

社会学部講演会

社会的相互作用と感情の日米の差異

インディアナ大学社会学部教授 D. R. ハ イ ス

〈解説〉

本稿は、1990年6月27日に行われたD. ハイス教授（イリノイ大学）による社会学部講演会の原稿である。原稿はもとの英文のまま掲載するので、ここで内容の簡単な解説を行っておくことにしたい。なお、この原稿内容はさらに加筆補正のうえ、Encyclopedia of Sociologyに‘Affect Control Theory and Impression Formation（感情統御理論と印象形成）’と題して出版される予定であることを付記しておく

※

一般に、感情というものは個人の主観的な現象とされている。ところが、少し考えてみると、感情（の表出）はそれほど「個人的」なものではなく、むしろ、社会的なルールによって規制されている社会的な現象であることに気づく。たとえば、葬式では、人はおかしくても笑えないし、笑わないでいるうちにおかしさも感じなくなったりする。つまり、笑いという一見個人的で自発的な感情表出にも、その適否を決めているような社会的なルールの網の目がかぶせられているのである。

ここに掲載するハイス教授の講演は、最近注目されてきた「感情の社会学」の一環として位置づけられる。そこでのキーワードはFACE（＝顔、面子）である。人々は日々さまざまな状況におうじていくつものFACEを使い分けている。さらに、FACEの取扱いが重大な感情（とくに、恥や怒り）を喚起することを知っていて、それを念頭において行動する。たとえば、われわれは兄に対するときは弟のFACEをもつが、弟に対するときは兄のFACEをもつ。そして、兄のFACEをつぶさないように、また、弟のFACEを維持するように行動する。もちろん、FACEの実質は文化によって異なっている。英語の“brother”が兄か弟かを区別しないように、アメリカでは兄のFACEと弟のFACEには、日本ほど明確な区別がみられない。だが、FACEをめぐる感情のマネジメントが、人々の社会的行動に一定の予測可能性をもたらすという原則そのものは、アメリカも日本も共通である。それは、〈LOSE FACE〉という表現が「面子をなくす」「顔をつぶされる」という表現とまったく同じ意味で使われていることから知られるだろう。

この講演の中で、ハイス教授はFACEをめぐる感情のマネジメントの在り方を、さまざまな具体例をあげてわかりやすく説明している。そのなかに、“derogation of the victim”（犠牲者の名誉失墜）という興味深い例がある。これは、名誉あるFACEをもつ人が、誰かに汚いことをされた場合、当の名誉ある人は犠牲者として同情されるどころか、逆に「汚い人間につけこまれた」というマイナスの評価をうけるといことである。たとえば、ある心優しい裁判官が、生活の窮状を訴える詐欺師の術策にはまって、大金をだましとられたとしよう。人々は、犠牲者である裁判官に同情するどころか、ヤクザな詐欺師と「かかわりあいになった」裁判官を笑うだろう。この場合、裁判官はその名誉あるFACEを失い、やり場のない屈辱感に苦しめられることになる。そうならないためには、はじめからヤクザな人とはかかわりあいになってはならないのである。

FACEを失うことは、重大なマイナス感情を喚起する。だが、どういうときにFACEを失うかに関しては、社会的相互作用において一定の規則性がある。とくにFACEの喪失にともなう恥の感情などは、すぐれて社会的な現象である。ハイス教授の講演は、「感情の社会学」についての専門的な議論を展開してはいない。が、注意深い読者には、そうした研究の有益さが実感されるはずである

（高坂 健次）
（宮原浩二郎）

FACE

An Introductory Lecture on Affect Control Theory for Audiences in Japan

David R. Heise

I have heard that “face” is very important in Japan. It may surprise you to learn that “face” also is very important in America.

Erving Goffman, a sociologist famous in America, spent his whole... career studying “face”, and Goffman said many interesting things about “face”. Here are some samples.

(1) The “face” that a person presents to others depends on the situation. For example, in American jobs you present one “face” to outsiders and another “face” to co-workers.

(2) Loss of “face” results in emotions like shame, and it leads to attempts to recover “face”. For example, failing in a task would be embarrassing, and it might lead to attempts to recover “face” like these. (a) An apology (I’m sorry and will never do it again); (b) An excuse (I was too tired to work well); (c) A justification (My boss is lazy, and I will not work harder than he does).

(3) People help each other maintain “face”. For example, if a person makes a minor breach of “face” then other people usually try to ignore it. For instance, if a person clumsily drops a pencil and has to pick the pencil up again, then other people usually try to act like nothing happened and they did not even notice. Also people often provide excuses for others who have lost “face”, as when someone comforts you after you made an error by saying, “I know, you were just tired”.

Like Goffman, I, too, have spent my whole career studying “face”. My approach is quite different than Goffman’s thought. I do research in order to develop a mathematical model that describes how “face” works in social relations.

The result is a theory of how people interact with each other a theory called Affect Control Theory. Another result is a computer program for conducting “pretend” social interactions in order to see what different kinds of people might do, how they might feel see what different kinds of people

might do, how they might feel during social interactions, and how they might change the “face” that they hold for themselves or for other people as a result of different kinds of events.

I am going to tell you a little about what the theory of affect control has to say about “face”.

The first thing I will discuss is how “face” is established in different situations. Then I will discuss how conforming “face” and losing “face” changes impressions of people and results in emotions. Finally I will tell you how we all try to maintain “face” through our conduct and our interpretations of people.

I am going to use Japanese examples to make it more interesting for you. Now I know nothing about Japan except what I get from the theory, and the theory does not tell me how to use your words correctly. So please forgive me when I say things that sound dumb. I am just a foreigner (gaijin), and that is all the “face” I dare claim while I am telling you about Japan.

DEFINITIONS OF SITUATIONS

When a family gets together in America, all of the sons are equal with each other, English has only one term, “brother”, to cover them all, For example, I have two older brothers, but when we get together, I have just as much authority as they do. Nobody thinks they have a right to tell me what to do just because they are older.

Evidently the situation is different in Japan. If I understand it correctly, you always refer either to older-brother (ani) or younger-brother (otouto). If you are the older-brother in a situation then you are supposed to put on a “face” that makes you nice and powerful and quiet. If you are the younger-brother, then you are supposed to put on a “face” that makes you not so nice, very powerless, and quite active. That is an example of how the situa-

tion determines what “face” you have. When you are with an older-brother you are younger-brother or younger-sister (imoto), and with a younger-brother you are older-brother or older-sister (ane).

I want to mention that in America (and my wife tells me that the same is true in England, too) there is one exception to not distinguishing among siblings by age. If you are the very youngest son, then you sometimes get called “baby-brother” (probably translates as akambou-otouto); and if you are the youngest daughter, then you sometimes get called “baby-sister”. It is usually the opposite-sex siblings who do this. For example, my sisters love to call me “baby-brother” even though I am 53 years old] Making me “baby-brother” does not change them—they still are just “sisters”, not “older-sisters”, But it does give me a “face” that constrains me to be dumb and silly and act like I have nothing important to say.

Now let me try to show how an observer can impose different “faces” on others. Suppose you encounter a male and a female, both adult, who are together.

If you never have met them before then you might think of them as a “man” (ojisan ?) and “woman” (kanoujo ?). Since they know that you know nothing about them, they will assume that is the way you see them, and those are the “faces” they will present to you.

However, suppose you do know them, and the main thing you know about them is that each is the “sweetheart” (koibito) of the other. Then when you appear they may feel obligated to present themselves as each other’s sweetheart while they are with you. They probably will act nice and “deep” as they try to uphold their “faces” as sweethearts with each other.

Finally, suppose again that you do know them, and you know that each is married to someone else even though you caught them acting like sweethearts with each other, and they know that you saw] So you and they believe that they are par-amours (jyoufuu and jyoufu). They have lost face with you in the sense that from then on you will think of them in those awful identities instead of as “husband” (otto) and “wife” (tsuma ?). However, more than that happened. When you caught them they acquired new bad “faces” that they have to uphold. As they do this, you can expect them to

treat you badly, perhaps jeering (daredare wo hiyakasu) or scolding (daredare ni kogoto wo iu) you]

I will give one more example to show the “face” a person acquires in a situation depends on culture. Suppose that in Japan a situation arises where a man (ojisan) and child (kodomo) are together and the two of them define themselves in those terms. neither one has a face that is very nice. but the man is supposed to be more powerful and quieter than the child. In support of these “faces” the man might examine (daredere wo shiraberu) the child, and the child might cling-to (daredare ni shigamitsuku) the man, on the other hand. suppose the same thing happens in America, Now both the man and the child have “faces” that are quite nice and lively, though the man is supposed to be more powerful than the child. Reflecting these American “faces”, the man might acclaim (daredare wo shousan suru) the child, and the child might jest (daredare ni jodan wo iu) the man. Thus you can see that even though the situation seems the same objectively, different cultures draw forth different “faces” for the people to uphold.

IMPRESSIONS AND EMOTIONS

A situation determines the basic “faces” that people are supposed to uphold, but events in the situation determine how those “faces” fare and what emotions people have as their “faces” are confirmed or nullified.

Let us return to two Japanese sweethearts (koibito). It would be natural for either of them to court (daredare ni kyuuai suru) the other. Such behavior creates impressions that match their “faces” very well. They both come out looking nice just like sweethearts are supposed to be. The one who is doing the courting is potent like a sweetheart should be, and also the one being courted does not seem weak. I think there might be some difference between Japanese males and females regarding how quiet courting is : for females courting produces the impression of being rather quiet whereas for males the impression is a tiny bit active. But anyhow, courting behavior matches the sweetheart identity for both males and females because their notions of how quiet a sweetheart is matches their notions of how quiet courting is.

The impressions created by courting produce very positive emotions for the sweethearts. The one who does the courting feels compassionate and contented. The one who is being courted feels contented and relaxed. Such are the emotions that arise when you confirm a good, potent, and more or less quiet identity.

Now let us suppose that for some unknown reason one of the sweethearts insults (*daredare wo bujoku suru*) the other. The one who did the insulting looks far worse than a sweetheart is supposed to be, and it is interesting to figure out why. First, insulting someone is a bad act, and anyone who engages in a bad act tends to look like a bad person. Second, in this case the person has engaged in a bad act toward a fine person—a sweetheart—and that makes it worse. You see, it would not be nearly as bad if the sweetheart had insulted someone bad, like a peeping-tom (*nozokima*), because that kind of person deserves to be insulted. But instead the sweetheart insulted a good person, and that seems unjust. This is a very important psychological principle, and we know it holds among Japanese as well as among Americans: you look good if you act nicely with good people or if you act nasty with bad people. On the other hand, you look bad if you act nasty with good people or if you act nicely with bad people.

Another interesting thing is that the sweetheart who was insulted looks worse, too, though not as bad as the actor. The loss of “face” for the sweetheart who was insulted represents another general principle called “derogation of the victim”. In general, if you have a positive “face” and someone acts nasty toward you, then you do not seem as good as you should be. You get blamed for getting involved in nasty events. Moreover, you seem weaker than you normally are, mainly because you let yourself be the object of someone else’s bad action.

Emotions reflect the impressions created by an event and how those impressions compare to the “face” a person is supposed to have. The sweetheart who insulted the other seems to be about as powerful as a sweetheart should be but also seems much more unpleasant and much more lively than a real sweetheart. Therefore when that sweetheart looks at himself and sees the impression created by what he is doing, he will develop an emotion that reflects

the fact that he appears to be bad, potent, and active when he is supposed to be good, potent, and fairly quiet. He will feel spiteful, furious, outraged—and in a sense those emotions explain to himself why he is doing what he is doing. The sweetheart who was insulted also will develop an emotion that reflects how she has lost “face”. The insult makes her seem less good much weaker than a sweetheart should be. So she feels dejected and self-pitying.

I now am going to summarize what I have said so far, but I will put it in general terms that apply to all kinds of social interaction. First, you acquire “faces” when you enter situations. The “face” you have depends on the situation, and you have different “faces” in different situations. Second, events that happen in a situation create impressions of you that may or may not maintain your “face”. These impressions arise from complicated psychological processes that operate during events, transforming who you are into who you will be. (And there are more psychological principles than the ones I mentioned.) Third, your emotions tell you how things are going. The emotion you feel during an event reflects the impression of yourself that is created by the event and also reflects how that impression compares to the “face” you are supposed to have.

CREATING EVENTS

The most important idea in affect control theory is that people try to have experiences that maintain their “face”. Experiences that maintain “face” are fulfilling, whereas experiences that undermine “face” nullify cultural meanings that help us to understand the world. Experiences that maintain “face” seem normal, whereas experiences that undermine “face” seem uncanny as if something weird is happening. Experiences that maintain “face” lead us to respond in usual ways, whereas experiences that undermine “face” cause us to respond in uncommon ways or even to change our understanding of what “face” someone has or what that “face” really means.

One direct way to have experiences that maintain “face” is to make experiences happen in just the way that you want them to happen. That is, rather than hoping that events will happen that maintain your “face”, you take the initiative and

create the right kind of event yourself.

For example, suppose that an older-brother (and) and younger brother (otouto) are together. According to affect control theory the older-brother might try to create an event that confirms his "face". But now there is a problem. How does he figure out what he is supposed to do in order to create an event that maintains his "face" ?

Well, the event is supposed to give an impression of him that matches his identity as older-brother. That means he has to come out looking nice, quite powerful, and quiet. Now according to the first psychological principle that I mentioned earlier, he will tend to create the impression that he is supposed to create if he acts in a way that is nice, quite potent, and quiet. However, the second psychological principle also will operate, and he has to take account of that. Since he is going to act nicely toward someone who is not really bad and who is weak, a nice act will tend to make him look even nicer than the first principle suggests. In fact, he had better not act too nicely or he will overdo it. He would be acting contrary to "face" if he made himself look too good or too powerful or too quiet. So he should act nice but not too nice, and he should choose an act that is powerful and quiet.

I used the computer program that makes up "pretend" interactions and it said that in Japan the older-brother might act toward the younger-brother as follows. He might suggest something (daredare ni shisa suru) to younger-brother, or instruct (daredare ni tehodoki suru) younger-brother, or negotiate with (daredare to koushou suru) younger-brother. Any of these acts make older-brother look good and powerful and quiet as he is supposed to be.

I better mention that females in Japan might expect things to go a little differently because females see older-brother as being little less powerful and a little less quiet than males do. Thus females might expect older-brother to engage in less potent and less quiet actions—behaviors like : agree with (daredare ni sansei suru), support (daredare wo mikata suru), or succor (daredare wo kawaigaru). You should keep the difference between male and female views in mind as I continue talking about this example, even though I will talk only about the male viewpoint.

Now what about younger-brother ? Should he

try to create an event too ? Well, if he did he would have to create an impression of himself as neither good nor bad. as very weak, and as very lively—that is the "face" of a younger-brother. Taking all psychological principles into account, he would have to act in a way that is neither good nor bad. slightly weak, and quite lively. