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Abstract: “Face is a complex phenomenon that needs to be studied from multiple perspectives” (Spencer-Oatey, 2007, p. 654). This paper reports on a study which aimed to collect data by which the conceptualization of ‘face’ (mentsu) by Japanese young people could be evaluated. It aims to clarify the factors considered by Japanese young people in their conceptualization of ‘face’. This study reports on the results of a questionnaire that sought opinions on the concept of ‘face’ in verbal communication from Japanese university students. The results were analyzed in terms of the gender of the respondent, and interpreted in relation to Brown and Levinson’s (1987) notion of ‘face’, and face as a universal construct in human interaction. The study aimed to answer a set of four research questions in order to clarify the conceptualization of ‘face’ by Japanese university students. The results suggest that face is a universal construct in Japanese interaction. Both positive face and negative face exist in Japanese culture, and university students appear to consider positive face more important than negative face. The findings offer insight into cultural and linguistic differences in emic conceptualizations of face, and may be useful in promoting smoother communication and preventing misunderstanding.
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1. Introduction

The past three decades have seen a dramatic increase in research on the concept of ‘face’, following the first publication of politeness theory by Brown and Levinson in 1978. As noted by various researchers, “face has become firmly established as a key concept not only in pragmatics but also in anthropology, sociolinguistics, communication studies, sociology, psychology, and other related fields” (Haugh, 2010, p. 2073). It was Goffman (1955) who first introduced the notion. Goffman (1967) defines ‘face’ as “an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes” (p. 5). However, it is Brown and Levinson’s (1978) application of ‘face’ in the context of politeness theory that has dominated much of the debate thus far (Haugh, 2010, p. 2073). Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) further developed Goffman’s notion of ‘face’ and presented two additional foci. According to Brown and Levinson (1978, p. 61), face constitutes the public self-image that every interlocutor wants to claim for himself, and consists of two related aspects:

1. Negative face: The basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction, i.e., to freedom of action and freedom from imposition.
2. Positive face: The positive consistent self-image or ‘personality’ claimed by interactants (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of).

Positive face is the basic claim for the projected self-image to be approved of by others. Negative face is the basic claim to territories, personal reserves, and rights to non-distraction. Since the concepts of positive and negative face were introduced, research on face has often centered on the validity of Brown and Levinson’s notion of ‘face’ for explaining politeness across various cultural contexts (Gu, 1990; Haugh & Hinze, 2003; Haugh, 2005, 2007; Ide, 1989; Matsumoto, 1988; Pizziconi, 2003; Tao, 1998). According to Haugh (2010), the continuing controversy as to whether or not honorifics in Modern Standard Japanese are indeed examples of a failure of Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory is a case in point. On the one hand, there is the often cited argument by Matsumoto (1988) that “what is of paramount importance to a Japanese is not his/her territory [negative face], but the position in relation to others in the group and his/her acceptance by others” (p. 405). On the other hand, other scholars have argued that Brown and Levinson’s notion of ‘face’ can in fact be applied to the study of honorifics, and thus politeness, in Modern Standard Japanese (Fukada & Asato, 2004; Fukushima, 2000; Ishiyama, 2009; Usami, 2002). In these latter approaches, however, Brown and Levinson’s notions of positive and negative face are reduced to an undifferentiated notion that can be either “lost” or “saved” (Haugh, 2005, p. 44).

As noted by Spencer-Oatey, (2007, p. 654), “face is a complex phenomenon that needs to be studied from multiple perspectives.” In recent years, face theory has been reexamined by many researchers and scholars. In this regard, Haugh (2007, p. 676) pointed out:

While the field of applied pragmatics has been steadily growing over the past twenty years, much work in applied pragmatics has tended to use pragmatic theories without sufficient consideration of their potential unsuitability for explicating culture-specific aspects of particular pragmatic phenomena. Bou-Franch and Garcia-Conejos (2003), for example, use the notions of positive and negative face (Brown and Levinson, 1987) in their approach to teaching politeness, without acknowledging that these notions may be quite unsuitable for highlighting differences in the conceptualization of ‘politeness’ across cultures. It is not intended, however, that this approach itself represent a theory of ‘(im)politeness’ or ‘face’. Instead, it is proposed as a tentative analysis which it is hoped will aid in deconstructing these complex notions to assist not only learners of Japanese, but also to lead to more careful theorizing about ‘(im)politeness’ or ‘face’, as evident in recently emerging approaches to ‘face’ and ‘(im)politeness’, such as Face Constituting Theory (Arundale, 1999, 2006) or Rapport Management Theory (Spencer-Oatey, 2000, 2005, 2007).

