

A CROSS-GENERATIONAL AND CROSS-CULTURAL STUDY ON DEMONSTRATION OF ATTENTIVENESS

Saeko Fukushima

Abstract

This paper looks into whether there are any differences in demonstration of attentiveness between different generations and different cultures. By attentiveness I mean a demonstrator's preemptive response to a beneficiary's verbal/non-verbal cues or situations surrounding a beneficiary and a demonstrator, which takes the form of offering. When and how often one would demonstrate attentiveness may vary according to such factors as generation and culture. Three groups of people from different generations and different cultural backgrounds (Japanese and Americans) served as the participants (280 people for the questionnaire data and 18 people for the interview data). It was investigated whether there were any differences among the participants in demonstration of attentiveness, in the reasons for demonstration of attentiveness, and in rating degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness. It was also examined whether there was any relationship between degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness and demonstration of attentiveness; and in which relationship (the relationship between a demonstrator and a beneficiary of attentiveness varied from very familiar to not very familiar at all) attentiveness was demonstrated. The data were collected using a questionnaire with six situations, based on field notes; and the interviews were conducted using the same six situations. The results show that in most situations there were no major differences among the participants in the choice of demonstration of attentiveness and the reasons for it. The participants chose to demonstrate attentiveness in four situations in the questionnaire, because they wanted to be of help to the other party. There was a relationship between degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness and demonstration of attentiveness in four situations. Overall, the interview data confirmed the questionnaire data.

Keywords: Politeness; Attentiveness; Generation; Japanese; Americans.

1. Introduction

In pragmatics research, there are two aspects: sociopragmatics (sociological interface of pragmatics) and pragmalinguistics (the study of the more linguistic end of pragmatics) proposed by Leech (1983: 10-11). According to Leech (2011), pragmalinguistic politeness is language-oriented and context-free (CF). On the other hand, socio-pragmatic politeness is society-oriented and context-sensitive (CS). Sociopragmatic or CS politeness is much related to norms (Leech, 2011). A number of studies have been conducted in politeness research, focusing on linguistic realizations in different speech acts in various languages¹. This means that a pragmalinguistic aspect has been much

¹ For example, the study by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) and that by Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989) are the major projects, dealing with requests and apologies in different languages.

investigated. Sociopragmatics, however, has not been paid as much attention as pragmalinguistics. I believe it needs to be more investigated, as Suzuki (2007: 288) also argues. This study, therefore, takes a sociopragmatic approach, investigating what people would do, rather than what they would say. More specifically, this study looks into whether the participants would demonstrate attentiveness or not under certain situations, and why they would do so. In other words, the present study tries to clarify the participants' norms on attentiveness. In this sense, this study falls in the area of metapragmatics, i.e., the systematic study of the metalevel, where indicators of reflexive awareness are to be found in the actual choice-making that constitutes language use (Verschuere 1999: 188). Attentiveness is focused on in the present study, as this area has not been much researched despite its importance in pragmatics.

By attentiveness I mean a demonstrator's preemptive response to a beneficiary's verbal/non-verbal cues or situations surrounding a beneficiary and a demonstrator, which takes the form of offering. In other words, a demonstrator does something for a beneficiary without or before being asked, inferring the need of a potential beneficiary. Marui et al. (1996: 396), who use a Japanese term, *kizukai* ("reading others' needs") to mean attentiveness, state that "In the case of *kizukai* such manifestations can take the form of offering things or services to show friendliness, especially in relationships which are neither too close nor too distant." An example of attentiveness is to open the window when someone says "It's hot in here" (a verbal cue). Attentiveness derives from consideration for others, i.e., a demonstrator thinks of the well-being of a potential beneficiary. Consideration for others is encompassed in politeness research according to Ohashi (2008: 2155); and it is broadly similar to Locher's (2004) definition of politeness: "the speaker's wish to express concern for the addressee." The study of attentiveness, therefore, is in the realm of politeness.

Not only considering the well-being of the other party, but there may be also occasions in which one demonstrates attentiveness for a demonstrator's own benefit. If a demonstrator is thought well by a beneficiary by demonstrating attentiveness, it is beneficial to a demonstrator, getting credit. Or, a demonstrator can simply get (material or non-material) benefit. Therefore, I propose that there are two kinds of attentiveness: (1) attentiveness for the well-being of a beneficiary and (2) attentiveness for the benefit of a demonstrator. I term the former "genuine attentiveness" and the latter "reflexive attentiveness". Reflexive attentiveness may not be always negatively judged (e.g., one is apple polishing to gain credit or a benefit); but it may be regarded as one of the wishes of human beings: "speakers naturally wish to make a good impression on their hearers, to be seen as reliable and of good character" (Riley 2007: 213). Even when reflexive attentiveness is demonstrated for the benefit of a demonstrator, it may also help a beneficiary.

Attentiveness can be translated as *kikubari* (lit. allocation of spirit) in Japanese. Those who demonstrate attentiveness as expected are evaluated positively, being called "*kigakiku*" 'attentive' (i.e., one is sensitive to others' needs) and those who do not demonstrate attentiveness as expected are often evaluated negatively, being called "*kigakikanai*" (negation of *kigakiku*). One can get credit only when attentiveness is evaluated positively. That is, those who demonstrate attentiveness as expected receive a positive evaluation. This is associated with expectability, which is an important notion in politeness, according to Watts (2003: 143). In relation to expectability, Haugh (2003: 399) argues as follows:

Politeness thus always arises relative to some kind of situation-specific social norms. These norms are essentially expectations about what people *should* show they think of others, or what people *should* show they think of themselves. In other

words, these social norms are expectations in the sense of *thinking something is necessary* (original emphasis).

Inference, which is also an important notion in politeness, is a prerequisite for attentiveness to arise. That is, attentiveness does not arise without a demonstrator's inference of the other party's needs. Verbal/non-verbal cues, situations surrounding a beneficiary and a demonstrator, and background/shared knowledge or assumptions can trigger inference. Attentiveness is also related to implicatures. Implicatures, a term introduced by Grice (1967, 1989), are extra messages conveyed by speakers indirectly. The important difference between implicatures and other inferences a hearer may draw on the basis of what the speaker has said is that implicatures are intended by the speakers, that is, the speaker wants the hearer to arrive at the implicature (Kallia 2004: 151). There are cases in which a potential beneficiary of attentiveness has an intention of receiving attentiveness; and there are cases in which a potential beneficiary does not intend to receive it. When attentiveness in the former case arises, it is related to implicatures and the one in the latter case to inferences.

Here is an example of attentiveness. The great east Japan earthquake (the most powerful earthquake ever recorded) hit Japan on the 11th March, 2011. Because of the earthquake, my office was in a chaotic condition. After the earthquake we all talked about the damages we had at the university. A British associate professor (H) was joining us from April, 2011 (The academic year starts in April in Japan). He visited our university on the 22nd March. When I walked down the corridor (The doors of some offices were open and some chaotic conditions could be seen), I happened to see another professor (K), who was talking with him (H), and she introduced me (S) to him.

