In addition, in interactional discourse, use by the guide of suitable subject-honorific and object-honorific verb forms will be necessary. Furthermore, there is a whole range of linguistic features which also need to be managed in conjunction with the honorific style in either transactionally- or interactionally-oriented discourse, including appropriate use of final particles and other predicate endings, the selection of lexicon to match the honorific style, as well as the use of honorific prefixes and suffixes.

Variation in the honorific style and in the choice of neutral or honorific forms employed in the tour guiding discourse will depend upon a number of factors, the function of the discourse being one of these. As mentioned above, we propose that tour guiding discourse consists of the tour guides' monologic commentary, which serves the purpose of information transmission and which can therefore be classified as discourse with a transactional orientation. In contrast is interactional discourse, commonly involving ordinary conversation between the tour guide and tourists. However, conversations between the guide and a tourist or a group of tourists will also often involve elements of a transactional orientation which concern the transmission of information. Other factors affecting variation in the honorific style and selection of neutral or honorific forms include characteristics of the tourists (age, status and number, ranging from a minimum of two up to approximately forty tourists), the setting (in the vehicle, at a sightseeing venue or moving between vehicle and venue) and the type of vehicle used (limousine [a large motor car], mini-bus or bus).
4. Methodology

This paper reports upon a study undertaken by Enomoto (1993), who investigated native speaker evaluations of the politeness deviations of Japanese-speaking Australians in tour guiding situations. For comparative purposes, some data were gathered from native speaker tour guides as well. Enomoto’s research design encompassed a number of stages.

During the first stage, semi-structured interviews were conducted with the tour guides on their backgrounds. At the second stage, the researcher undertook participant observation of a number of tour guiding situations. During this period, short unstructured interviews were conducted with tourists inquiring about their backgrounds and impressions of Australia.

Four tours were then recorded on video tape during the third stage: two situations where the tour guide was a young Australian (one female and one male), and a further two tours which were led by Japanese guides (again, one female and one male). These tours were randomly selected for recording. The mode of transport in these four tour guiding situations was a mini-bus and the number of Japanese tourists varied from four to ten. The recordings, taken in Melbourne and Sydney, consisted of three half-day and one full-day tour. (The tour companies involved did not approve the recording of certain segments of the data; they excluded the opening segments, and the meal situation in the case of the second recording.) The length of the recordings of the situations with the Australian guides were two and three hours respectively. Participant observation was also employed on the days of the tape-recordings, thus allowing monitoring of the full interaction between the guide and the tourists, including the segments of interaction which were not captured on the video camera.

The background of the two Australian guides was as follows. AG1 was a young Australian female in her early twenties, and AG2 an Australian male in his mid-twenties. Neither had formally studied Japanese at any educational institution either in Australia or Japan, although both had resided in Japan for a period of time. Following her return to Melbourne from Japan, AG1 worked for a year as a tour coordinator and for the past six months had been employed as a tour guide for Japanese groups. She has been mainly assigned to limousine car tours with only one honeymoon couple as passengers; the largest group to which she was assigned was a twelve-person mini-bus tour group. AG2 had been working as a tour guide in Sydney for approximately two years since his return from Japan. He had been assigned to various tours including large groups (a forty-person bus tour) and a group involving an eminent Japanese singer. The tour led by AG1 and recorded on video tape consisted of eight tourists: two middle-aged couples and their daughters (one teenager and one university student), and one young married couple. The six
tourists in AG2’s group consisted of two young honeymoon couples and two young, single working women.5

The next component in the methodological procedure involved brief follow-up interviews with all four guides immediately after the tours in order to collect additional data to supplement the base recording. Second follow-up interviews were conducted on specific points after the researcher had prepared a transcript and analysis of the recorded data.

During the fifth stage, a panel of raters was engaged to assess deviations from politeness norms found in the behavior of the Australian tour guides. The data collected by this means were of critical importance in the study of evaluative behavior.

4.1 Use of a rating panel

Six raters with various backgrounds unrelated to the tourism industry were selected. In making the selection of raters, consideration was given to approximating the characteristics of the tourists in relation to sex, age and social status. As a result, the panel of raters included three females and three males whose ages ranged from the mid-twenties to the late fifties. Details on the raters are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Backgrounds of the raters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>No. of years in Australia</th>
<th>Occupation in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>mid-20s</td>
<td>not known</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>tertiary student of computer science and engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>late-20s</td>
<td>university graduate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>secretary in Japanese company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>mid-20s</td>
<td>high school graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>hairdresser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>late-50s</td>
<td>university graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>early-30s</td>
<td>university graduate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>car designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>university graduate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>employed by Australian company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the base recordings of the tour situations varied from two to three hours in length, it was not possible to show the full recordings to the raters. Consequently, for each of the tour situations, Enomoto made a selection of segments of about thirty minutes in length, which included deviations from appropriate communicative norms. Sessions with the native raters, during which time they watched these selections, varied from an hour and a half to two hours in length.
Prior to replaying the video tape-recorded data, the nature of the recording and the aim of the native speaker evaluation session were explained. The recorded data were shown segment by segment and the following open-ended questions were asked, the interviewer’s objective being not to restrict or influence the responses:
1. What do you think of this guide’s performance?
2. Are there any points which you noticed?

After commenting upon the guide’s performance, each rater was asked why he/she arrived at such a conclusion. In relation to points that they noticed, the interviewer asked how they evaluated these points in terms of ‘appropriateness’ or ‘naturalness’, ‘degree of politeness’ and ‘acceptability’. If the open-ended questions were not successful in achieving the type of response wanted by the interviewer or if the raters’ responses did not cover certain points, questions on specific behavior were asked, using the pattern: ‘What do you think of X?’. The methodology used here thus differed from that commonly employed in previous studies which investigated the relative seriousness of deviations. At the conclusion of this evaluation session, the raters were also asked for their overall impression of the guide and why they had reached such an evaluation. Very rich data on evaluative behavior were obtained through use of this method. Some examples of the findings are reported in the section to follow.

5. Findings on evaluative behavior

The native speaker evaluations of the deviations which characterized the interaction of the two guides were categorized into two broad groups: deviations connected with the honorific style and other politeness deviations. The intensity of the evaluations was also measured. This was achieved by allocating the evaluative judgements of the raters to three groups which carried numerical scores: very negative (-2), negative (-1) and neutral (0). No score was given in cases where the rater did not note any deviation. Some raters advanced positive evaluations, usually as a result of a comparison with a deviation on the part of the other guide. These positive evaluations are not discussed here, due to constraints relating to the length of the paper.

Table 2 below indicates the features in honorific style which were noted and evaluated by the raters. This list covers features relating to the Honorific system and to the grammatical elements from the Polite Language sector which are used in conjunction with the honorific style, as previously explained.
Table 2. Evaluations of deviations in honorific style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AG</th>
<th>J1</th>
<th>J2</th>
<th>J3</th>
<th>J4</th>
<th>J5</th>
<th>J6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Desu-masu or gozaimasu style</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Contracted forms</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pers. ref. forms minna hito</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dare</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prefix o/go</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Classifier</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Subject honorific</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Da-style in transactional disc</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Final particle ne</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. N-desu</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. N-desu in question form</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Da-style in interactional disc</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating Scale: 
-2 = very negative evaluation  
-1 = negative evaluation  
0 = neutral  
a blank indicates no noting and no subsequent evaluation

Table 2 shows how the six raters evaluated the deviations of the two guides and it also shows the totals obtained for ratings of the deviant features. Table 3 displays the ratings given for deviations of other politeness features. These features belong to the Polite Language system, as defined earlier, and in this particular table cover mainly non-grammatical deviations.
Table 3. Evaluations of other politeness deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J1</th>
<th>J2</th>
<th>J3</th>
<th>J4</th>
<th>J5</th>
<th>J6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Apology</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Content</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Compliment</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Request</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Offering help</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Axis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Smile</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Intonation</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Emphasis</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Pause filler 'eeto'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Use of hand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating Scale: -2 = very negative evaluation
-1 = negative evaluation
0 = neutral
a blank indicates no noting and no subsequent evaluation

The most conspicuous finding to emerge from Tables 2 and 3 is that the behavior of one guide, AG1, was evaluated far more negatively than was the conduct of AG2, the other guide. When the scores given in the two tables are added together, AG1 scores -156 against -23 for AG2 with respect to negative evaluations advanced by the raters.

Some differences in the severity of judgments made by the raters occurred. As Table 4 shows, the mean score for all judges in their negative evaluations of AG1 was -26, with a standard deviation of 5.2. J6 was the harshest judge while J5 was the most lenient. For AG2, the mean negative score for the raters' negative evaluations was -3.8, with a standard deviation of 1.9. In this case, the strictest judge was J3; J1 and J5 produced the most lenient evaluations.
Table 4. Variation in the negative and very negative evaluations for honorifics and other politeness deviations of the six raters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raters</th>
<th>AG1</th>
<th>AG2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J1 (M)</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2 (F)</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3 (F)</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4 (F)</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J5 (M)</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J6 (M)</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean -26 -3.8
Standard deviation 5.2 1.9

Interesting findings further emerge when we examine the number of occasions on which either very negative or negative markings occur. Tables 5 and 6 show the frequency of occurrence of very negative (Table 5) and negative evaluations (Table 6), as against the tables presenting the severity of the judgements (cf. Tables 2 and 3 above). When the totals given in Tables 5 and 6 are aggregated, we find that there were 119 occasions when AG1 committed deviations that were marked negative or very negative. In comparison, there were only seven occasions for AG2. However, of these seven cases, five of AG2's deviations were evaluated very negatively, constituting 71% of the number of occasions. In other words, when the raters evaluated the deviations of this speaker, they did so quite severely. On the other hand, in the case of AG1, the very negative evaluations constitute only 37 occurrences out of 119, or 31%. That is to say, the individual raters marked the majority of AG1's deviations negatively, not very negatively.

Table 5. Number of occasions of very negative evaluations given by the raters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raters</th>
<th>AG1</th>
<th>AG2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honorific</td>
<td>Other politeness features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Number of occasions of negative evaluations given by the raters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raters</th>
<th>AG1 Honorific</th>
<th>AG1 Other politeness features</th>
<th>AG2 Honorific</th>
<th>AG2 Other politeness features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further difference becomes obvious when we examine the number of occasions when judges negatively or very negatively evaluate deviations relating to either honorific style or other politeness features. Although there were not many instances, the discourse of AG2 is evaluated more frequently for deviations in honorifics: five times out of seven (or 71%) (cf. Tables 5 and 6). For AG1, deviations in honorifics constitute 55% of her deviations (66 out of 119 occasions), the remaining 45% relating to other politeness features. However, the findings show that when taken alone, the very negative ratings for AG1 occur in 27 out of 37 (or 73%) occasions in relation not to honorific style but to other politeness forms (Table 5). In other words, for AG1 it is deviations in other forms of politeness which more frequently attract the most strongly marked evaluations.

One feature which was not systematically analyzed in the treatment reported in this paper is the existence of multiple deviations in many of the utterances or sequences. This was a predominant feature of the discourse but could not be adequately displayed in the above tables. Nevertheless, it will become apparent in the descriptions below.

Using the scores awarded to the evaluations of the raters to mark intensity (cf. Tables 2 and 3), we can categorize the evaluated features into three groups. Table 7 shows the guide responsible for the deviation and whether the type of deviation concerns the honorific style (H) or other politeness features (O). The three groups are as follows:

A. Maximally evaluated negative deviations, where the total score for one guide varies from -12 to -8. (Every rater would have to advance an evaluation that was given a weight of -2 in order to achieve a total of -12, while in the case of -8, various combinations are possible, for example, -1 and -2, three times respectively.)
B. Considerably negative evaluations, where the total score for one guide varies from -7 to -5; and,
C. Somewhat negative evaluations, where a guide's total score is in the range of -4 to -1.

Table 7. Classification of features according to intensity of evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>AG1</th>
<th>AG2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximally evaluated negative deviations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliment</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reference <em>minna</em></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>AG2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted form</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axis</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerably negative deviations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Desu-masu</em> or <em>gozaimasu</em> style</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smile</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefix <em>o/go</em></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering help</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reference <em>hito &amp; dare</em></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classifier</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject honorific</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Da</em>-style in transactional discourse</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pause filler</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat negative deviations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final particle <em>ne</em></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>N-desu</em></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question <em>N-desu</em></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Da</em>-style in interactional discourse</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of hand</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of six raters naturally meant that variation was found in the way they evaluated deviations. The total scores given to the deviations by all six judges, plus the variation according to the individual rater is of interest. The following sections discuss segments from the discourse which were nega-
tively evaluated by the raters. Consequently, within these, we can observe rater variation.

5.1 Maximally negative evaluations

This section covers those deviations which were most severely evaluated by the raters overall. As shown in Table 7 above, there was a preponderance of other politeness features in this group. The sequence containing a deviation from an apology norm was found when, in response to a tourist taking a photo with a flash in an old mansion (Como House) where such action was prohibited, AG1 reprimanded the tourist and then weakly apologized for not having given adequate instructions prior to entering the venue. The sequence was as follows:

(1) AG1: Eeto, kono uchi mo shashin totte mo ii to okyakusan ni itte nai. Sumimasen. [walking with downcast eyes]
('Umm, I didn’t tell you that you can take photos in this house, too. Sorry.')
Saki ni ieba yokatta kamo shirenai.
('I probably should have told you beforehand.')

AG1 had not given any instruction about the prohibition of photography using a flash prior to alighting from the bus. At each sightseeing venue where the tourists alighted from the bus, all the other guides in the data, except AG1 at this and at other times, issued instructions about the tourists’ belongings and actions prohibited at the location. All the raters noted the deviations contained in the sequence quoted in (1) above and evaluated them as extremely serious (cf. Table 3). We could further see from the replay of the video tape recording that the tourists themselves were startled with the guide’s behavior. Not only did the guide severely reprimand the tourist in a direct manner, but she also failed to encode an appropriate apology. That is to say, her attempt to subsequently employ mitigating strategies, firstly, through use of an apology routine and, secondly, by partly assuming the blame on herself, were unsuccessful. Softening the assumption of blame through the use of the phrase kamo shirenai ('probably') may in fact have aggravated, rather than mitigated, this modificatory move. Here, too, her employment in interactional discourse of the da-style—a feature of this guide’s communicative style—was also inappropriate.

Some of the comments of the raters provided insights into how interactants evaluate deviations of this nature. J3 maintained that the reprimand was too direct and strong and therefore impolite, and J6 claimed that AG1’s utterance made the listener feel guilty, as if taking the photo was the tourist’s fault.
Four of the raters pointed out that the utterance of *sumimasen* itself as well as AG1’s failure to adequately apologize were impolite. J2 regarded AG1’s use of the routine *sumimasen* as not sounding apologetic since she turned her gaze away from the tourists when producing the utterance. It is of interest that the rater noted the lack of this concomitant non-verbal act in the sequence, and commented upon this deficiency rather than upon the weakness of *sumimasen* as an apology routine. J5 indicated that as Japanese tourists are known for their habit of taking photos when travelling, the guide should have given the instruction in advance. J5 maintained, therefore, that AG1 should have apologized not only to the tourist concerned but also to the whole group. Such a comment as this is indicative of the seriousness of the guide’s action and suggests that she had failed to fulfil an important function pertaining to her role.

In the second case which attracted an equally strong negative evaluation (cf. Table 3), the guide employed a comment which was regarded by the tourists as racially discriminating. When in the main bedroom of an old cottage (Captain Cook’s) the guide conveyed information about the furniture and articles inside. Included in her commentary was a description of the size of the old bed:

(2) AG1: *Kono beddo wa daburu nan desu ne. Haba ga aru kedo, tate wa arimasen kara, mukashi no hito ga nihonjin mitai ni shinchoo ga chiiyakatta n desu tte.*

(‘This is a double bed. It is wide, but short, so I’ve heard that English people in the past were small like the Japanese.’)

Though AG1 did not intend to encode any discriminatory utterance, her use of the expression *nihonjin mitai ni* (‘like the Japanese’) in relation to the height of Japanese people was evaluated by all the raters as one of her most serious deviations. One rater claimed that the statement would have offended any short male tourist, had one been among them. Another three raters claimed that any statement based upon a comparison of particular characteristics of ethnic groups is prohibited. One rater also noted that the emphatic intonation at the end of the statement added to its inadequacy. A further rater commented that this statement was unsuitable in the discourse of a guide, but suggested that the addition of some ambiguity in the form of *gurai* (*nihonjin gurai no*) (literally = ‘about’) would make the statement more objective and without discriminatory connotations.

AG1’s management of the speech act of complimenting also belongs to this extremely negative category, attracting a maximum score of -2 from each of four raters and -1 by the remaining two (cf. Table 3). In this case, AG1 praised the ability of one of the tourists who played a piece of music on the piano of the ballroom of Como House:
AG1 intended to convey the fact that she was impressed with the tourist’s performance. However, there are cross-cultural differences in the expression of compliments, including the tendency in Japanese not to directly praise an interactant’s abilities or skills, especially not of an older addressee. As well, AG1 claps, selects inappropriate lexicon and also uses the da-style with a contracted verb. Four of the raters displayed a very critical attitude towards the deviation. One of these raters claimed that a Japanese native speaker guide would have never produced such an utterance and a further two stated that this kind of statement should not be used, even by a non-native speaker of Japanese. One rater argued that kanshin suru (literally: to be impressed by, to be struck with admiration) is usually used by older, superior speakers toward a younger person, a condition that was not satisfied here.

Four raters evaluated AG1 in the severest way for problems in the management in the axis (cf. Table 3). Here, axis refers to the degree of axis of one’s shoulders to that of the addressee (cf. Watson 1970). When delivering her commentary on the bus AG1 remained in the front seat and either gazed forward or else cast her eyes downward and seldom turned around towards the tourists. In one instance when engaged in interactional discourse with a tourist on the way back from Captain Cook’s Cottage to the coach, she was noted to seldom turn her face toward her Japanese addressee and kept looking straight ahead. Such behavior contrasted in this context with that of the tourist who frequently turned her face toward the guide. J2, J3, J4 and J6 disapproved of AG1’s lack of postural attention in the above instances. One rater admitted that while it might be difficult for a guide to maintain an appropriate axis in relation to the tourists while on the bus, at least in face-to-face discourse the guide should assume an axis where the Speaker more directly faces her addressees. Another judge interpreted AG1’s deviation in axis resulting in overall lack of eye contact as ‘restless’ and ‘nervous’, an evaluation which was probably correct since AG1 herself admitted to being quite nervous with regard to the management of the tour schedule.

Another instance of a deviation which falls into the maximally evaluated category involved use of a personal reference form (cf. Table 2). The data contained four forms of address used towards the group of tourists as a whole by the two Japanese and the two Australians: minasamagata, minasama, minasan and minna. Of these, the variant of minna which was used twice by AG1 was noted as a deviation by all raters in the study, and evaluated very negatively by four of them and negatively by two, thus giving a total score
of -10. Both this feature and a further deviation of AG1’s consisting of the use of contracted forms relates to the management of the honorific style.

Only one deviation in the discourse of AG2 has been categorized as a maximally negative deviation based on the individual evaluations of the six raters. This concerned the speech act of requesting (cf. Table 3). AG2 formulated a deviant request form when asking the tourists to note down his telephone number in case of an emergency:

(4) AG2: *Ichioo watashi no denwa bangoo o o-oshie shimasu kedo yokattara chotto kakimasu ka.*

(‘I will give you my phone number just in case, so will you just write it down?’)

The above request was judged very negatively by two raters and negatively by the remaining four, resulting in a total score of -8. As well as sounding unnatural, J1, J2, J4 and J5 added that native speakers of Japanese would not have articulated such an utterance, and two of them gave a variety of acceptable variants which could have been employed. J3 and J6 evaluated AG2’s utterance in (4) as very ‘blunt’, J6 commenting that it was more conspicuous in the case of this guide since his Japanese ‘was fluent and most of his speech followed naturally’. This was thus the feature which attracted the highest negative score for AG2.

In conclusion, the data show that deviations belonging to the Polite Language sector, including non-verbal behavior, attracted maximal negative evaluations in comparison with deviations relating to the honorific style.

5.2 Considerably negative evaluations

This group covers the features for which total scores in the range of -7 to -5 were given to the negative evaluations of the raters. In the majority of cases the deviations attracted a score of -1 for a particular feature, and only occasionally a rating of -2 from any one rater. Six features involved deviations in honorific style and a further six covered other politeness deviations. As shown in Table 7, AG1 committed most of these deviations. However, AG2 also did so on two occasions.

Deviation in appropriate use of the desu-masu style was a conspicuous feature for both guides, particularly for AG2, in view of the relatively low number of negative evaluations made of his discourse by the raters (cf. Table 2). AG2 received strong markings from three raters but only neutral rankings from the other three, indicating some variation in the judgements of the raters. On the other hand, AG1 consistently received -1 from each rater.

Lack of smiling behavior on the part of AG1 attracted a negative rating from all of the judges, with one of the evaluations classed as very negative
Initially, the maintenance by AG1 of an expressionless face gave the impression to two of the raters that the guide worked very hard to perform her duty. However, along with the other raters, overall, they evaluated her behavior negatively, pointing out the rather formal atmosphere which was created. J3 even evaluated the lack of a smile as AG1’s most serious deviation, commenting that she could have compensated for her linguistic incompetence and inexperienced guide behavior if she had smiled a lot and had been amiable. During the follow-up interview which the researcher conducted with AG1, it was clear that the guide was a nice, friendly young Australian girl whose behavior during the tour guiding situation was characterized by presentational deviance.

In many of the cases found in the present data, deviations in politeness could be classified as presentational deviance, following Neustupný’s classification of deviance as propositional, presentational, performance, correction or discord deviance (Neustupný 1985a). Presentational deviance refers to the inability to send (or receive) information on the speaker’s personality, attitudes or intentions (Neustupný 1985a: 51).

On occasions, only one-half of the raters evaluated a communicative feature very negatively while the other half either remained neutral or did not even note the feature. For example, a range of judgements was made in relation to emphasis of the guide’s voice (cf. Table 3). AG1 generally tended to place stress on many words, including those in sentence final positions. When this deviation was combined with other grammatical deviations relating to honorific style, for instance, inappropriate use of the final particle ne after a verb phrase in an honorific form like gozonji deshoo ka ne (‘I wonder if you know’), then the utterance tended to be strongly marked by the raters with a negative evaluation. The three raters claimed that use of ne in the above utterance, for instance, ‘rang’ in their ears. J4 also referred to the stress which AG1 sometimes placed on the subject particle ga, suggesting that it sounded like the speech style of young Japanese, and he assumed she must have acquired this speech pattern through living with Japanese students while in Japan.

Although it can be expected that tour guides will offer to take photographs for their Japanese clients, neither AG1 and AG2 were able to use appropriate polite routines when offering assistance (Table 3). For example:

(5) AG1:  
*Shashin o totte agemasu ka.*  
(‘Shall I take a photo for you?’)

(6) AG2:  
*Shashin o doo desu ka.*  
(‘How about photos?’)
All six judges evaluated the above two utterances negatively, describing them as 'unnatural expressions'. The comments of the raters were given scores of -1 in the case of both guides. Deviations in politeness in these utterances were of a propositional nature. In the case of (6), the raters were unable to comprehend the guide's message, with J4 interpreting it to incorrectly mean that the group would have their photo taken by a professional photographer. Several other judges suggested that if they were present in the actual situation, they might be able to guess the meaning from the context.

A number of AG's deviations revealed problems in the management of the honorific style. Deviations relating to personal reference forms was discussed above in relation to minna. Other deviations of a similar nature include use of the inappropriate variant hito on five occasions, for example, ma, shitteru hito mo iru to omoimasu ga... ('well, some of you might know that...'), a deviation negatively evaluated by four judges and very strongly evaluated by another, J6 (cf. Table 2). In this case several of the raters claimed not to be unduly offended since AG1 was a non-native speaker of Japanese. We judged such a comment to be worthy of a negative score of -1, since it does, in fact, reveal a negative, rather than a neutral evaluation. We can attribute the raters' attitude to their preconception that a learner of Japanese is unable to acquire native-like competence. On the other hand, J6 was particularly critical, claiming that the non-use of the appropriate form kata, coupled with use of the contracted form of shitteru made AG1's utterance sound too casual and inappropriate in a guide-client situation.

Similarly, in her use of classifiers for people, AG1 failed to select the appropriate classifier, as in the following example (Table 2):

(7) AG1: Eeto chikin o tabetai kata ga te o agete kudasaimasu ka. Ichī, nii, san, san dake desu ka?

('Could you raise your hand if you would like the chicken dish? One, two, three, only three all together?')

All raters evaluated this deviation as inappropriate, constituting a violation of the use of a polite classifier which should have been used. Two of the raters also commented upon the inappropriateness of the use of dake ('only'), which seemed to suggest that more tourists should select chicken (which is the cheapest meat in Japan).

Sometimes deviations affected the transmission of the message, and thus represented propositional deviance, as mentioned earlier. For instance, misuse of the honorific o/go prefix and the suffix san with appropriate nouns occurred in the discourse of AG1 (cf. Table 2). AG1 attached the honorific prefix to words where it is not the norm, for example, hata ('flag') and eki ('station') and conversely, she failed to attach the prefix where necessary, as in o-tetsudai-san ('maid'). Rating these deviations negatively, J6 considered...
them as serious deviations, stating that o-hata (‘flag’) ‘sounded a little jarring to his ear’. All raters mentioned that this kind of deviation could result in communication breakdown, as illustrated in AG1’s use of o-hata which was not understood by five of the six raters. Similarly, J6 did not understand the deviant form, tetsudai-san without the honorific prefix o.

The first guide’s intonation attracted negative ratings from four raters, all maintaining that her commentary was delivered in such a manner as to suggest that she was reading aloud (cf. Table 3). Two of these allocations attracted a score of -2, and -1 was given by another two raters. These judges evaluated her intonation as monotonous, and not directed towards them as listeners. Consequently, even if the guide employed linguistically acceptable patterns in some sequences, poor management of intonation affected her output. For instance, just before arriving at a sightseeing venue (St Patrick’s Cathedral) she delivered the following instruction:

(8) AG1: *Eeto, kochira dewa gofunkurai ano shashin sutoppu ni shimasu ga, ano shashin toritai kata doozo orite totte kudasai.* [said in a flat, monotonous tone of voice]  
(‘We’ll make a photo stop here of about five minutes so those passengers who wish to take photos can get off here.’)

J3, who evaluated the above utterance in (8) as ‘blunt’, felt it carried the interpretation that ‘you can take pictures if you want, but I don’t care’. This kind of behavior on the part of AG1 suggested to the raters that the guide lacked experience and confidence. In the follow-up interview, this assessment was in fact confirmed as accurate by AG1 herself. She admitted to being confident in accompanying a honeymoon couple but not a larger group consisting of more than four participants. For the tour which was video tape-recorded she claimed to be nervous because of the number of tourists, and the presence of the researcher and video camera.

AG1’s discourse also contained deviations with the speech act of request, which attracted a total score of -6 (cf. Table 3). Already, the problem with requesting behavior for AG2 has been discussed under the section of maximally-evaluated negative deviations. In the case of AG1, the following deviations were found:

(9) AG1: *Migi no hoo goran ni natte kudasaimase ne.*  
(‘Please look at your right-hand side, won’t you.’)

(10) AG1: *Doozo kiite kudasaimase ne.*  
(‘Please listen [to them], won’t you.’)
All raters noted the above two deviations where the final particle *ne* was unnecessarily added to the polite request form, and they unanimously evaluated this act negatively.

In summary, features which were judged to be considerably negative by the rating panel related either to the honorific style or to other politeness features. Most of the deviations were committed by AG1 in comparison with AG2. This section did not introduce all the deviations found in the data. Details of the deviations concerning use of the subject honorific in the *desu-masu* style, use of the *da*-style in transactional discourse and use of the pause filler *eeto* have been omitted for the sake of brevity.

5.3 Somewhat negative evaluations

The category of somewhat negative evaluations refers to those deviations which attracted fewer negative evaluations from the raters and also, in general, fewer severe evaluations. Because ratings between -4 and -1 are included in this category, it follows that a neutral rating of 0 sometimes occurs for a number of the features.

Of the five features in this group attracting negative evaluations (cf. Table 7), four related to use of the honorific style. As noted in data extracts (1) and (3) above, AG1 employed the *da*-style or a mixture of the *da*-style and *desu-masu* style in the final predicate position in interactional discourse with the tourists. On these occasions when she was not involved in the transmission of regular information where her use of the *desu-masu* style was generally higher, this guide employed the *da*-style and, in so doing, failed to encode linguistic politeness. All the raters noted AG1’s use of the *da*-style in situations where she conversed face-to-face with the tourists. Three of the raters evaluated this deviation negatively, commenting that in this situation use of the *da*-style was inappropriate for a guide. These same three raters claimed that they would not be unduly offended by AG1’s deviation, given that she was a non-native speaker of Japanese. However, they indicated that if a young Japanese guide had used this style in the same situation, they would have labelled him/her as an uneducated person or one who lacked common sense. This type of comment was indicative of a degree of leniency which was thus shown to foreign speakers of Japanese. Nevertheless, in our categorization it constituted a negative evaluation, even if somewhat weak. On the other hand, the other three raters did not evaluate AG1’s use of the *da*-style negatively, suggesting that face-to-face communication was less public than the situation of a guide talking to a group and that use of the *da*-style would create a friendly atmosphere. One of these raters, J4, further suggested that even a young native speaker of Japanese might employ the *da*-style in similar situa-
tions, and referred to her experience of participating in a tour in Melbourne where the young Japanese guide used more casual language than would be the case of a guide in Japan. Some further clarification of this issue was obtained in the interview with one of the Japanese guides whose tour was also video tape-recorded. This Japanese guide claimed to employ the da-style on occasions when engaged in face-to-face discourse with a tourist as a strategy to show empathy toward them when they were younger than himself and when the setting was not formal. Other deviations in the honorific style concerned overuse of the final particle ne, a feature of the discourse of both guides, and overuse of N-desu, including N-desu in a question form.

In the case of use of the hand, both guides received quite a weak negative evaluation. Guides frequently need to be able to indicate direction as well as the location of things and places when giving guiding commentaries. In most instances, AG1 followed the Japanese norm of pointing with her palm held down, but the raters noted one instance where she held her hand with her palm upwards before turning it over, and another instance where she directed the tourists inside a building using her hand while walking at the same time. Several judges were neutral about the latter action, admitting they were unsure of the norm. In the same situation, the guide clapped her hands twice during her discourse. One of the judges, in reference to these various hand movements, maintained that such acts created a casual impression and were therefore inappropriate, particularly when the guide clapped her hands during her own commentary. A further rater commented that in the actual situation tourists may not notice the guide’s clapping behavior and that provided such actions were not frequent, it could be permissible. What these evaluations seem to suggest is that the raters were not conscious of the definite norms regarding the use of hands in guiding situations and hence they did not provide many critical remarks.

6. Concluding discussion

This paper introduced the use of a rating panel as a methodological procedure for measuring evaluative behavior, specifically as encoded by native speakers of Japanese in relation to the politeness deviations of non-native speaker tour guides. The use of video recordings of naturally occurring situations together with in-depth interviews with the raters about problems which occurred in the recorded interaction enabled us to observe how these native speakers of Japanese assessed the discourse and interaction of non-native speakers of Japanese. In this concluding section we summarize the type of deviations, the intensity of the raters’ evaluations and individual variation in the evaluative behavior of the raters.
The type of deviations noted and negatively evaluated (regardless of intensity) belonged either to the honorific style or to other politeness features. Those deviations which were negatively evaluated but which did not relate to honorific style concerned the management of the speech acts of apology, compliment, request and offering help. A serious problem concerning content rules was also identified. Problems of a paralinguistic nature included intonation and emphasis, while problems with axis, smiling behavior, and use of the hand relate to non-verbal features. In relation to honorific style, deviations in the use of personal reference forms and the classifier for persons were strongly evaluated in a negative manner. So, too, was the use of contracted verbal forms. Other negatively-evaluated deviations included inappropriate use of the desu-masu or gozaimasu style, over-use of the da-style in interactional as well as in transactional discourse, misuse and lack of use of the honorific prefix (o/go), inadequate use of the pause filler eeto, overuse of the final particle ne, and overuse of N-desu, including N-desu in question form.

The degree of intensity of the evaluations was calculated by means of awarding scores to indicate whether the deviations were very negatively, negatively or neutrally evaluated. On the basis of the total of these scores for all six raters, the features were grouped into three categories to show the overall intensity of the evaluations. A most important finding to emerge from the data was that politeness features other than those connected with honorific style were more severely evaluated than were deviations relating to honorific style. Of the group of deviations which attracted the severest evaluations from the raters, most were other politeness features, as defined in this paper. Furthermore, within this group, the most severe evaluations were for deviations in the management of speech acts and the content of the discourse. On the other hand, the kind of deviations which received the weakest negative evaluations in this study were concerned with the honorific style.

However, when we examine all of the evaluations made of the deviations of the two Australian tour guides, an important difference emerges. Whereas deviations in other politeness features were more commonly evaluated for the less competent Japanese speaker, AG1, for the other guide who was a more advanced Speaker, negative evaluations were made more frequently in relation to deviations in honorific style.

The data show that more leniency was extended towards the less competent speaker. Furthermore, on occasions, the judges reported that they would be stricter towards native speakers of Japanese than they were towards either of the Australian guides. Nevertheless, in their evaluations, clearly, they were stricter towards AG2, the more advanced of the two guides. This finding suggests that deviations may be judged in accordance with the level of proficiency of the non-native speaker. Moreover, it appears that some deviations which are likely to attract a very negative evaluation in internal situations...
only receive a somewhat negative or even a neutral evaluation when committed by a non-native interactant.

Several observations can be made with regard to individual variation in the evaluative behavior of the raters. In the case of their evaluation of AG1, the mean score for both sexes is -26, as is the individual mean scores for males and females (cf. Table 4). However, it must be remembered that the male, J6, was much stricter than other male or female raters. In fact, the standard deviation within the male group was high, in comparison with a low standard deviation for the female group. Further variation in the evaluative behavior between the sexes emerges in the case of their evaluations of AG2. In comparison with the total mean of 3.8, the female mean is 4.6 as against the mean of 3 for the male raters. Consequently, the female raters are more severe with AG2, the more competent of the two guides. This finding may suggest that female raters are stricter overall in their evaluative behavior and that J6's conduct is due to idiosyncratic variation.

How the age variable affects evaluative behavior is an important issue, but obviously a larger sample is necessary on which to base observations. Of the small panel of six raters used in this study, the two older raters in their 40s and 50s (J4 and J6) were the strictest raters of the two guides, with an average of -36 for the scores which indicate intensity of evaluation (cf. Table 4). On the other hand, the easiest raters were J2 and J5 who were in their late 20s and early 30s and who produced an average negative evaluation of -26. Just slightly higher was the mean evaluation of -28 given by J1 and J3, both aged in their mid-20s. Although further data are necessary, these findings may suggest a tendency for the older age group to advance stricter evaluations.

Other reasons to explain the amount of individual variation among raters may be related to the fact that numerous deviations were of a multi-faceted nature, and may have contributed to the tendency for some individuals to consider the effect of more than one deviation when they were dealing with a particular sequence while others focused upon a single deviation. In the former case, such raters may have offered a stricter evaluation.

Implicit in the findings on evaluative behavior are the norms which are considered appropriate by native speakers of Japanese. We could identify, for example, some of the components of the important speech acts of apologizing and complimenting in Japanese. At the same time, we could also observe the presence of norm dissonance as a result of interference of English norms in the management of those speech acts by the Australian guide. In relation to the control of discourse content, the proscription of matters which could be interpreted as racially discriminating also emerged. The study further showed that, apart from variation in what is accepted as the norm, native speakers themselves are not always sure of the norm at times. When situations were outside of those in which they normally participate, such as a
guided tour, they were not necessarily aware of the appropriateness of certain norms, for instance, the guide's hand movements.

This paper has been concerned with the stages of noting and evaluation in the language management model. The final stage of the model covers adjustment where deviations may remain unadjusted or, alternatively, be adjusted. The data from this study show that many deviations are being committed in actual guiding situations, suggesting that not only is more rigorous and thorough pre-training of guides necessary, but that in-service training is also needed. Furthermore, in both the pre-training and in-service situations, instruction is needed on a wide range of communicative and interactional features which are relevant to these situations.

The study therefore carries important implications for the training of tour guides in particular, and, more generally, of non-native speakers of Japanese. This is because many of the norms identified in this study are applicable in non-guiding contexts as well. It seems that certain speech acts like apologies, compliments, requests and offering help are quite central in the Japanese system of politeness and consequently emphasis should be placed on their early acquisition. In guide training, special emphasis must be given to commonly occurring routines and also upon non-verbal behavior like axis and smiling behavior, and also upon paralinguistic features like intonation and emphasis. Another finding with important implications for training is that good management of certain aspects of the communicative system allows other deviations which are noted to be only neutrally evaluated, or, alternatively, not even noted. The objective of our study has been delineation of the evaluative behavior of raters in relation to deviations committed by tour guides. Future research should aim at producing a finer grid of negative deviations in order to depict the hierarchy that exists. It is important to add, in conclusion, that the evaluations of the tourists in the actual situations examined were probably different, with many of the deviations of the tour guides not noted or evaluated. Nevertheless, there is a possibility that some tourists will assume the role of judges, and make evaluations such as those advanced by the raters in this study.

_Monash University_

Notes

1. The term 'Australian' is used in this paper as a broad term referring to non-native speakers of Japanese in Australia.
2. In the case of the native speaker guides, questions covered their place of birth, length of residence in Australia, status in Australia (permanent resident or temporary sojourner),
age, length of experience in tour guiding, attitude towards use of honorifics and problems experienced in tour guiding. Other questions for the Australians included their previous study of Japanese, and length and purpose of any period of residence in Japan.

3. AG1 spent one year in Japan as an exchange student from January 1989 to January 1990. After completing secondary school, AG2 worked for an Australian computer company for a year and then from April 1989 to August 1990 lived in Osaka, Japan where he taught English while utilizing a working holiday visa.

4. Except for the young couple, all were visiting Australia for the first time and all came from the Kanto area of Japan. They commenced their tour in Canberra after which they came to Melbourne, where the video tape-recording of a morning tour was made. AG1 had met the tourists on the previous day and on this second and final morning in Melbourne, the tour included visits to various sightseeing venues in the vicinity of Melbourne prior to terminating at the airport. Sydney was to be their final Australian destination.

5. All the tourists were visiting Australia for the first time. Sydney was the first destination for them, after which they would visit Ayers Rock and Cairns. The tourists were similarly from the Kanto area. The recording was undertaken in Sydney as part of a one-day sightseeing tour of the city and a wild-life park. Although it was the second day for the group in Sydney, it was the first time for AG2 to meet these tourists.

6. In those studies, raters were merely asked to indicate the relative seriousness of a deviation on a pre-established numerical rating scale.

7. This variation is a reflection of the different recruitment and training procedures in Australia in comparison with Japan.
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