Despite debate such as that above, there has been relatively little research on native speaker beliefs about face, and a number of important questions remain. The present study aims to address the following questions in this regard:

1. Do Japanese people regard saving face very highly?
2. Do Japanese young people think that saving face is very important?
3. How do Japanese young people perceive positive face and negative face?
4. Do Japanese young people like to save their face in personal relationships?

Interviews and questionnaires focusing on native speaker beliefs about face are highly
valuable sources of insight into the emic conceptualization of the face perspective. This study uses questionnaires and provides useful insights into the thoughts and traditional moral values of Japanese young people on the basis of an analysis of questionnaire data. The data are also analyzed in terms of gender differences. The main purpose of this study was to discover how Japanese young people differ from those of other groups in their opinions regarding the notions of positive and negative face (Brown and Levinson, 1987), and how this may impact the emic conceptualization of face.

2. Face in Japanese

The concept of ‘face’ is Chinese in origin and includes two aspects, namely lian and mian-zi. Lian represents the confidence of society in the integrity of the ego’s moral character, while mian-zi represents a reputation achieved through success and ostentation. According to Sueda’s (1995) research, historical analyses of the Chinese concept of mian-zi explain how it differs from the honor of the Japanese samurai or warrior or the Western European knight. In Japan and Western Europe, honor is not centered around social fame but around an individual’s level of dignity under feudal systems. However, Chinese society has since 200 B.C. been governed by civilians rather than by soldiers, and their sense of honor is traditionally different from that of Japan and Western Europe. Chinese society placed less value on a warrior’s honor than did Japanese society, rather placing value on the reputation of an individual and family. With the increase of interaction between China and Japan, the word mian-zi was introduced to Japan and came to be realized as mentsu. According to Sueda (1995), mentsu was not regarded as seriously as a warriors’ honor, for which a warrior could die. Because mentsu is but one factor contributing to an individual’s reputation in the community in daily life, Sueda describes it as “little honor” as opposed to warriors’ honor, which is described as “big honor.” With the decline of the warrior class over time, mentsu or “little honor” became the more prevalent notion. Japanese mentsu encompasses an evaluation of not only the individual but also the entire group or community to which the individual belongs (Inoue, 1977).

Haugh (2007, p. 662) argued that, “in discussions of ‘face’ in Japanese thus far, the focus has been primarily on how Japanese ‘face’ differs in nature from that proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), but little has been said about the actual constituents of ‘face’ in Japanese. The lack of explanation about the nature of Japanese ‘face’ is due in part to the lack of clarity as to the status of folk or emic notions of ‘face’.”

Japan is a shame-sensitive society. According to Japanese dictionaries, the emic notion of ‘face’ in Japanese is represented through a number of related lexemes, namely mentsu, kao, menboku, taimen, sekentei, teisai, giri, meiyo, jyoujitu, koken, otoko, katami, iichibun, kiryou, seken, haji, and miei (Tao, 1998). For example, in Japanese idiomatic expressions, ‘to save face (honor/credit)’ is mentsu o tamotu, kao o tateru, menboku ga tatu, otoko ga tatu, and ‘to lose face’ is mentsu ga tubureru, menboku o usinau, otoko no ichibunn ga tatanai, kiryou o sageru. The terms kao, menboku, taimen, and sekentei play important roles in the emic notion of ‘face’ in Japanese.

For example, the term kao has the widest semantic field, encompassing face as representative of a person, both literally as an individual (e.g., kao a dasu, meaning “to attend” or “make an
appearance”), and figuratively as one’s social image (e.g., kao o tsubusu, meaning “to crush someone’s face”). The latter may involve the social image of either individuals or groups or family (e.g., chichiyo no kao ni doro o nuru youna mane o suruna, meaning “Don’t stain your father’s reputation (or good name)”). Kao also encompasses face as representing power, both in terms of one’s degree of influence in a group (e.g., Kare ha oji no kao de ano kaisya ni haitta, meaning “He entered the company through his uncle’s influence”). Other idiomatic expressions include kao ga kiku, kao o kikasu, which translates literally as “one’s face is effective,” meaning that someone is influential, and kao ga hiroi, kao ga ureru, which translates literally as “one’s face is broad,” meaning that someone is famous or knows a lot of people, and relates to the degree to which one either represents a group or is well-known as an individual. A further example is kare wa kono kaiwai de kao ga ureteiru, which means “He is well-known around here” (Haugh, 2007, p. 662).

The term mensu in Japanese is used to reflect one’s social image (e.g., mensu o omonnjiru (hold face in esteem); mensu o tateru (save face); mensu ni kakawaru (touch upon one’s honor)). For example, kare ha iiinigere o site mensu otamotta means “He managed to save face by giving an evasive answer.” In Tao’s (1998) investigation, it was also pointed out that mensu has a more narrow conceptual field than kao and menboku. As Haugh (2007, p. 663) pointed out, the concept of ‘face’ in Japanese as a kind of ‘positive social image’, representative of a person as an individual or of the group to which the person belongs, can be analyzed in terms of the notions of menboku and taimen.

The term otoko (“male”) in Japanese is also used figuratively to refer to one’s social image (e.g., otoko ga tatu (save face)). For example, sousite kurereba watasi no otoko ga tatu means “I can save face if you will do that” and otoko o sageru refers to harming one’s reputation or losing (one’s) face. The use of the term otoko in Japanese to refer to one’s face or social image reflects cultural knowledge of the male-dominated society in Japan. It leads to the idea that women are inferior to men, and this idiomatic expression deeply interests me in my study of Japanese face.

According to the Kojien dictionary, menboku is defined as “the face with which one meets people” or “honor in the seken” (hito ni awaseru kao, seken ni taisuru meiyo) (Shinmura, 1998, p. 2631). Haugh (2007, p. 663) suggested that menboku thus primarily involves external evaluations within a particular community of practice or wider society (the seken) of one’s meiyo (lit. ‘honour’), or one’s own dignity/character (jinkaku), or that of one’s salient in-group (uchi). In other words, menboku is closely related to the dignity/character of a person (jinkaku) that can arise from his/her own conduct or the conduct of others towards that person. The interactional achievement of menboku is related, then, to receiving praise of one’s performance or abilities, or acknowledgement of one’s status and influence within a particular group (and thus is closely related to the second sense of kao as representative of power).

The notion of taimen, in contrast, is defined in the Kojien dictionary as “an individual’s or group’s appearance in public” (seken ni taisuru teisai, menboku) (Shimura, 1998, p. 1618). Nevertheless, while the notions of menboku and taimen initially appear to encompass different aspects of face, they are arguably both related to the core notion of place, both in the sense of the place one belongs (uchi) and the place one stands (tachiba) (cf. Haugh, 2007, p. 663; Tanaka...
& Kekidze, 2005, p. 110). According to Haugh (2007, p. 663), ‘loss of face’ (Kao o tsubusu) may arise in situations where harmony within the place one belongs (uchi) is not maintained, while one can ‘give face’ (kao o tateru) by allowing others to look good in the place they stand (tachiba) (Morisaki & Gudykunst, 1994, p. 56, citing Cole, 1989). The difference between the two appears to lie in the way they vary in their orientation to place. Many researchers point out that the notion of place underlying face in Japanese is also closely related to external evaluations by particular “imagined communities” (seken) that are perceived as constantly having the potential to judge one’s actions as (in) appearance (Abe, 1995; Haugh, 2007; Hasada, 2006; Inoue, 1977; Shiba, 1999;). In sum, as many scholars have pointed out, particular definitions of face are culture-specific.

3. Methodology

The participants in this study were 187 university students living in Japan. The data obtained from the written questionnaires was separated according to the gender of the respondent. The data allowed a comparison to be drawn between the concepts of communicative behavior concerning face (mentsu) of Japanese young people.

3.1. Participants

In order to examine differences between Japanese male and female young people, the data obtained from the written questionnaires was separated according to the gender of the respondent. Following this, qualitative differences among the answers to each particular question were determined by grouping the responses into categories.

The participants in this study were university students living in Japan, enrolled in universities in Tokyo, Yokohama, Toyama, and Kanazawa in June and July of 2013. Data were collected from 187 such respondents (94 males and 93 females), ranging in age from 17 to 21 years.

3.2. Materials and Procedures

Data were gathered by means of respondents completing a written questionnaire. The questions on the questionnaire aimed at gathering information on current conceptualizations of what constitutes Japanese mentsu. The data allowed a comparison to be drawn between the concepts of communicative behavior concerning face (mentsu) of Japanese young people, and other English and Japanese concepts that assess human behavior. The questionnaire was therefore presented in Japanese. The questionnaire consisted of a total of 54 questions, including both multiple-choice and free-response questions. This paper focuses on the data drawn from the answers to four of the questions:

1. Do you think that Japanese people regard saving face very highly?
2. Do you think that saving face is very important for you?
3. Which one do you think is considered most important in Japanese culture, negative face or positive face?
4. Do you like to save your face in personal relationships?

4. Results

The data obtained from the questionnaires were separated according to the gender of the respondent. Following this, qualitative differences among the answers to each question were determined by grouping the responses into specific categories. This quantitative data was obtained in terms of numbers of responses to each question option – each question presented two, three, or four options, and respondents had to select one of the options. The data below indicate the percentage of respondents selecting each option, and are not from free-response questions. This analysis revealed great variety in the types of responses. Below, similarities and differences in face described by Japanese students are examined. Regarding Question 1, Table 1 classifies the types of responses by Japanese males and females.

Table 1. Responses of Male and Female Respondents to Questions 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Do you think Japanese people regard saving face very highly?</td>
<td>Very highly</td>
<td>79 (84.0%)</td>
<td>82 (90.3%)</td>
<td>161 (85.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very highly</td>
<td>15 (16.0%)</td>
<td>11 (9.7%)</td>
<td>26 (14.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Do you think saving face is most important for you?</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>70 (74.5%)</td>
<td>75 (80.6%)</td>
<td>145 (77.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>24 (25.5%)</td>
<td>18 (19.4%)</td>
<td>42 (22.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Results of Responses to Q1 and Q2 by Gender

As is clear from Table 1, 85.8% of respondents thought that Japanese people regard saving face very highly, specifically 84% of the male respondents and 90.3% of the female respondents. In response to Question 2, 77.5% of respondents indicated that saving face was most important for them, specifically 74.5% of the male respondents and 80.6% of the female respondents. Table 1 therefore shows that slightly more female than male respondents indicated
that “Japanese people regard saving face very highly.” Likewise, slightly more female than male respondents indicated that saving face was most important for them. Furthermore, the table shows that more responses were given by male and female respondents indicating that “Japanese people regard saving face very highly” than were given indicating that “Saving face is most important for them.”

Table 2 presents data based on the respondents’ answers to Questions 3 and 4 of the questionnaire. In response to Question 3, 41.2% of respondents indicated that positive face is considered most important in Japanese culture, 32.1% that both positive and negative face are considered most important, and 21.4% that negative face is considered most important. Only 5.3% of the respondents indicated that neither positive nor negative face is important. In response to Question 4, 79.6% of respondents indicated that they like to save their face in personal relationships, while 20.4% of the respondents did not agree with this.

Table 2. Responses of Male and Female Respondents to Questions 3 and 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Which one do you think is considered most important in Japanese culture, negative face or positive face?</td>
<td>Negative face</td>
<td>19 (20.2%)</td>
<td>21 (22.6%)</td>
<td>40 (21.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive face</td>
<td>36 (38.3%)</td>
<td>41 (44.1%)</td>
<td>77 (41.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both of them</td>
<td>31 (33.0%)</td>
<td>29 (31.2%)</td>
<td>60 (32.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither of them</td>
<td>8 (8.5%)</td>
<td>2 (2.1%)</td>
<td>10 (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Do you like to save your face in personal relationships?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>74 (78.7%)</td>
<td>75 (80.6%)</td>
<td>149 (79.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20 (21.3%)</td>
<td>18 (19.4%)</td>
<td>38 (20.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Results of Responses to Q3 and Q4 by Gender

Table 2 separates the responses to Questions 3 and 4 on the basis of gender. The table shows that 38.3% of male respondents thought that positive face is considered most important in Japanese culture, 33.0% that both positive and negative face are considered most important, and 20.2% that negative face is considered most important. Only 8.5% of male Japanese students thought that neither positive nor negative face is considered important. Turning to the
female respondents, 44.1% thought that positive face is considered most important in Japanese culture, 31.2% that both positive and negative face are considered most important, and 22.6% that negative face is considered most important. Only 2.1% of female respondents thought that neither positive nor negative face is important in Japanese culture. There is, therefore, no significant difference between male and female respondents, although more female respondents thought that positive face is considered most important in Japanese culture than did male respondents.

The responses to Question 4 indicate that 78.8% of male respondents and 80.6% of female respondents like to save face in personal relationships. On the other hand, 21.3% of male respondents and 19.4% of female respondents did not agree with this.

The data presented above suggest that Japanese young people regard saving face very highly. To summarize, most of the Japanese students surveyed in the present study thought that aspects of face are important and positive, and liked to save their face in personal relationships. It would also appear that positive face remains important and meaningful to Japanese students.

5. Discussion

The present study yielded valuable information on the emic conceptualization of face among Japanese university students. The results objectively verify the awareness of face among younger Japanese people, proving that most Japanese university students regard saving face very highly and think that saving face is most important. The data show that more respondents agree with the statement “Japanese people regard saving face very highly” than with the statement “Saving face is most important.” The data also suggest that most Japanese young people like to save face in their own communicative behavior. In addition, it appears that both positive face and negative face exist in Japanese culture, but that most students think positive face is considered important in Japanese culture, more so than negative face. On this point the data differ from Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987), for the reason mentioned in Section 2, namely that, in Japanese society, “the perceived evaluation of one’s place by particular ‘imagined communities (seken)’ has much to do with the loss, gain or maintenance of one’s own face, or that of one’s group. The kind of ‘face’ that arises through interactions is thus dependent on what one thinks others in a wider ‘imagined communities’ (seken) show they think of one’s conduct relative to the place one stands or belongs” (Haugh, 2007, p. 663).

Many scholars have pointed out what Matsumoto (2003) claimed, namely “I did not encounter enough evidence to support the universality of Brown and Levinson’s definition of negative face” (p. 1516). In the present investigation, I also found that Brown and Levinson’s negative ‘face’ concept does not fully explain other cultural notions of ‘face’. This is particularly so in terms of the widely used Japanese formulaic expression yoroshiku onegaishimasu, which literally means “Please treat me favorably.” The hearer may perceive this expression as an imperative structure that imposes on him/her. However, Japanese speakers regard yoroshiku onegaishimasu as an honorific form, and it is used as a politeness token in Japanese communication. This shows that Japanese politeness is different from Western politeness, which is seen as a means to avoid imposition (Matusumoto, 1988; Ide, 1989).

With regard to the concept of negative politeness in Japan, Takita (2012) analyzes the
Japanese notion of *enryo* as face, and provides evidence for a common phenomenon observed in negative face, as suggested by Brown and Levinson (Takita (2012, p. 194) argues as follows:

The classic concept of *enryo* is described as an empathic orientation and hesitation of self expression by minimizing frank expression, which can be seen to protect the hearer’s negative face. However, people nowadays, particularly the younger generations, are using *enryo* more conveniently and more as a means to show their refusal to an invitation. This might indicate that the younger generations in Japan are becoming more individualistic and less sensitive to empathic orientation toward others. Therefore, unlike looking at the collectivistic perspective of face argued by Japanese scholars in the past, the new concept of *enryo* can be said to be similar to the concept of negative face, since both negative face and *enryo* can be seen as the social contract that allows rejection to be expressed indirectly to others by satisfying one’s desire to be unimpeded on an individual level.

This may explain why approximately one-third of the Japanese university students surveyed in this study also regard negative face as important. The results of the present study lead me to agree with Matsumoto’s position in terms of the importance of a social perspective of face rather than individual autonomy in Japanese society. I also support Takita’s idea that the new perspective of *enryo* as a desire not to be imposed upon by others is very similar to the concept of negative face proposed by Brown and Levinson.

To summarize, issues around face tend to be vulnerable to subjective perceptions, and thus can never be judged in true vs. false terms. This makes data informing perceptions of face both worthwhile and necessary (Spencer-Oatey, 2007, p. 654).

### 6. Concluding Remarks

The study of perceived face in Japanese verbal communication is a very interesting theme. First, this study gives an overview of research on the status of face. Second, it provides further explanation around the different conceptualizations of face in Japanese culture. Third, this research investigated the opinions of Japanese students’ own conceptualizations concerning face. Fourth, it discusses and analyzes the nature or emic notion of Japanese students’ conceptualizations of face, as well as considering the data in terms of respondents’ gender. The results suggest that face is a universal construct in Japanese interaction. Generally speaking, it appears that the notion of ‘face’ is regarded as important, and that saving face is regarded as important in Japanese verbal communication. Both positive face and negative face exist in Japanese culture, and university students appear to consider positive face more important than negative face. This finding represents a divergence from Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987). The opinions on face discussed above were indicated slightly more by females than males. This study makes a contribution to research on the concept of ‘face’ among Japanese young people, suggesting that in-depth study of face conceptualization across cultures and societies is a fruitful avenue of research.
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Appendix
アンケート

このアンケートは、ポライトネスについての異文化比較研究です。私は、「英語、中国語と日本語におけるポライトネス現象」というテーマで、今、研究と調査に取り組んでいます。また「face 面子 メンツ」の特徴についてデータを集めています。私は中国人、日本人の「面子 メンツ」の特徴とBrown & Levinson の“face”概念を比較し、その相異点を明らかにしたいです。つきましては、皆さんの現在の「メンツ」とポライトネスの意識や面の態について、いくつかの質問にお答え頂いたと思います。どうかこの調査にご協力下さい。


年齢: (        )  職業: ________

1. あなたは日本人が「メンツ」を重んじると思いますか？
   [1]「メンツ」を重んじる。  [2]「メンツ」を重んじない。

2. あなたにとってメンツは重要であると思いますか？
   [1]「メンツ」は重要である。 [2]「メンツ」は重要でない。


   (1) 消極的面子(negative face)：(他人から邪魔されたくない）個人の領域を維持し行動の自由を保つことへの欲求 (62)
   (2) 積極的面子(positive face)：(自分の望みが、人に好かれたい）個人から承認された望ましい自己像を維持することへの欲求
日本はどちらを大切にする文化であると思いますか。
   [1] 消極的面子(negative face)       [2] 積極的面子(positive face)

4. あなたは人係において自分の「メンツ」(face) を保ちたいですか？
Questionnaire

This questionnaire is to be used in my research on the cross-cultural comparison of polite language. I will investigate the politeness phenomena in English, Chinese and Japanese. I am collecting data about the characteristics of face. I want to compare the characteristics of face in Chinese and Japanese with Brown and Levinson’s (1987) conceptualization of face, identifying their major difference. Here, I would like to know how you think face and polite language.

Sex: F / M Age: _______ Nationality: __________________

Major:__________________ Profession:_____________________________

Q1. Do you think that Japanese people regard saving face very highly?
   A. Japanese people regard saving face very highly.
   B. Japanese people do not regard face very highly.

Q2. Do you think that saving face is very important for you?
   A. Yes
   B. No

Q3. Adapted from Goffman (1967), face is a universal (albeit culturally elaborated) notion, a public self-image that every member of a society wants to claim for himself (p. 61). Brown & Levinson (1987) characterize two types of face in terms of participant wants rather than social norms:

   Negative Face:
   “the want of every ‘competent adult member’ that his action be unimpeded by others” (p. 62).

   Positive Face:
   “have to do with one’s want to be appreciated and approved of by others” (p. 61).

Which one do you think is considered most important in Japanese culture, negative face or positive face?

   A. Negative face   B. Positive face   C. Both of them   D. Neither of them

Q4. Do you like to save your face in personal relationships?

   A. Yes   B. No