- 1 K: This is Professor Fukushima.
- 2 S: I'm Saeko. Nice to meet you.
- 3 H: Hamish. Nice to meet you, too.
- 4 S: I'm looking forward to having you here.
- 5 H: Likewise.
- 6 S: My office is in chaos, too. The refrigerator has moved.
- 7 H: Can I help you put it back? I am strong.
- 8 S: That would be very helpful.

A British associate professor inferred the need of help from turn 6 (a verbal cue) and also from the situation we had had after the earthquake; and he demonstrated attentiveness linguistically in turn 7 (He made a preemptive response. I have not asked him to help me). And he came to my office and moved the refrigerator back, which was attentiveness demonstrated behaviorally (non-verbally). In this case, therefore, the attentiveness was demonstrated in two stages: first linguistically (turn 7) and next behaviorally (after the above conversation). In turn 6, I did not even have any intention of receiving attentiveness, just having stated the condition of my office. Therefore, inference, not implicatures, arose.

Not only inferring the other party's needs, but also the demonstrator's willingness is needed for attentiveness to arise. There may be situations in which one would not demonstrate attentiveness, although one could infer the other party's needs. A demonstrator's willingness may be influenced by many factors, one of which may be degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness. In order to demonstrate attentiveness, time, energy, effort or financial burden are required. These may be decisive factors for degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness. It can be hypothesized that the higher degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness is, the less attentiveness is

demonstrated. In the present study, the participants were asked to rate degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness (see 2.2 and 4.1.3); and the relationship between degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness and demonstration of attentiveness was investigated (see 4.1.4).

Whether, how often and under what kind of situations one would demonstrate attentiveness may depend on such factors as culture or generation (i.e., age group). Norms of attentiveness, which are closely related to consideration for others, may differ from culture to culture or from generation to generation. Although the notion of consideration for others is universal, its manifestation may differ cross-culturally. According to Marui et al. (1996: 405), taking care of interpersonal relationships is important in Japanese culture. Lebra (1976: 38) maintains that *omoiyari* ('empathy'), which she defines as "the ability and willingness to feel what others are feeling, to vicariously experience the pleasure or pain that they are undergoing, and to help them satisfy their wishes," is important for the Japanese. Lebra (1976: 38) is even tempted to call Japanese culture an *omoiyari* culture. *Omoi-yari* can be the idea behind attentiveness. "The ability and willingness to feel what others are feeling" is similar to inference of a potential beneficiary's needs; and "to help them satisfy their wishes" can be fulfilled by demonstrating attentiveness. In our society, we need to care for (*omoiyaru*) (a verb form of *omiyari*) others, not only thinking about ourselves, because we cannot live by ourselves. Both the statement by Marui et al. (1996: 405) and that by Lebra (1976: 38) indicate that consideration for others is important in Japanese culture. If these statements hold true, it can be hypothesized that Japanese people would demonstrate attentiveness more often than people from other cultures in which consideration for others, *omoiyari* and interpersonal relationships are not so highly appreciated as in Japanese culture.

In previous studies, cross-cultural comparisons of attentiveness were made between British and Japanese participants (Fukushima 2000, 2009) and among British, Swiss and Japanese participants (Fukushima 2004). There were not many differences in demonstration or evaluation of attentiveness among the participants in these studies. In order to further investigate cultural differences, the participants in the present study include those from a negative politeness culture (Japanese) and those from a positive politeness culture (American) according to Brown and Levinson's (1987: 244-251) classification, as the above studies focused mainly on such negative politeness cultures as Japanese and British.

Having daily access to many young Japanese people, i.e., university students in their late teens and early twenties, I sometimes feel that there are some differences in demonstration of attentiveness among people of different generations. The reason why there were no major differences between the Japanese participants and other participants from different cultural backgrounds in Fukushima (2000, 2004, 2009) may be due to the fact that they were all young university students, who belong to the same generation. According to Spencer-Oatey (2000: 4), culture is associated with social groups, which include gender groups, ethnic groups, generational groups, national groups, professional groups and so on. Spencer-Oatey (2000: 4) argues that all these different groupings can be seen as different cultural groups. It can be said that the participants in the above studies partly share the same cultural group, i.e., the same generation, although they belong to different national groups. In this study, therefore, a comparison of the participants of different generations is also made. While attentiveness may no longer be very important to young people, elder people may still consider attentiveness as a virtue. If this holds true, it can be hypothesized that elder people would demonstrate attentiveness more frequently than younger people. In order to investigate generational differences, the age among the participants varied (see 2.1).

The purposes of the present study are (1) to investigate whether there are any differences among the participants of different generations and different cultures in demonstration of attentiveness, in the reasons for demonstrating attentiveness, and in rating degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness, (2) to investigate whether there is any relationship between degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness and demonstration of attentiveness and (3) to investigate the relationship between a demonstrator and a beneficiary when attentiveness is demonstrated. The research questions for this study are as follows:

- (1) Are there any differences among the participants in demonstration of attentiveness?
- (2) Are there any differences among the participants in the reasons for demonstrating or not demonstrating attentiveness?
- (3) Are there any differences among the participants in rating degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness?
- (4) Is there any relationship between degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness and demonstration of attentiveness?
- (5) In which relationship (between a demonstrator and a beneficiary) is attentiveness demonstrated?

In the next section, data collection of the present study is explained, and in sections 3 and 4, data analysis and results are presented respectively. In section 5, the findings are discussed.

2. Data collection

The data were collected through questionnaires in order to obtain quantitative data; and interviews were conducted to obtain some qualitative insights into whether the participants would demonstrate attentiveness or not and the reasons for that. Interview data can also be expected to verify questionnaire data².

2.1. Participants

2.1.1. Participants for questionnaire

280 people served as the participants and they consisted of the following three groups: (1) 156 Japanese university students³ (JS hereafter) (age range: 18-28; mean age: 20.2), (2) 92 Japanese parents⁴ (JP hereafter) (age range: 36-76; mean age: 51.5) and (3) 32 American university students⁵ (AS hereafter) (age range: 19-23; mean age: 20.7).

² Whereas multiple choices were given in a questionnaire, the participants talked freely in interviews. If the results of the interviews coincide with (or are similar to) those of the questionnaire, it can be said that the results of multiple choice, which were ordered to match the options in Questions 1 and 2, have high levels of reliability.

³ They are undergraduates of Tsuru University in Yamanashi, Japan.

⁴ It was intended to collect data from those who were older than the students. The participants of this group did not have to be blood-related to their students, but they had to be only in an elder generation than the students. They included their parents, relatives and acquaintances, their parents being the majority of this group (68.5%). For this reason, this group was called Japanese parents.

⁵ They are undergraduates of University of California and are all native speakers of English.

2.1.2. Participants for interview

Eighteen participants (six participants for each group, i.e., Japanese students, Japanese parents and American students) served as the participants for interviews. Their age range and mean age of the participants were as follows, which are similar to those of the participants for the questionnaires: Japanese students (age range: 20-22; mean age: 20.5); Japanese parents (age range: 48-55; mean age: 51.33), and American students (age range: 20-23; mean age: 21.66). The participants were all females in order to avoid the gender difference, as gender may be a factor which would influence demonstration of attentiveness.

2.2. Research instrument (Questionnaire)

The research instrument consisted of a multiple-choice questionnaire and a five-point Likert scale. The questionnaire in the present study tries to clarify the participants' norms on attentiveness, the participants choosing what they believe to be appropriate in each situation. That is, they make metapragmatic judgements on attentiveness. According to Kasper (2000: 330), "multiple choice is a versatile questionnaire format which can elicit information on production, comprehension, and metapragmatic judgements." Therefore, a multiple-choice questionnaire suits the aim of the present study.

There is another reason why a multiple-choice questionnaire was used. It is important to think about the participants' burden when distributing questionnaires. When the burden on the participants is very heavy (i.e., time-consuming or complicated), the participants may not write appropriate answers and consequently, the data elicited may not be reliable. "Multiple-choice responses require that subjects evaluate a very small number of presented alternatives against their memory structures of compatible events, a much less demanding task than having to conduct a free memory search and make an appropriate selection from a wide array of possible solutions" (Kasper 2000: 330-331). A multiple-choice questionnaire, therefore, does not give the participants a heavy burden; and reliability of the data can be ensured.

A scale was used to ask the participants to rate degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness. A five-point Likert scale was chosen, because of the following reason. According to Hatch and Lazaraton (1991: 57), a 5-point, 7-point or 9-point scale was used, as the wider range encourages respondents to show greater discrimination in their judgments. In my opinion, the participants would be confused if they were given too many discriminations; and the same choice (e.g., 7 on a 9-point scale) can mean different judgments according to different participants. A five-point scale can avoid this kind of obscurity, one being no imposition, five being the biggest imposition, the scores under three being a fairly small imposition, and the scores above three being a fairly big imposition.

The six situations in the questionnaire were taken from those which occurred

(It was hoped to obtain data from American parents, too, but their marital situation was more complex than that of Japanese parents. For example, they got divorced/remarried. There were students, who did not have close contact with them; or some of them did not know to which father or mother (their real one or the new one) they should contact. Thus, the idea to obtain American parents' data was abandoned.)

in actual students' and parents' lives. The situations which would be applicable both to students and parents were chosen from the field notes, as the participants were students and parents. A few amendments were made so that the situations would suit both for a students' and a parents' life⁶. As noted in section 1, attentiveness is a demonstrator's preemptive response to verbal/non-verbal cues or situations surrounding a beneficiary and a demonstrator, which takes the form of offering. The situations used in the questionnaire included the ones with verbal cues (situations 2 and 4), and non-verbal cues and situations (situations 1, 3, 5 and 6).

In order to investigate in which relationship (between a demonstrator and a beneficiary) attentiveness is demonstrated, the relationship between a potential demonstrator and a potential beneficiary of attentiveness in the questionnaire varied from very familiar to not familiar at all: (1) very familiar (close friends/close colleagues in situation 2); (2) familiar (friends/colleagues in situations 3 & 4) (professor/boss in situation 5); (3) not very familiar (an acquaintance in situation 1) and (4) not familiar at all (a stranger in situation 6).

The situations are as follows (Alphabetical letters were used to name the people to avoid the gender influence and the influence which personal names may give the participants. The following is the students' version):

Situation 1

You are sitting in a train, reading a book. There are many standing passengers, but there is a vacancy in a priority seat in the same car. At the next station, A, your acquaintance, gets on the train. A is carrying a lot of baggage. You do not have any heavy baggage.

Situation 2

You and your close friend, B, have gone for lunch in the canteen. B says that B has carelessly left her/his wallet at home. B lives near the campus.

Situation 3

You are in a big city and have stopped at a big bookstore, X. You happen to find a book, Y, which your seminar friend, C, has been looking for, for her/his thesis. The book, Y, is not available at local bookstores. It costs \$50.

Situation 4

You hear that your colleague at a part-time job, D, has to suddenly take a five-day leave, because of a funeral service. According to the work schedule, you do not work on the days of D's leave.

Situation 5

You have attended a lecture at the university and are about to go home. There were presentations from every group in the class. There has been a huge amount of papers submitted to the professor from every group. You do not have any urgent appointment after class.

Situation 6

⁶ For example, in a students' questionnaire they have lunch at a canteen and in a parents' questionnaire they have lunch at a restaurant near a company in situation 2. The book in situation 3 was for a thesis in a students' questionnaire and it was for a project in a parents' questionnaire. The situation in situation 4 was at a part-time job in a students' questionnaire and it was at a company in a parents' questionnaire. The situation in situation 5 was at a university in a students' questionnaire; and it was at a company and papers were submitted to a boss at a project meeting in a parents' questionnaire.

When you are walking in a train station, you notice that somebody has just dropped her/his rail pass.

In each situation, there were three questions: question 1 (whether one would demonstrate attentiveness or not), question 2 (the reason for question 1) and question 3 (how one would rate degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness). The multiple choices were given for questions 1 and 2. Constructing the multiple choices for question 1, the possibilities to respond to off-record requests in Fukushima (2000) (preempting a beneficiary's request and demonstrating attentiveness, suggesting an alternative means other than doing something oneself, and refusing a beneficiary's request) were taken into consideration. The choices for question 1 included the following: (1) the participants would demonstrate attentiveness; (2) the participants would suggest or tell something which may be useful for the other party; (3) the participants would not do or say anything and (4) others. Below are the examples from situations 1 (seat) and 4 (work schedule):

Situation 1

Question 1. What would you do in this situation?

- (1) You offer A a seat. Or you hold A's baggage.
- (2) You tell A that there is a vacancy in a priority seat⁷.
- (3) You keep reading a book.
- (4) Other (write what):

Situation 4

Question 1. What would you do in this situation?

- (1) You suggest that you work on the days of D's leave instead of D.
- (2) You suggest that some other colleagues work on the days of D's leave.
- (3) You do not say anything.
- (4) Other (write what):

The multiple choices in question 2 (the reasons for the choice in question 1) included the following: (1) the participants wanted to be of some help to the other party; (2) the participants thought it would be all right to just give the other party the information, or they thought it was a matter of the other party; (3) it was troublesome and (4) others⁸. Below is an example from situation 4 (work schedule):

Question 2. Why did you choose the above?

- (1) You wanted to be of help to D.
- (2) It was D's matter.
- (3) It would be troublesome.
- (4) Other (write what):

A five-point Likert scale, one being "the attentiveness does not require a demonstrator any imposition" and five being "the attentiveness requires a demonstrator a big imposition" was given for question 3 (rating degree of imposition to demonstrate degree

⁷ Priority seats are for the elderly and the handicapped, therefore, those who are carrying a lot of baggage are not candidates for priority seats.

⁸ Although it could be assumed that those who selected choice 1 (demonstration of attentiveness) in Question 1 would select the first reason in Question 2, it was necessary to confirm this. And more detailed reasons can be obtained by giving choice (4) (other) in Question 2.

of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness). Below is an example from situation 4 (work schedule):

Question 3. How much imposition would it cause you if, instead of D, you worked on the days of D's leave? Circle a number on the scale, one being "no imposition," and five being "great imposition."

(A five-point Likert scale is given.)

2.3. Procedure

2.3.1. Questionnaire

The questionnaire was given to the participants in their mother tongues, i.e., in Japanese to Japanese students and Japanese parents, and in English to American students. In each situation the participants were asked to choose one of the multiple choices in questions 1 and 2: (1) what they would do under certain situations (whether they would demonstrate attentiveness or not) and (2) why they would do so; and they were asked (3) to rate degree of imposition of attentiveness on a five-point Likert scale in question 3 and to circle a number on a scale. The participants were asked to fill in the questionnaire anonymously in order to obtain honest judgments. If the participants had to give their names, they may want to present their good images or good impressions to others and select different choices from the ones they would actually do. Anonymity can avoid this kind of problem.

2.3.2. Interview

The participants were asked to read the six situations (the same situations as in the questionnaire) and were asked to state what they would do and why they would do so in each situation. Interviews were conducted in Japanese to Japanese students and Japanese parents, and in English to American students. Each interview lasted approximately 15 minutes.

3. Data analysis

3.1. Questionnaire

- (1) In order to answer research questions 1 (Are there any differences among the participants in demonstration of attentiveness?) and 2 (Are there any differences among the participants in the reasons for demonstrating or not demonstrating attentiveness?), the choices for question 1 and those for question 2 were summed up.
- (2) In order to answer research question 3 (Are there any differences among the participants in rating attentiveness?), a one-way ANOVA (participants) was conducted.
- (3) In order to answer research question 4 (Is there any relationship between degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness and demonstration of attentiveness?), two different forms of ANOVA were conducted. A two-way ANOVA (participants x

participants' choices) was conducted in situations 1, 3, 4 and 5; and a one-way ANOVA (participants) was conducted in situations 2 and 6. In situations 1, 3, 4 and 5, two factors (participants and participants' choices) were used for the analysis. In situations 2 and 6, however, participants' choices could not be used as a factor for the analysis, because most participants selected the same choice for question 1 in these situations. This is why a one-way ANOVA was conducted in situations 2 and 6.

- (4) In order to answer research question 5 (In which relationship (between a demonstrator and a beneficiary) is attentiveness demonstrated?), the relationship between a demonstrator and a beneficiary of attentiveness was identified.

3.2. Interview

All the interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed.

4. Results

4.1. Questionnaire

4.1.1. Demonstration of attentiveness

In answering the first research question (Are there any differences among the participants in demonstration of attentiveness?), there were no major differences in demonstration of attentiveness among the participants, except for situation 5 (papers). Most of the participants selected choice 1 (demonstration of attentiveness) most frequently in situations 1 (seat), 2 (lunch), 4 (work schedule) and 6 (rail pass). In situation 3 (book), most of the participants selected choice 2 (giving information about the book) most frequently. In situation 5 (papers), the most frequent choices varied among the participants. The most frequent choice by Japanese students was choice 1 (demonstration of attentiveness) (55.1%), immediately followed by choice 3 (saying nothing) (39.1%); that by Japanese parents was choice 1 (91.3%); and that by American students was choice 3 (50.0%). The answers in choice 4 (other)⁹ varied in each situation. Table 1 shows the results by each group of the participants.

⁹ Choice 4 (other) in each situation included the following. Situation 1 (seat): It would depend on how old A was and how much s/he appeared to be struggling with her/his baggage (JP & AS); It depends on how I feel (JP). Situation 2 (lunch): I would ask B, "Shall I treat the lunch?" (JS); Pay for B's lunch but expect them to pay back or return the favor in the future (AS). Situation 3 (book): Call C to see if C needs the book (JS, JP & AS); Suggest to use Amazon (JS). Situation 4 (work schedule): I would work if they ask (JS, JP & AS); I would work if I do not have any particular schedule (JS & JP); We would consult among colleagues and adjust the schedule (JS & JP); Suggest that we switch work shifts for the week (AS). Situation 5 (papers): If the professor asks for some assistance, then I would help (JS & AS); It depends on the relationship between the professor and me (JS); It is natural to help the boss (JP); It would be a problem, if some important papers were missing when I help (JP). Situation 6 (rail pass): I would let the station staff know about that (JS).

Table 1. Demonstration of attentiveness

Situation	Participants	Choice 1	Choice 2	Choice 3	Choice 4
Situation 1 (seat)	JS	80.8%	12.8%	3.8%	2.6%
	JP	88.0%	6.5%	2.2%	3.3%
	AS	81.3%	12.5%	3.1%	3.1%
Situation 2 (lunch)	JS	96.1%	1.3%	0.6%	1.9%
	JP	94.6%	1.1%	0%	4.3%
	AS	90.6%	0%	0%	9.4%
Situation 3 (book)	JS	1.9%	62.8%	1.3%	34.0%
	JP	16.3%	60.9%	1.1%	21.7%
	AS	6.3%	65.6%	0%	28.1%
Situation 4 (work schedule)	JS	56.2%	3.2%	25.6%	18.6%
	JP	50.0%	1.1%	26.0%	22.8%
	AS	50.0%	6.3%	28.1%	15.6%
Situation 5 (papers)	JS	55.1%	1.9%	39.1%	3.8%
	JP	91.3%	0%	6.5%	2.2%
	AS	46.9%	0%	50.0%	3.1%
Situation 6 (rail pass)	JS	92.3%	5.8%	0.6%	1.3%
	JP	87.0%	12.0%	1.1%	0%
	AS	96.9%	0%	3.1%	0%

Choice 1= The participants would demonstrate attentiveness.

Choice 2= The participants would suggest or tell something which may be useful for the other party.

Choice 3= The participants would not do or say anything.

Choice 4= Other

JS: Japanese students; JP: Japanese parents; AS: American students

4.1.2. Reasons for demonstration of attentiveness

In answering the second research question (Are there any differences among the participants in the reasons for demonstrating or not demonstrating attentiveness?), there were no major differences among the participants. They would demonstrate attentiveness, because they want to be of some help to the other party (choice 1). There were, however, some differences in the percentage of the choices among the participants; and there were various reasons in choice 4 (other)¹⁰ in each situation.

¹⁰ Choice 4 (other) in each situation included the following. Situation 1 (seat): Because A is an acquaintance of mine (JS, JP & AS); I feel bad, if only I remain seated (JS); It depends on whether A is older or younger than me (JP); That is what I want to be offered (JP). Situation 2 (lunch): It is natural (JS, JP & AS); It is mutual (*otagaisama*) (JS & JP); It is all right if B pays me back (JS, JP & AS); B is a friend/colleague (JS, JP & AS); It would be troublesome to wait for B (JS & JP). Situation 3 (book): S/he may no longer need it or s/he may have it already (JS, JP & AS); It would be imposing (JS & JP); It would be a burden on a beneficiary (*kiotsukawaseru*, which means that a beneficiary may have to do something for a demonstrator in return, or give a demonstrator a gift in return) (JS). Situation 4 (work schedule): It is mutual (*otagaisama*) (JS & JP); It is for the company and for everybody (JS & JP); It is natural (JS & JP); I would be in trouble if I were D (JP); It is up to the company to assign people to cover up D's job (JS, JP & AS); I want to work, because I can get an extra pay (JS, JP & AS). Situation 5 (papers): It is natural to help her/him (JP); I probably wouldn't think about it unless they asked (JS & AS); If the professor needed help, he would ask (AS); I will assume that the professor already has TA's helping him/her (AS); The professor should be aware that a lot of papers would be turned in, so he should have brought something to carry them with (AS). Situation 6 (rail pass): It's the right thing to do (JS, JP

Table 2 shows the results by each group of the participants.

Table 2. Reasons for demonstration of attentiveness

Situation	Participants	Choice 1	Choice 2	Choice 3	Choice 4
Situation 1 (seat)	JS	67.9%	7.1%	3.2%	21.8%
	JP	77.2%	7.6%	2.2%	13.0%
	AS	78.1%	6.3%	3.1%	12.5%
Situation 2 (lunch)	JS	63.5%	1.9%	10.9%	23.7%
	JP	67.4%	0%	9.8%	22.8%
	AS	75.0%	0%	6.3%	18.8%
Situation 3 (book)	JS	60.9%	17.9%	0.6%	20.5%
	JP	65.2%	17.4%	0%	17.4%
	AS	71.9%	18.8%	3.1%	6.3%
Situation 4 (work schedule)	JS	43.6%	5.8%	19.2%	31.4%
	JP	44.6%	15.2%	8.7%	31.5%
	AS	56.3%	9.4%	9.4%	25.0%
Situation 5 (papers)	JS	51.2%	7.1%	20.5%	21.2%
	JP	70.7%	1.1%	5.4%	22.8%
	AS	43.8%	18.8%	12.5%	25.0%
Situation 6 (rail pass)	JS	78.2%	4.5%	1.9%	15.4%
	JP	73.9%	13.0%	2.2%	10.9%
	AS	93.8%	0%	3.1%	3.1%

Choice 1= The participants wanted to be of some help to the other party.

Choice 2= The participants thought it would be all right to just give the other party the information, or they thought it was a matter of the other party.

Choice 3= It was troublesome.

Choice 4= Other

JS: Japanese students; JP: Japanese parents; AS: American students

4.1.3. Imposition to demonstrate attentiveness

In answering the third research question (Are there any differences among the participants in rating attentiveness?), there was a significant difference in rating degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness among the participants in situations 1, 3 and 5, according to the results of ANOVA¹¹. In situation 1 (seat), the score by Japanese students was significantly higher than that by Japanese parents and American students. In situation 3 (book), the score by Japanese students was significantly higher than that by Japanese parents. In situation 5 (papers), the score by Japanese students was significantly higher than that by Japanese parents. The mean scores of degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness in each situation by the participants are

& AS).

¹¹ The results of ANOVA showed that the main effect of the participants was significant in situations 1 (df=2/277, F=6.666, p<0.01), 3 (df=2/277, F=5.339, p<0.01) and 5 (df=2/278, F=3.329, p<0.05). A post hoc test (Bonferroni test) was conducted and the results showed that there were significant differences between Japanese students and Japanese parents and between Japanese students and American students in situation 1 (p<0.05), between Japanese students and Japanese parents in situation 3 (p<0.05), and between Japanese students and Japanese parents in situation 5 (p<0.05).

presented in table 3.

Table 3. Mean scores of degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness

Situation	Mean scores
Situation 1 (seat)	JS: 1.935 (.948) JP: 1.597 (.865) AS: 1.437 (.618)**
Situation 2 (lunch)	JS: 1.666 (.939) JP: 1.532 (.895) AS: 1.906 (.962)
Situation 3 (book)	JS: 2.929 (1.349) JP: 2.347 (1.378) AS: 2.656 (1.334)**
Situation 4 (work schedule)	JS: 2.967 (1.177) JP: 2.619 (1.221) AS: 2.906 (1.058)
Situation 5 (papers)	JS: 2.128 (1.19) JP: 1.739 (1.077) AS: 1.937 (1.134)**
Situation 6 (rail pass)	JS: 1.692 (1.000) JP: 1.75 (1.105) AS: 1.5 (.879)

The numbers outside the parentheses indicate the mean scores and the numbers in the parentheses indicate the standard deviation. **There was a significant difference at the .01level ($p < 0.01$).

JS: Japanese students; JP: Japanese parents; AS: American students

1=small imposition 5=big imposition

4.1.4. Relationship between imposition to demonstrate attentiveness and demonstration of attentiveness

In answering the fourth research question (Is there any relationship between degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness and demonstration of attentiveness?), there was a significant relationship between degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness and demonstration of attentiveness in situations 1, 3, 4 and 5, according to the results of ANOVA¹². In situation 1 (seat), there was a relationship between degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness and demonstration of attentiveness only among Japanese parents. Japanese parents who selected choice 3 (to keep reading a book) tended to rate a higher degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness than those who selected

¹² The results of ANOVA in situation 1 showed that the main effect of the participants' factor was significant ($df=2/263$, $F=6.637$, $p < 0.01$). The main effect of question 1 was significant ($df=2/263$, $F=4.904$, $p < 0.01$). The interaction was also significant ($df=4/263$, $F=4.216$, $p < 0.01$). Since the interaction was significant, a one-way ANOVA (participants' choice in question 1) and a post hoc test (Scheffe test) were conducted. The results showed that Japanese parents, who selected choice 3 (keep reading a book), rated a high score (4.50) ($p < 0.05$). There were no significant differences between demonstration of attentiveness and degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness among Japanese students and American students. The results in situations 2 and 6 showed that there were no significant differences among the participants. The results in situations 3, 4 and 5 showed that only the main effect of question 1 was significant ($df=1/189$, $F=11.759$, $p < 0.001$) (situation 3) ($df=2/216$, $F=23.295$, $p < 0.0001$) (situation 4) ($df=1/262$, $F=42.601$, $p < 0.0001$) (situation 5).

choice 1 (demonstration of attentiveness). In situation 3 (book), those who selected choice 2 (giving information about the book) tended to rate a higher degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness than those who selected choice 1. In situations 4 (work schedule) and 5 (papers), those who selected choice 3 (saying nothing) tended to rate higher scores of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness than those who selected choice 1.

4.1.5. Relationship between a demonstrator and a beneficiary of attentiveness

In answering the fifth research question (In which relationship (between a demonstrator and a beneficiary) is attentiveness demonstrated?), attentiveness was demonstrated in situations in which a demonstrator and a beneficiary of attentiveness were very familiar (situation 2: close friend/colleague), familiar (situation 4: friends/colleagues), not very familiar (situation 1: an acquaintance) and not familiar at all (situation 6: a stranger).

4.2. Interview

Overall, the results of the interviews did not differ very much from those of the questionnaires. That is, there were no major differences among the three groups of the participants, except in the case of situation 5 (papers). The participants would demonstrate attentiveness, because they want to be of help to the other party in most situations (situations 1, 2, 4 and 6). In situation 3 (book), most of the participants would contact their friend, C, and would buy a book, if necessary, or give C information about the book. In situation 5 (papers), what they would do and why they would do so varied among the participants. Next, the more detailed results of each situation are presented.

In situation 1 (seat), four Japanese students out of six said that they would offer a seat and two would carry A's baggage, which can be equivalent to choice 1 (demonstration of attentiveness) in the questionnaire. They think it would be a lot of trouble for A to carry a heavy baggage. By offering a seat, they can be of help to A. A Japanese student said as follows:

Seki o yuzuri masu. Omosouna nimotsu o motte tatteiruno wa taihen dakara. 'I would offer a seat, as it would be troublesome to stand, carrying heavy baggage.'

Five Japanese parents would offer a seat, as they think it would be a lot of trouble for A to carry heavy baggage; and one Japanese parent would carry A's baggage, which can be considered as demonstration of attentiveness. One Japanese parent said as follows:

Jibun ga koshi o itameteiru kara nimotsu o hiza no ue ni okimasu. 'As I have a pain in the back, I would carry A's baggage on my lap.'

Four American students would offer A a seat, as they do not have a lot of baggage. One American student said as follows, which shows that it depends on the situation (if A is tired):

If they were like super tired from hanging on the baggage, I would of course give my seat.

Two American students would let A be seated in a priority seat, which differed from the other two groups of the participants. One of them said as follows:

They can sit there until elderly people come. If an elderly person comes, you have to move.

Another American student said as follows:

I would probably have A sit in a priority seat. There is no one that needs the seat at the moment. Then it's fine. There is an empty seat. If someone comes, who needs a seat, I'll tell them, "Get off."

In situation 2 (lunch), all the Japanese students said that they would lend money, as it takes time to go back home. One Japanese student said as follows:

Ohiru yasumi ichijikan mo nai node iki kaeri taihen nanode okane o kashi masu. 'As a lunch break is less than an hour and it would be a trouble to go back and forth, I will lend B some money.'

Another Japanese student stated the low imposition as a reason:

Gakushoku no ohiru 500 yen shinai. Dakara futan janai. 'As the lunch in a canteen costs less than 500 yen, it is not a big imposition.'

Three Japanese parents said that they would lend money. There were following reasons:

B san wa shitashii douryou. 'B is a close colleague.'

Kaisha nimade torini iku jikan mottainai. 'It would be a waste of time to go back to a company to fetch money.'

Moshi jibun ga onaji tachiba nara tatekaete morau 'If I were in the same situation, I would get B to lend the lunch money.'

Three other Japanese parents would just pay the lunch (i.e., they don't expect B to pay them back). The reasons were as follows:

B san niwa higoro osewani natteirunode. 'B always supports me.'

Itsumo B san towa shitashiku shiteiru node. 'I always have a close relationship with B.'

Wazawaza kaisha ni modoraserunomo kinodoku dakara. 'I feel sorry for B to go back to the company all the way.'

All the American students stated that they would pay for the lunch, but there were differences whether they expected B to pay them back or not. Two American students said that they do not expect them to pay back. One of them said as follows:

I'll just pay. I'll treat you. My heart is bigger than yours. I'm a student and I'm broke. Usually, when I go out to eat, it costs 20 dollars. But the lunch costs 5 dollars. It's a small meal. I'll pay.

The rest of American students want B to pay them back. One American student said as follows:

Don't worry about it. I'll just pay for it, and you can just pay me back when we get back to your place. I don't wanna interrupt us eating, 'cause like we've just got there, and I'm probably hungry, and I just like, just wanna eat food.

In situation 3 (book), all the Japanese students said that they would contact C (either by mail or telephone). If C still needs it, they would buy a book. One Japanese student said

as follows:

C san ni meeru de renrakuo totte mada C san no temotoni nakereba kau. Jimoto no shoten niwa naishi sotsuron niwa hitsuyou. C san no yaku ni tachi tai. ‘I’ll contact C by mail. If C does not have the book, I would buy it, as we cannot buy it at a local bookstore and C needs that book for her thesis. I want to be of help to C.’

All the Japanese parents said that they would contact C. It depends on the situation whether they would buy a book or not. She would give information if she does not buy a book. One Japanese parent said as follows:

C san ni denwa shite, hoshii to iunode areba katte ikimasu. Douryou nanode shinrai no okeru aidagara dakara. Denwa ga tsunagaranakattara atta toiu houkoku o kaette kara shimasu. ‘I’ll call C and if C wants it, I would buy it. If I cannot contact C, I would tell C that I found the book, on returning.’

All the American students would contact C and would buy a book, if C needs it. There are some conditions to buy a book (whether C pays her back or not, or whether C can go to the bookstore or not). One American student said as follows:

I first call them and say, “I found this book. It’s 50 bucks. Do you want it?”, implying she has to pay me back. If she says, “50 bucks? No, I’d find it on line.” Then, OK, never mind.

Another American student said as follows:

It would depend on if the person could go to the bookstore by themselves, and I would ... I feel like either I would tell them that it’s there so that they could go get it, or if it’s really far away, and it’s just easier for me to get it for them, I would get for them.

There was another American student who would buy a book without any condition, after contacting C. She said as follows:

I would call first. I would buy it. I’m very ... Books are very important. So, I can understand the situation. I would be ... I feel like ... I would be thankful. I have a lot of overseas friends. They can’t get books easily. I would mail them a book, even though they are overseas. I’m used to doing this kind of thing.

In situation 4 (work schedule), all the Japanese students said that they would replace D, but the reasons varied (the desire to help D, reflexive attentiveness, or mutuality). These reasons were as follows:

Yotei nai node hima. Ie no koto taihen nanode tasuketai. ‘I do not have any plan. So, I have time. D has difficulty, because of the situation at home. I want to help D.’

Jibun ga komatta toki ni tasukete moraeru. ‘I’d be helped when I am in need.’

Otagaisama dato omou. ‘I think it is mutual.’

All the Japanese parents said that they would replace D. One Japanese parent, who had a similar experience to this situation, said as follows:

Chouji wa sakete toorenai. Kawarini dekiru kotonanode yasumi o henjyo shimasu. Jissai ni konomae kouiu kotoga arimashita. Doyoubi wa touban de koutai de shukkin shimasu. Senjitsu ie dewa tambo no shitaku ga attakedo houji toiu hito no kawari ni shigoto ni demashita. ‘One cannot avoid a funeral service. I would work, as I can replace D. Actually, a similar case happened to me recently. On Saturdays we work

on a shift. The other day we had to prepare for the rice field. But there was somebody who could not work because of a memorial service. So, I came to work, replacing her.'

Half of the Japanese parents stated mutuality as a reason to replace D:

Otagaisama nanode. 'It is mutual.'

Most of the American students said that they would replace D, but the reasons varied (one can get money, or it is because of the funeral service). One American student said as follows:

Hey, I'm covering your hours so I would take their hours and their money.

Another American student said as follows:

Actually, firstly, I'll wait if anyone else would take place. Secondly, check whether I can be paid extra. I'll negotiate with another co-worker. I'd separate the days with another colleague. You take two. I take three. You're just doing a favor, so you don't want to sacrifice your time, but you still want to help. It's something unexpected. I want to go to Disneyworld. It's not like that. It's a serious topic. So, try to help that person as much as possible.

There was one American student who said she would not work, saying that:

I don't know. I won't work. Even though they are my friends. Because it's work. To me, I have to balance, work and school. I don't know. There are also other people. They can take the job, too. It's not a big deal. Unless the person personally asks me to take over the job, I won't work. That's the work. I prioritize school over work.

In situation 5 (papers), four Japanese students would help a professor bring the papers to a professor's office, because it would be a lot of trouble for a professor to carry a huge amount of papers. The other two students said that it would depend on the relationship between a professor and a demonstrator. One of them said as follows:

Sensei to no kankei ni mo yorimasu. Zemi no sensei ya shitashii sensei dattara kenkyushitsu ni motte ikimasu. Fudankara osewani natte irunode atarimae. Shitashiku nakereba koe o kakemasen. 'It depends on the relationship between a professor (and me). If the professor is the one of the seminar (I belong to) or I feel close to the professor, I would carry papers to the professor's office. It is natural, because the professor always supports me. If I do not feel close to the professor, I would just leave.'

All the Japanese parents would help their boss carry the papers, as they think it is natural to work for the boss. One Japanese parent said as follows:

Jyoushi ni motteitte yoika ukagai o tatete motte ikimasu. Tsutome to shite wa jyoshi no tame ni suru no wa touzen. 'I would ask my boss if I can carry the papers. Then, I would carry the papers. It is natural to help the boss. That's the work.'

Four American students said they would help a professor, but the reasons varied. There were genuine and reflexive attentiveness as follows (in the order of genuine attentiveness and reflexive attentiveness):

It's not a big deal to help. It would take a minute or two to help. If it would take three, four hours, ...

He's grading. I want to make good impression.

There were two American students who would not help the professor. One of them said as follows:

He knows it's comig. I'm not a TA or anything. There's nothing to do with me, whether or not he has a lot of papers. UCLA is a big university. It's their job. I'm not a TA. I won't be helping.

In situation 6 (rail pass), all three groups of the participants would pick up the pass and give it back to the person. The reasons are the same among the three groups of the participants, i.e., the person will be in trouble; or the pass costs a lot.

5. Discussion

In terms of demonstration of attentiveness, the results of the questionnaire indicate that choice 1 (demonstration of attentiveness) was most frequently selected by all three groups of the participants in four situations (situations 1, 2, 4 and 6) out of six. In situation 3 (book), choice 2 (giving information about the book) was most frequently selected by all three groups of the participants. Only in situation 5 (papers), was there a generational difference in demonstration of attentiveness among the participants. In this section, these results are discussed along with the reasons given by the participants, the rating of degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness, the relationship between degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness and demonstration of attentiveness, and the relationships between a demonstrator and a beneficiary of attentiveness. The results of the questionnaire and those of the interview are also compared.

Although there were significant differences among the participants in rating degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness in situation 1 (seat) (see 4.1.3), rating degree of imposition influenced the choice of attentiveness only by Japanese parents (see 4.1.4), i.e., Japanese parents who selected choice 3 (to keep reading a book) tended to rate a higher degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness than those who selected choice 1 (demonstration of attentiveness). There were no major differences in the choice of attentiveness (i.e., most participants selected choice 1) and the reasons (i.e., they wanted to be of help to the other party) among the participants, but it is worth noting that only Japanese participants stated such reasons as "I feel bad, if only I remain seated" and that "It depends on whether A is older or younger than me." This implies that Japanese participants have the sense of guilt of remaining seated and that age is important to them. The interview results also showed that most participants would demonstrate attentiveness by offering A a seat or carrying A's baggage, but two American students would let A sit in a priority seat. Although it cannot be said that there was a cross-cultural differences only from these interview data, as only two participants stated these, more research will be needed to further investigate cross-cultural differences in demonstration of attentiveness.

In situation 2 (lunch), most participants selected choice 1 (demonstration of attentiveness) in the questionnaire. The main reason by all three groups of the participants was that a demonstrator wanted to be of help to a beneficiary. Only Japanese participants stated that it was mutual (*otagaisama*, which literally means that we can depend on each other, or we help each other when we are in trouble). Paying for lunch did not cost very much, degree of imposition being low (see table 3). It is beneficial to a beneficiary, but it may be beneficial also to a demonstrator. The response written by American students in choice 4 (other) (Pay for B's lunch, but expect them to

pay back or *return the favor in the future*) shows this, implying that it is reflexive attentiveness. The interview results also showed that the participants would pay for B's lunch, confirming the above questionnaire results. The reasons written in choice 4 in the questionnaire as indicated in the above were also stated in the interviews.

In situation 3 (book), all three groups of the participants selected choice 2 (giving information about the book) most frequently, followed by choice 4 (other). The mean score of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness in this situation was relatively high (see 4.1.3), as there is a financial burden on a demonstrator if s/he bought a book. This may have lead most of the participants to select choice 2 (giving information), as those who selected choice 2 rated higher scores of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness than those who selected choice 1 (buying a book) (see 4.1.4). As a reason for not having selected choice 1, it is worth noting that some Japanese participants wrote that it would be imposing or it would be a burden on a beneficiary (*kiotsukawaseru*) (see note 10), if a potential demonstrator bought a book. This implies that attentiveness can be construed both as a virtue or an intrusion/interference. If a beneficiary feels that attentiveness was imposing or a burden, it would lead to a negative evaluation. The interview results show that most participants would contact C, which may correspond to choice 2 in the questionnaire, which confirmed the questionnaire results.

The most frequently selected choice in situation 4 (work schedule) by all three groups of the participants was choice 1 (demonstration of attentiveness) in the questionnaire. Some attentiveness may be reflexive, as some participants wrote that they would be able to get an extra pay as a reason. Choice 3 (saying nothing) was selected next frequently after choice 1. Selection of choice 3 is associated with high degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness. These results may also be because a beneficiary (D) had to be responsible for her/his leave as well as the owner of a shop or a company where D works. Indeed, some participants wrote: It is up to a company to assign people to cover up D's job. Therefore, her/his colleague may have remained silent (choice 3). Although there were no major differences among the participants in the selection of demonstration of attentiveness, some differences between Japanese and American participants can be seen from the following reasons. Only Japanese participants wrote in the questionnaire such reasons as "It is mutual" (*otagaisama*, which literally means that we can depend on each other, or we help each other when we are in trouble) and "It is for the company and for everybody," which will be further discussed later in this section. Mutuality was also found only in the Japanese participants' interview data.

Whereas most Japanese parents (91.3%) selected choice 1 (demonstration of attentiveness) in situation 5 (papers) in the questionnaire, only almost half of Japanese (55.1%) and American students (46.9%) selected this choice. Choice 3 (saying nothing) was the most frequent choice by American students (50.0%) and it was the second frequent choice by Japanese students (39.1%). This can be regarded as a generational difference. Japanese parents have selected to demonstrate attentiveness, because demonstrating attentiveness to their superiors was natural for them, which can be seen from the reason (It is natural to help her/him). The score of rating degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness by Japanese students was significantly higher than that by Japanese parents (see 4.1.3). And there was a relationship between imposition to demonstrate attentiveness and demonstration of attentiveness in this situation (see 4.1.4). Therefore, it can be said that degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness was a factor which lead the participants to select different choices. Japanese parents, who rated degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness lower than Japanese students, selected choice 1 (demonstration of attentiveness) more frequently than Japanese

students. Power difference between a demonstrator and a beneficiary (a subordinate and a boss) may have also influenced the high frequency of the selection of demonstrating attentiveness by Japanese parents. It can be said that Japanese parents could infer the need of a beneficiary, while Japanese and American students would not have been able to do that. The following reason given by the students (both Japanese and American) shows this: I probably would not think about it unless they asked. The following reason given only by American students indicates that they have not even admitted the need of inferring the necessity of the other party: If the professor needed help, he would ask.

