Politeness Level Comparison of Request Expressions
—Focused on Gender through American and Japanese Films—

KURAYA Nobuko
Nihon University, Graduate School of Social and Cultural Studies

依頼表現の丁寧度比較
—日米の映画に見られるジェンダーによる違い—

藏屋　伸子
日本大学大学院総合社会情報研究科

　本稿では、2000 年以降に公開された日米の映画の依頼シーンに見られる男女の依頼表現の丁寧度の違いについて考察した。従来の研究では、社会的地位の低さや社会的活動の多さから、日本語、英語共に女性の方が男性よりも丁寧な表現が見られるとされてきたが、現代の依頼シーンの全体的な傾向としては特に日本語であまり大きな違いは確認できなかった。

　女性日本語母語話者及び男性日本語母語話者が男性に依頼をする場合は、丁寧度の低い表現を選択する傾向が見られた。しかし、女性英語母語話者の選択には明確な傾向が見られず、自らあるいは聞き手の社会的地位とは別の要因で丁寧度を選択していると考えられる。また、男性英語母語話者が女性と話す場合にもその影響が見られた。

　本稿では、言語とジェンダー別に上下関係の影響によって選択する依頼表現の丁寧度の傾向を見るため、依頼状況における緊急性と遂行義務の条件を制限した。今回制限したこれらの要因やその他の条件の丁寧度の選択への影響の調査が今後の課題である。

1. Introduction

　　　It has been said that expected or actual styles of speaking are different between men and women. In Japan, since the Ordinance for Enforcement of the Act on the Securing, Etc. of Equal Opportunity and Treatment of Men and Women in Employment was enacted in 1986[1], people have been required to treat men and women more equally and more strongly and it seems less people think of the gender role seriously. Even so, some linguists still observe different speaking styles between men and women. Deborah Tannen observed and described different conversational styles at work between men and women in *Talking from 9 to 5* (1995) and others. Shoko Ide presented a section named "Josei wa naze teinei ka [The reason why women speak politely]" in her

Wakimae no Goyou ron (2006). Janet Holmes described the differences in politeness between men and women. She published the results of her survey conducted mainly in New Zealand as *Women, Men, and Politeness* (1995). This paper aims to review the above researchers' literature by focusing on request expressions and then observe current speaking styles in films.

2. Literature Review
2.1　Indirectness by Tannen

　　　Tannen (1995) introduces a variety of scenes at work as examples, and the point to be focused on here is "indirectness." She illustrates that "the gender difference lies not in the ability to interpret indirectness, but in whether or not one expects indirectness in a given situation." (p.88) She also reports that "most studies finding women to be more indirect are about getting

---

[1] See (MHLW, 1986).

others to do things. That too can be common among men -- as the cases of the military officer and the manager I called Sid demonstrated." (1995, p.89) According to her explanation, "the situations in which men are most often found to be indirect have to do with the expression of weakness, problems, and errors, and of emotions other than anger." (1995, p.89-90)

On the other hand, she highlights men's indirect requests. One of them is an indirect question to confirm that his secretary already started expected arrangements (1995, p.83-84); another is a description of a Greek authoritative father's. "This father felt so powerful ... he simply needed to let her know his preference." (1993, p.174) While it is thought that indirectness is mainly used by people in a lower social position, Tannen insists that "indirectness is a prerogative of the powerful," (1993, p.174) and "it can be used by either the powerful or the powerless." (1993, p.175)

However, the interpretation of indirectness depends on cultures. In the United States, "because middle-class European-American women are more likely to give orders and make requests in an indirect way, we associate indirectness with powerlessness and insecurity -- emotions that women in our society are expected to have. And the situation is reinforced by the negative response people are likely to get if they do not speak in expected ways." (1995, p.99) However, in Japan, "it is well known that saying 'no' is considered too face-threatening to risk, so negative responses are phrased as positive ones" (1993, p.174), whose indirectness both men and women use. Therefore, "because Japanese adults learn to be indirect, they associate indirectness with maturity and power." (1995, p.99) In short, in the United States, indirectness is usually used by powerless people, especially women, whereas in Japan, both men and women use after maturity. In other words, only some people use indirectness in both of those countries. Accordingly, it is not surprising if the real meaning cannot be interpreted correctly, this can cause various problems. For dealing with this kind of risk, Tannen introduces Kunihiko

Harada's suggestion that "the secret of successful communication lies not in teaching subordinates to be more direct, but in teaching higher-ups to be more sensitive to indirect meaning." (1995, p.95)

2.2　Women's speaking style by Ide

Ide (2006) starts her explanation with historical backgrounds in the United States. According to her, "in the United States, the Seventh Amendment in 1964 triggered the movement toward gender equality, and Lakoff researched gender equality in speaking styles as a pioneer. Typical female speaking styles ... show lack of confidence. By using these styles, the speaker unintentionally shows that she is not an important person." (p.164-165, translation mine) This situation is similar to the middle-class European-American women introduced by Tannen (1995, p.99).

Ide (2006) says that the reason why women are expected to use more polite honorifics in Japan is based on "a combination of the idea that 'women are positioned in lower positions' or that 'men are mainstreamers and women are on the periphery' and the idea that 'honorifics are to be used by lower-positioned people to higher-positioned people.'" (pp.166-167, translation mine) However, in terms of positions, she also points out that an unreasonable result is reported in Ide & Inoue (1992) saying that "female managers use more polite expressions than young female staff." (2006, p.167, translation mine) Ide (2006) does not explain the reason, but it can be related to the combination of indirectness and maturity in Japan (Tannen 1995, p.99).

In terms of politeness level, Ide (2006) gives a noteworthy example. "As women use polite expressions more frequently than men, real politeness levels of their expressions will be lowered than men's." (p.173, translation mine) Therefore, "women use more polite expressions not only because women enjoy more social conversations but also because the politeness level of their expressions cannot be delivered properly due to their too frequent use." (p.173, translation mine) Ironically, "the same expressions have the proper

politeness level when they are used by men." (2006, p.173, translation mine)

2.3　Gender difference in politeness by Holmes

Unlike Tannen and Ide, Holmes discusses the background factors in the difference between men and women based on politeness. Regarding the lower position women usually have, which is something that Tannen and Ide mention, Holmes (1995) explains that "in communities where women are powerless members of a subordinate group, they are likely to be more linguistically polite than the men who are in control" (p.8), and "women are regarded as a subordinate or less powerful group than men in many communities, and this is, not surprisingly, often reflected in the different politeness devices used by and addressed to women." (p.19)

However, it seems that a real reason comes not from status but from a way of thinking. Holmes (1995) starts with the notion that "women are more concerned with making connections; they seek involvement and focus on the interdependencies between people. Men are more concerned with autonomy and detachment; they seek independence and focus on hierarchical relationships." (p.7) and adds that "women are socialised to be polite (p.220)."

However, from a wider point of view apart from the comparison between men and women, Holmes (1995) insists "in more professional transactions, identifying and meeting the clients' needs is the most obvious objective. The professional must be, above all, other-orientated. In all these situations, the facilitative, supportive, and considerate politeness strategies typical of female talk have been shown to be more effective" (p.221), which is common with Tannen's suggestion that people should be trained to become more sensitive to indirectness.

3. Research Questions

From the above literature review, while it is highly likely that the differences in speaking styles between

men and women come from the differences in their social status, it seems that some people believe people need to be sensitive to indirectness in order to care about others. At present, in the 2010's, it is likely that gender role and the differences in their speaking styles may be interpreted differently compared with the 1990's. Therefore, this paper targets the current usage in the 2000's, and the research questions are as follows: 1. Do women still tend to use more polite expressions in making a request than men? 2. Are there any differences in chosen politeness levels of request expressions between English speakers and Japanese speakers?

4. Method

This is part of my larger area of research. Therefore, the basic procedure of data preparation and many related descriptions in this section follow my previous papers including Kuraya (2014b).

4.1　Data from Films

In this research, request data are extracted from films. In the sociolinguistics field, it is thought that natural conversation data are preferred for valid analysis. Some researchers point out problems caused by using creative works. Mizumoto (2010) says "about two thirds of scriptwriters choose speaking styles of cast in a drama not because people usually say something this way but so as to illustrate the character or the setting where the person is more effectively." (pp.101-102, translation mine) However, Mizumoto (2010) also reports that "actual young women use common language and sometimes even 'male'-like language to express their ideas. So, some scriptwriters do not use typical female postparticles for young women. In addition, in these past few years, these kinds of postparticles are seen less and less frequently in trendy dramas." (p.104, translation mine)

I believe that artificial conversations from films are valid enough because of the following reasons. 1. It is not easy to record natural conversations in business situations mainly due to confidential information and

increasing sensitivities to Private Information Protection Law. Even if possible, it is highly likely that top secrets are the most worth analyzing but cannot be recorded. So, artificial conversations should be analyzed as substitute data, which is better than nothing. 2. Role play is one of the representative methods to know people's wordings, and film scripts can be thought of as products of role play though one writer produces many lines. 3. Film scripts are created based on certain settings and backgrounds and have sufficiently clear contexts of most scenes or conversations. 4. Both English and Japanese lines have been created under similar conditions mentioned in 3, which can allow comparison and analysis of extracted expressions as valid conversation data. For all of the above reasons, film scripts are used as conversation data here even though there are some limitations.

The target source data is shown in Appendix. These films are chosen because they were produced in the 2000's and many scenes are set in workplaces. Data are extracted from request scenes where main characters ask other individuals, except for very close people such as family and lovers, to do something or are asked something mainly related to work. For that purpose, English subtitles on the screen and/or published film scripts are referred to if available, but what is actually heard is prioritized if any differences are found.

4.2 Variables

When seeking better strategies for making a request, it is crucial to correctly understand the situation. The situation is referred to as "contexts" here. Contexts include variables. The target variables are Urgency, Obligation, and Vertical Distance. These variables are set as follows:

Urgency:
5=Extremely urgent, 4=Very urgent, 3=Rather urgent, 2=Very easy to immediately follow, 1=Not urgent at all.
Obligation:

5=Required to be done, 4=Supposed to be done, 3=Expected to be done, 2=Unnecessary to be done, 1=Supposed not to be done.
Vertical Distance:
5=Speaker is much higher than Addressee, 4=Speaker is higher than Addressee, 3=Speaker is equal to Addressee, 2=Addressee is higher than Speaker, 1=Addressee is much higher than Speaker.

After excluding the data whose addressee is not sure or more than one person, 1096 scenes are left. For focusing on Gender and Vertical Distance here, target data are limited to common conditions in workplaces which still need certain directive forces for request realization: Obligation: 3 and Urgency: 3 or 4. As a result, the number of target scenes is 263 in total (See Appendix). Note that repetition or rephrasing can provide more than one request expressions in a request behavior (scene in the film), and only main ones are handled as request bodies here. The extracted request expressions are classified by Gender (Speaker, Speaker vs Addressee) and then by Vertical Distance. The summary of the data is shown in Table 1. Discussion will be made only for Vertical Distance = 2, 3, and 4.

Table 1 Target Request Scenes

Gender (S)	Gender (A)	Gender (SvsA)	Total	Vertical Distance				
				1	2	3	4	5
M	M	Same	126	0	36	41	44	5
	F	Different	43	0	8	12	23	0
F	F	Same	33	4	16	4	9	0
	M	Different	61	0	26	15	20	0
Total			263	4	86	72	96	5

4.3 Request Element Lists and Politeness Level

For comparison of politeness levels of request expressions, reference ranking lists are required. For English, Kuraya (2014a, p.211) summarizes request elements in a table as shown in Table 2.

Table 2 English Request Elements

Feeler	Core	Main Verb
I would be happy if	it would be possible to	ask
Would you mind if	you would mind ~ing	others
I was wondering if	Would you mind ~ing?	
Would it be all right if	you could	
I wouldn't suppose	you would	
I don't suppose	May I ...?	
Do you suppose	Would it be possible to	
Do you think	You couldn't ..., could you?	
	Do you mind?	
	Could you...?	
	Can you...?	
	Would you ..?	
	I'd like you to	
	Will you...?	
	I need to	
	I want you to	
	You need to	
	You will	

Note: For asking for permission, *I* can be combined with *can / could* instead of *you* in Core.
(Kuraya 2014a, p.211 Table 1)

Leech et al. (2003), Inoue (2011) and other researchers explain that longer sentences can be more polite. Inoue (2011, pp.336-338) considers the number of moras as the length of sentence and illustrates the relations between the number of moras and politeness level by using the results of a large scale of survey reported by Ide et al. (1986). However, each element has a subtly different nuance and this basic rule might not be completely followed. In addition, the number of combinations can be almost limitless and the ranking of all the extracted expressions can avoid delivering typical tendencies. Therefore, request expressions (bodies) are classified into five groups here by giving a point for each small element, calculating a total number of point for each form of request expression, and dividing the request forms into five politeness levels based on total points. The classification rule is established by referring mainly to Brown & Levinson (1987) and Ide et al. (1986) in addition to Table 2. The indirectness by Tannen is one of the important factors to provide a higher point.

Points for elements)
Declarative with Subject "you": -1
Please/*Mind*: 1
Wonder/*Think* and the like:
  past progressive 4, past simple 3,
  present progressive 2, present simple 1
Can/*Will*/*May*: conditional 2, present 1
Be going to/progressive: 1
Negation/Question/Possibility/Tag/*If*: 1
Want: *would like to* 2, *want* 1
Need: *have to*/*need* 1, *have got to*/*gotta*/*better* 0
Asking for permission/*Ask*/Invitation/Omission: 1
Hope: *wish* 5, *hope* 3
Appreciation:
  appreciate 2, *helpful*/*happy* and the like 1
Suggest/Emphasis: -1

Note that the highest point is given to *If* clause only, Condition, Availability, and Reason because these sentences are not clear requests and the addressee might not notice what is expected.

Politeness Levels)
5: 5 or over points
  e.g. *I was wondering if you could ~*, Reason
4: 3 or 4 points
  e.g. *Would you mind ~ing?*, *Could you ~?*
3: 2 point
  e.g. *Will you ~?*, *I think you need to ~*
2: 1 point
  e.g. *I want you to ~*, *You'll have to ~*
1: -1 or 0 points
  e.g. Imperative, You + declarative

For Japanese, no similar list to Table 2 is available as far as I have searched so far. Therefore, based on Brown & Levinson (1987), Himeno (2006), Inaga et al. (2012), Inoue (2011), Kawaguchi, Kamatani, Sakamoto (2002), MEXT (2006), NINJAL (1983), Yamaoka (2008), Yamada (2004), the elements used in Japanese request expressions are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3 Japanese Request Elements

Main Verb	Subsidiary Verb	Auxiliary	Auxiliary/ Postparticle
o~	itadaku (benefactive verb R)	yoroshii (asking for permission R) *	deshouka (question P)
respectful language verb	dekiru (possibility)	masen (negation P)	desuka (question P)
humble language verb	kudasaru (benefactive verb R)	masu (P)	ka (question O)
~ sasete	morau (benefactive verb O)	nai (negation)	keredomo (assumption) *
~ shite	kureru (benefactive verb O)	desu (postparticle P)	kedo (assumption) *
	kudasai (benefactive verb I)	da (postparticle O)	ga (assumption) *
	onegai (please)	ureshii (appreciation) *	yo (emphasys)
	hoshii (hope)	ii (asking for permission O) *	
	choudai	arigatai (appreciation) *	
	nasai	tasukaru (appreciation) *	
		tai (hope) *	

*: Can be combined with the *morau* group only.

R: respectful form, O: ordinary form, I: Imperative form

In the same way as it is found in English, Japanese request expressions will be classified into five groups. The classification rule is established by referring mainly to NINJAL (1983), Brown & Levinson (1987), and Ide et al. (1986) in addition to Table 3.

Points for elements)

Benefactive verb:

  respectful 3, polite 2, ordinary/imperative 1

Onegai: polite 2, ordinary 1, casual 0

Question: polite 2, ordinary 1

Negation: 1

Sasete: 1

Asking for permission: polite 2, ordinary 1

Possibility/Hope: polite 2, ordinary 1

Appreciation/Assumption/Subjunctive: 1

Postparticle: polite 1

Invitation: polite 2

Omission: 1

Emphasis: -1

Politeness Levels)

5: 8 or over points

  e.g. *o~ negae masen' deshou ka?*, Reason

4: 6 point

  e.g. ~ *shite itadake masen' ka?*

3: 3 to 5 points

  e.g. ~ *shite morae masu ka?*

2: 1 or 2 points

  e.g. ~ *shite kudasai*

1: 0 point

  e.g. ~ *shite*

4.4 Procedure

Firstly, selection tendencies are observed by language and gender of speaker.

Secondly, the results of the first step are compared between English and Japanese in the same gender.

Thirdly, the results of the first and second steps are compared between men's and women's.

Finally, typical tendencies are described as a conclusion.

5. Results and Discussion

5.1 Male English Speakers

The number of scenes where a male English speaker makes a request is shown in Table 4. In order to compare with other data, the number is converted into percentage as shown in Table 5.

Table 5 clearly shows that when a man asks another man to do something, he often chooses Politeness Level 1 (hereinafter "Politeness Level" referred just as "Level"), but when the speaker is in a higher position than the addressee, the percentage is higher. In addition, Vertical Distance = 3 and 4 have proportional relations from Level 4 to Level 1, but Vertical Distance = 4 has a steeper slope. This can indicate that some men think of Vertical Distance carefully. Level 5 of Vertical Distance = 3 and 4 has relatively many scenes considering the other conditions and must have a special reason other than Vertical Distance.

On the other hand, when a man asks a woman to do something, no clear tendency is apparent in this table. One reason might be that the number of scenes is very small, but this can be interpreted that men choose an

appropriate style of speaking much more carefully depending on the situation when the addressee is female probably because of the different gender.

As a result, it can be said that English-speaking men prefer to choose Level 1 regardless of Vertical Distance between the same gender, while they apply a completely different rule to choose Politeness Level to the different gender.

Table 4 Politeness Levels of Male English Speakers (Number of Scenes)

Speaker	Male					
Addressee	Same			Different		
Vertical Distance	2	3	4	2	3	4
Politeness Level	14	26	24	4	10	7
5	1	5	3	1	2	2
4	3	2	0	1	1	0
3	3	4	2	0	3	1
2	3	6	7	1	0	1
1	4	9	12	1	4	3

Table 5 Politeness Levels of Male English Speakers (Percentage)

Speaker	Male					
Addressee	Same			Different		
Vertical Distance	2	3	4	2	3	4
Politeness Level	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
5	7.14%	19.23%	12.50%	25.00%	20.00%	28.57%
4	21.43%	7.69%	0.00%	25.00%	10.00%	0.00%
3	21.43%	15.38%	8.33%	0.00%	30.00%	14.29%
2	21.43%	23.08%	29.17%	25.00%	0.00%	14.29%
1	28.57%	34.62%	50.00%	25.00%	40.00%	42.86%

5.2　Male Japanese Speakers

In the same way as is shown in Section 4.1, Levels chosen by male Japanese speakers are shown in Table 6 (Number of Scenes) and Table 7 (Percentage). According to Table 7, when a man asks another man who is equal to him or in a lower position, he prefers to choose Level 1; when the addressee is in a higher position than his, he likes to choose a slightly higher Level 2. Vertical Distance = 3 and 4 have proportional relations from Level 4 to 1, but Vertical Distance = 4 has a slightly

steeper slope. Level 5 should need further examination to find why this level is special.

On the other hand, when a man speaks to a woman, Level 2 is rather common regardless of Vertical Distance, and Level 1 follows in Vertical Distance = 3 and 4. The number of scenes is limited, but "no scenes" of Level 3 and 4 can indicate that this result is not invalid.

As a result, it is found that Japanese men often choose low politeness levels of expressions; but the level can be more diverse to a men than to a women.

Table 6 Politeness Levels of Male Japanese Speakers (Number of Scenes)

Speaker	Male					
Addressee	Same			Different		
Vertical Distance	2	3	4	2	3	4
Politeness Level	22	15	20	4	2	16
5	1	1	3	1	0	1
4	1	1	0	0	0	0
3	6	4	4	0	0	0
2	13	4	5	3	1	8
1	1	5	8	0	1	7

Table 7 Politeness Levels of Male Japanese Speakers (Percentage)

Speaker	Male					
Addressee	Same			Different		
Vertical Distance	2	3	4	2	3	4
Politeness Level	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
5	4.55%	6.67%	15.00%	25.00%	0.00%	6.25%
4	4.55%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
3	27.27%	26.67%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
2	59.09%	26.67%	25.00%	75.00%	50.00%	50.00%
1	4.55%	33.33%	40.00%	0.00%	50.00%	43.75%

5.3　Female English Speakers

Table 8 (Number of Scenes) and Table 9 (Percentage) show Levels preferred by female English speakers. As shown in Table 9, almost no tendencies are seen. The only point to be noted is when a women asks a man in a lower position, Level 1 is rather common. Therefore, it can be said that female English speakers decide a suitable Politeness Level mainly not based on

Vertical Distance or gender of the addressee.

Table 8 Politeness Levels of Female English Speaker (Number of Scenes)

Female					
Same			Different		
2	3	4	2	3	4
5	4	6	10	13	10
2	0	0	1	4	1
0	2	3	2	1	2
0	2	0	1	4	0
1	0	0	4	2	1
2	0	3	2	2	6

Table 9 Politeness Levels of Female English Speakers (Percentage)

Speaker	Female					
Addressee	Same			Different		
Vertical Distance	2	3	4	2	3	4
Politeness Level	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
5	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	30.77%	10.00%
4	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	20.00%	7.69%	20.00%
3	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	10.00%	30.77%	0.00%
2	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	15.38%	10.00%
1	40.00%	0.00%	50.00%	20.00%	15.38%	60.00%

5.4 Female Japanese Speakers

Politeness Levels selected by female Japanese speakers are shown in Table 10 (Number of Scenes) and Table 11 (Percentage). According to Table 11, though no scenes of Vertical Distance = 3 are seen, when a woman asks another woman in a lower position, the first choice is Level 1 and the second 2. When the addressee is in a higher position than the speaker, Level 2 is chosen most frequently, and Level 5 and then 3 follows. This shows that if the choice is not "slightly higher," the highest will be favored.

On the other hand, when a female speaker is in a higher position than a male addressee, it seems that she prefers to choose Level 1 or 2; however, even when the addressee is in a higher position, she still opts for Level

2. In that case, the percentage of Level 1 drastically decreases, and that of Level 3 slightly increases.

As a result, female Japanese speakers have a similar tendency regardless of the addressee's gender. That is, they tend to choose Level 1 or 2 when the speaker is in a higher position, while 2 or 3 is more common for the speaker in a lower position.

Table 10 Politeness Levels of Female Japanese Speakers (Number of Scenes)

Speaker	Female					
Addressee	Same			Different		
Vertical Distance	2	3	4	2	3	4
Politeness Level	11	0	3	16	2	10
5	3	0	0	1	0	1
4	0	0	0	1	1	0
3	2	0	0	3	0	1
2	6	0	1	10	0	4
1	0	0	2	1	1	4

Table 11 Politeness Levels of Female Japanese Speakers (Percentage)

Speaker	Female					
Addressee	Same			Different		
Vertical Distance	2	3	4	2	3	4
Politeness Level	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
5	27.27%	0.00%	0.00%	6.25%	0.00%	10.00%
4	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.25%	50.00%	0.00%
3	18.18%	0.00%	0.00%	18.75%	0.00%	10.00%
2	54.55%	0.00%	33.33%	62.50%	0.00%	40.00%
1	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	6.25%	50.00%	40.00%

5.5 Speaking Styles by Gender

As mentioned in Sections 4.1 and 4.2, when a man asks another man who is equal to or in a lower position (Vertical Distance = 3 or 4), he chooses Level 1 most frequently. However, when the addressee is in a higher position (Vertical Distance = 2), English speakers still like Level 1 but Japanese prefer Level 2, which has a small but clear difference between them. In addition, in Vertical Distance = 4, both of them have proportional relations from 4 to 1, but Japanese have a milder slope. This suggests that Japanese speakers are more deferential,

particularly towards others in a higher social position, more often than English speakers.

However, when the addressee is a woman, the situation will change. English speakers' choice is diversified, while Japanese' is concentrated on Level 1 or 2 though only Level 2 is common when the addressee is in a higher position, which is slightly higher level than the others. It should be said that Japanese men usually choose relatively low levels for women compared to English speakers.

From the results of Sections 4.3 and 4.4, a clear difference can be seen between English-speaking women and Japanese-speaking women. Japanese speakers tend to choose Level 1 or 2 for the addressee in a lower position and 2 or 3 for higher; English speakers do not show any typical patterns and must choose one level not based on Vertical Distance or gender of the addressee.

5.6　Speaking Styles by Language

Overall, men have a similar pattern in the requests between men regardless of language although it seems that Japanese speakers consider Vertical Distance more carefully than English speakers, and the Japanese also have a similar tendency between men and women. Accordingly, female English speakers are clearly different from the other three groups though English speakers commonly have a variety of choices when the addressee's gender is different from the speaker's. In terms of Obligation, negotiable Obligation = 3 scenes are targeted here, but this condition could still be enough not to be greatly cared. The result can show that female English speakers, nevertheless, want to care for others more than those of the other groups at work.

The literature review suggests that women tend to use more polite expressions than men both in English and Japanese due to their social status. However, the above results show that in Japanese, it could be said that no clear gender differences are seen in terms of Politeness Level. In addition, the situation in English is not clearly shown because female English speakers must have a different strategy of choosing an appropriate

politeness level from their positioning. Note that Vertical Distance and their own positioning should be handled separately, but it is not surprising that those who think of their positioning seriously consider Vertical Distance carefully. That is why it will be concluded here that women's general status is less important now than before especially in English.

6. Conclusion

This paper has observed how languages and genders can influence on the choice of Politeness Level of request expressions. Compared to the past research, it can be said that the differences in chosen Politeness Levels between men and women have been reduced and other different factors including professionalism and being sociable by Holmes must have some influence, which needs further thorough examination.

Male English speakers and both male and female Japanese speakers frequently use relatively low levels of expressions at work, whereas female English speakers carefully choose one depending on the situation except for Vertical Distance and their attitudes might influence on male speakers' use to some extent.

The gender role has been changing since gender equality movements started, and speaking styles by gender also could change. Consequently, this theme needs watching and further examination is required considering other factors.

References

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness – Some universals in language usage* --. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Himeno, T. (2006). Nihongo Gakushuusha no tame no Jujudoushi no Taikeiteki Kijutsu: Ruiji, Tairitsu suru Keishiki tono Kanren wo Chuushin ni [Systematic Description of Verbs of Giving and Receiving for Japanese Learners : With Special Reference to Similar and Opposite Forms], Saitama University (Ed.) *Ryuugakusei Kyoiku* 8, 33-52. Retrieved on December 10, 2013 From

http://ci.nii.ac.jp/els/110006184139.pdf?id=ART0 008156663&type=pdf&lang=jp&host=cinii&order _no=&ppv_type=0&lang_sw=&no=1386660219& cp=

Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, Men and Politeness*. New York: Longman Group

Ide, S. (2006). *Wakimae no Goyou ron* [Pragmatics of Wakimae]. Tokyo: Taishukan Publishing.

Ide, S, Ogino, T., Kawasaki, A. & Ikuta, S. (1986). *Nihonjin to Americajin no Keigo Koudou – Daigakusei no Baai* [Deferential Behaviour of Japanese and Americans – In case of university students]. Tokyo: Nan'un-do.

Inaga, K., Takemori, T., Aeba, T., Ii, H., Iida, Y., Ishihara, C., & et al. (2012). *Hyoujun Kokugo Sougou* [General Standard Japanese]. Hiroshima: Daiichi Gakushusha.

Inoue, F. (2011). *Keizai Gengogaku Ronkou* [Economic Linguistics Discussion]. Tokyo: Meijishoin.

Kawaguchi, Y., Kamatani, H., & Sakamoto, M. (2002). "Keigo Hyogen" to "Poraitonesu" ―Nihongo kenkyuu no tachiba kara― [Honorific Expressions and Politeness ―from the view of Research on Japanese―]. *Shakai Gengo Kagaku* [The Japanese Journal of Language in Society], 5(1), 21-27.

Kuraya, N. (2014a). Studies on Politeness Levels of Request Expressions ―Trends in English for the Past Century―. *Nihon University GSSC JOURNAL*, 13(3), 209-217 Retrieved on February 28, 2014, from http://atlantic2.gssc.nihon-u.ac.jp/ kiyou/pdf14/14-209-217-Kuraya.pdf

Kuraya, N. (2014b). *Variations in Voice Pitch Reflecting Request Strategies in Erin Brockovich*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Leech, G., Cruickshank, B., & Ivanič, R. (2003). *Corpus katsuyou Longman Jitsuyou Eibunpou Jiten* [An A – Z of English Grammar & Usage New Ed.]. (Takeda, S., Ikeda, C., Inoue, T., & Ohara, J. Trans.) Tokyo: Pearson Education.

MEXT. (2006). Keigo-no Gakushū-ni Kansuru Gakushuu Shidou Youryou tou-no Omona Kijutsu [Main descriptions of studying honorifics in the curriculum guidelines], Shiryou 4-2 "Kokugoka-no Genjō to Kadai, Kaizen-no Hōkōsei" Kankei Shiryou [Document No. 4-2 Document on "The current situation, challenges, and the direction of improvement"]. In *Kyouiku Katei bukai Kokugo Senmon bukai Dai 8 kai Haifu Shiryou* [Handout of the Eighth Special Japanese Committee, Curriculum Committee]. Retrieved on September 7, 2012 From http://www.mext.go.jp/ b_menu/shingi/chukyo/chukyo3/011/siryo/ 06072701/007/007.htm

MHLW. (1986). *Koyou no Bunya ni okeru Danjo no Kintou na Kikai oyobi Taiguu no Kakuho tou ni kansuru Houritsu Shikou Kisoku* [Ordinance for Enforcement of the Act on the Securing, Etc. of Equal Opportunity and Treatment of Men and Women in Employment]. Retrieved on January 12, 2013 from http://www.mhlw.go.jp/general/seido/ koyou/danjokintou/koyou_kaisei/01.html (English Translation Retrieved on May 17, 2014 from http://www.mhlw.go.jp/general/seido/koyou/danjo kintou/dl/koyou01a.pdf)

Mizumoto, T. (2010). 5 TV Dramas – Terebi Dorama – "Dorama go" to shite no "Onna Kotoba" ["Female Speaking Styles as "Drama Language"], II Medhia ga Tsukuru "Jendaa" [Gender Created by Media], Nakamura, M. (Ed.) *Jendaa de Manabu Gengogaku* [Linguistics Studied through Gender], 89-106. Kyoto: Sekaishisosha.

NINJAL (1983). *Keigo to Keigo Ishiki ―Okazaki ni okeru 20 nen mae to no Hikaku―* [Socio-Psychological Survey on Japanese Polite Expression ―After 20 Years from the Preceding Survey in Okazaki City, Aichi Pref.―]. Retrieved on July 8, 2013 from http://www.ninjal.ac.jp/ s_data/drep/report_nijla/R0077.PDF

Tannen, D. (1993). 7 The Relativity of Linguistic Strategies: Rethinking Power and Solidarity in Gender and Dominance, III The Relativity of Discourse Strategies, Tannen, D. (Ed), *Gender and*

Conversational Interaction, 165-188. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, D. (1995). Three "Why Don't You Say What You Mean?": Indirectness at Work, *Talking from 9 to 5 – How Women's and Men's Conversational Styles Affect Who Gets Heard, Who Gets Credit, and What Gets Done at Work*, 78-106. London: Virago Press.

Yamada, T. (2004). *Nihongo no Benefakuthibu ―"teyaru""tekureru""temorau" no bunpou ―* [Japanese Benefactive ―Grammar of "teyaru," "tekureru," and "temorau"―]. Tokyo: Meijishoin.

Yamaoka, M. (2008). *Hatsuwa Kinou Ron* [Theories of Speech Act Functions]. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.

Appendix

Target Film List

Release Year	Language	Film Name	Scenes
2000	E	*Erin Brockovich*	12
2001	E	*Anti Trust*	10
2002	E	*Maid in Manhattan*	23
2002	J	*Ashita ga Aru sa the Movie*	11
2005	J	*Peanuts*	13
2006	E	*10 Items or Less*	9
2006	E	*The Devil Wears Prada*	11
2006	J	*Kenchou no Hoshi*	6
2006	J	*The Uchouten Hotel*	14
2007	E	*No Reservations*	13
2007	J	*Hero*	9
2009	E	*Up in the Air*	9
2009	J	*Eiga Hagetaka*	7
2010	E	*Social Network*	22
2010	J	*Patisserie Coin de rue*	14
2011	E	*Margin Call*	17
2011	E	*Money Ball*	16
2011	J	*Salary Man Neo Gekijo-ban ―Warai―*	7
2012	J	*Girl*	15
2012	J	*Sutekina Kanashibari*	25
	E	Total	142
	J	Total	121
	All	Total	263

Detailed Information[2] [3]

2000

DeVito, D., Shamberg, M., Sher, S., (Producers), & Soderbergh, S. (Director). (2000). *Erin Brockovich* [Motion picture] United States. Columbia Pictures Industries & Universal Studios.

Fukunaga, Y. (Ed.). (2002). *Meisaku Eiga Kanzen Serifu shuu Erin Burokobitch kaitei-ban* [Screenplay Erin Brockovich (Rev. ed.)], Screenplay Series. Nagoya: Screenplay.

2001

Wechsler, N, Hoberman, Addis, K.,D., Nicksay, D. (Producers), & Howitt, P. (Director). (2000). *Antitrust* [Motion picture] United States. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Pictures.

2002

Newirth, C., Medina, B. (Executive Producer), Goldsmith-Thomas, E., Schindler, D., Schiff, P. (Producers) & Wang, W. (Director). (2002). *Maid in Manhattan* [Motion picture] United States. Revolution Studios.

Shiihara, H., & Nixon, W. (Ed.). (2003). *Meisaku Eiga Kanzen Serifu shuu Meido in Manhattan* [Screenplay Maid in Manhattan], Screenplay Series 117. Nagoya: Fourin.

Kadoya, D., Moriya, K., Inoue, K., Kabeya, Y (Producers), & Iwamoto, H. (Director). (2002). *Ashita ga Aru sa The Movie* [Tomorrow is Another Day] [Motion picture] Japan. Robot Communication.

2005

Tamura, M., Furugoori, S., Yamamoto, T (Producers), & Uchimura, T. (Director). (2005). *Peanuts* [Motion picture] Japan. Peanuts Seisaku Iinkai [Peanuts Production Committee].

2006

Finerman, W. (Producer), & Frankel, D. (Director).

(2006). *The Devil Wears Prada* [Motion picture] United States. Twentieth Century Fox Film.

Kameyama, T. (Ed.). (2008). *Meisaku Eiga Kanzen Serifu shuu Prada wo Kita Akuma* [Screenplay The Devil Wears Prada], Screenplay Series 128. Nagoya: Fourin.

Silberling, B. (Producer & Director). (2005). *10 Items or Less* [Motion picture] United States. 10 Items, LLC.

Haruna, K., Ichikawa, M., Usui, H., Iwata, Y (Producers), & Nishitani H. (Director). (2006). *Kenchou no Hoshi* [Promising Star of Prefectural Government] [Movie Vulture] [Motion picture] Japan. Kyodo Television.

Ishihara, T., Sakura, K. (Executive Producer), Shigeoka Y., Ogawa, Y., Ichikawa, M. (Producers) & Mitani, K. (Director). (2006). *The Uchouten Hoteru* [The Euphoric Hotel] [Motion picture] Japan. Cross Media.

2007

Heysen, K., Agüero, S., Winkler-Ioffreda, M. J., Cartsonis, S. (Producers), & Hicks, S. (Director). (2011). *No Reservations* [Motion picture] United States. Castle Rock Entertainment & Village Roadshow Pictures.

Shimizu, K., Shimatani, Y., Iijima, M. (Executive Producer), Genouzono, Y., Makino, T., Miyazawa, T., Wadakura, K. (Producers) & Suzuki, M. (Director). (2007). *Hero* [Motion picture] Japan. Cine Bazar.

2009

Pollock, T., Medjuck, J., Griffin, T., Beugg, M. (Executive Producers), Reitman, I., Reitman, J., Dubiecki, D., Clifford, J. (Producers), & Reitman, J. (Director). (2012). *Up in the Air* [Motion picture] United States. Montecito Picture Company, Rickshaw Productions, & Right of Way Films.

Okada, E., Ichikawa, M. (Executive Producer), Rube K., Endou, M. (Producers), & Otomo, K. (Director). (2009). *Eiga Hagetaka* [Movie Vulture] [Motion picture] Japan. NHK Enterprises.

2010

Spacey, K. (Executive Producer), Rudin, S., Luca, M. D., Street, T. (Producers), & Fincher, D. (Director). (2010). *The Social Network* [Motion picture] United States. Relativity Media.

Maeda, H. (Producer), & Fukagawa, Y. (Director). (2010). *Yougashiten Koandoru* [Patisserie Coin de Rue] [Movie Vulture] [Motion picture] Japan. Wilco.

2011

Barnum , R. O., Benaroya, M, Dodson , N., Jenckes, J., Moosa, C., Quinto, Z. (Producers), & Chandor, J.C. (Director). (2011). *Margin Call* [Motion picture] United States. Myriad Pictures.

Chandor, J. C.(2012). *Margin Call*. Retrieved June 18, From http://www.ropeofsilicon.com/Images/web/template/awards/2012/scripts/margincall.pdf

Bakshi, M., Luca, M. D., Horovitz, R., Jaffe, R., Karsch, A., et al. (Producer), & Miller, B. (Director). (2011). *Moneyball* [Motion picture] United States. Columbia Pictures.

Fujimaki, N., Kawai, S., Kitamaki, Y. (Executive Producers), Kanbayashi, S., Matsumoto H., Hosoya, M. (Producers), & Yoshida, T. (Director). (2011). *Salary Man Neo Gekijo-ban* —*Warai*— [Salary Man Neo theatrical ver.—Laugh—] [Motion picture] Japan. NHK Enterprises.

2012

Kazuya (Executive Producer), H., Nasuda (Supervising Producer), A., Kubota, O. (Producer), & Fukagawa, Y. (Director). (2012). *Girl* [Motion picture] Japan. C&I Entertainment.

Kameyama, C., Shimatani, Y. (Producer), & Mitani, K. (Director). (2011). *Sutekina Kanashibari* [Great Hypnagogic Sleep Disorder] [Motion picture] Japan. Fuji Television Network & Toho.