Another factor other than inference of the other party's needs, which is required for attentiveness to arise, is a potential demonstrator's willingness, as stated in section one. Even when one infers the other party's wishes and admits the necessity of demonstrating attentiveness, attentiveness does not arise unless a potential demonstrator is willing to demonstrate attentiveness. In situation 5 (papers), Japanese students selected choice 3 (It was troublesome) as a reason for choice 3 (saying nothing) in the questionnaire. This implies that they may not have been willing to demonstrate attentiveness.

According to the questionnaire data, American students selected choice 3 (saying nothing) most frequently in situation 5. The interview data, which basically confirmed the questionnaire data, showed a more detailed account than the questionnaire data. For example, the interview data showed that one American participant would not help the professor, because she thought it was their job (see 4.2). She would not say anything to a professor, which corresponds to choice 3 in the questionnaire, but the interview data revealed what a participant would do and why in more detail.

In situation 6 (rail pass), most of the participants selected choice 1 (demonstration of attentiveness), because they wanted to be of help to the person who had dropped the rail pass. Demonstrating attentiveness in such a situation may be natural or regarded as a common behavior, because shared knowledge (the one who has dropped a pass will be in trouble) would not differ very much from person to person, or from culture to culture. The interview data confirmed these results.

It was hypothesized that degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness would influence demonstration of attentiveness. The results in situations 1, 3, 4 and 5 confirmed this (see 4.1.4), as those who did not choose to demonstrate attentiveness rated higher scores of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness than those who selected to demonstrate attentiveness. This indicates that people may not be willing to demonstrate attentiveness when degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness is high. This means that degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness influences a demonstrator's willingness to demonstrate attentiveness.

As noted in section 1, Japanese culture is described as an *omoiyari* culture by Lebra (1976); and taking care of interpersonal relationships is important in Japanese culture according to Marui, et al. (1996: 405). Attentiveness derives from thinking of the well-being of the other party, which is similar to *omoiyari*; and attentiveness would not arise if interpersonal relationships are not counted on. It was, therefore, hypothesized that more attentiveness would be demonstrated by the Japanese participants than by the American participants. And if the elder generation cherishes *omoiyari* more than the younger generation, Japanese parents would demonstrate attentiveness more frequently than the students. The results of the present study, however, showed that there were not many cross-cultural or cross-generational differences in demonstration of attentiveness except for situation 5 (papers). Although there were no major cross-cultural differences in the choice of demonstration of

attentiveness in most situations, only Japanese participants wrote such reasons as *mutuality* (in situations 2 (lunch) and 4 (work schedule)) and *being for the company and everybody* (in situation 4). The interview data also showed that only Japanese participants stated mutuality in situation 4. These can be regarded as the features of *omoiyari* and interpersonal relationships.

6. Summary and conclusion

The results of the present study, a comparative study on demonstration of attentiveness between generations and cultures, show that the participants would demonstrate attentiveness in four situations out of six in the questionnaire, because they wanted to be of help to the other party. There was a relationship between degree of imposition to demonstrate attentiveness and demonstration of attentiveness in four situations. Attentiveness was demonstrated in every degree of familiarity between a demonstrator and a beneficiary, i.e., from very familiar to not very familiar at all. In one situation, a generational difference in the choice of demonstration of attentiveness was found. While most Japanese parents chose to demonstrate attentiveness, only almost half of Japanese and American students selected demonstration of attentiveness. In this situation, there was a power difference between a demonstrator and a beneficiary. Interview data also confirmed the questionnaire data, giving a more detailed account. For example, when one selected choice 3 (saying nothing) in the questionnaire, the information we get is just they would not say anything. From the interview data, however, we know exactly what the participants would do, e.g., in situation 4 (work schedule) one American student would not work, or in situation 5 (papers) one American student would not help a professor. All these can be subsumed under choice 3 in the questionnaire.

Future studies with many more possible situations with different degrees of familiarity, a power difference between a demonstrator and a beneficiary and different degrees to demonstrate attentiveness would reveal more about demonstration of attentiveness. Further research on intentionality and inferences/implicatures in attentiveness as well as evaluation of attentiveness needs to be conducted in future studies.

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my gratitude to the anonymous reviewer for his/her insightful comments and the editor of *Pragmatics*. My thanks also go to the participants who provided me with the data, Robert McKenzie, who gave me valuable comments on the earlier version of this paper, and Yukari Ohashi, who gave me statistical advice. All errors and weaknesses remain mine.

References

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, and Elite Olshain (1984) Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of

speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics* 5.3: 196-213.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, Juliane House, and Gabriele Kasper (1989) *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson (1987) *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fukushima, Saeko (2000) *Requests and culture: Politeness in British English and Japanese*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Fukushima, Saeko (2004) Evaluation of politeness: The case of attentiveness. *Multilingua* 23: 364-387.

Fukushima, Saeko (2009) Evaluation of politeness: Do the Japanese evaluate attentiveness more positively than the British? *Pragmatics* 19: 501-518.

Grice, H. Paul (1967) Logic and conversation. Unpublished Ms. from the Williams James Lectures 1967.

Grice, H. Paul (1989) Logic and conversation. In P. Grice, *Studies in the ways of words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 22-40.

Hatch, Evelyn, and Anne Lazaraton (1991) *The research manual: Design and statistics for applied linguistics*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Haugh, Michael (2003) Anticipated versus inferred politeness. *Multilingua* 22: 397-413.

Kasper, Gabriele (2000) Data collection in pragmatics research. In H. Spencer-Oatey (ed.), *Culturally speaking: Managing rapport through talk across cultures*. London: Continuum, pp. 316-341.

Kallia, Alexandra (2004) Linguistic politeness: The implicature approach. *Multilingua* 23: 145-169.

Lebra, Takie Sugiyama (1976) *Japanese patterns of behavior*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Leech, Geoffrey (1983) *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Leech, Geoffrey (2011) Pragmalinguistic vs. sociopragmatic politeness: A wrong turning in (im)politeness theory? A paper presented at the 12th International Pragmatics Conference at the University of Manchester on the 7th July, 2011.

Locher, Miriam A. (2004) *Power and politeness in action: Disagreements in oral communication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Marui, Ichiro, Yoshinori Nishijima, Kayoko Noro, Rudolph Reinelt, and Hitoshi Yamashita (1996) Concepts of communicative virtues (CCV) in Japanese and German. In M. Hellinger & U. Ammon (eds.), *Contrastive sociolinguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 385-409.

Ohashi, Jun (2008) Linguistic rituals for thanking in Japanese: Balancing obligations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40: 2150-2174.

Riley, Philip (2007) *Language, culture and identity*. London: Continuum.

Spencer-Oatey, Helen (2000) Introduction: Language, culture and rapport management. In H. Spencer-Oatey (ed.), *Culturally speaking: management rapport through talk across cultures*. London: Continuum, pp. 1-8.

Suzuki, Toshihiko (2007) *A pragmatic approach to the generation and gender gap in Japanese politeness strategies*. Tokyo: Hituzi Shobo.

Verschueren, Jef (1999) *Understanding pragmatics*. London: Arnold.

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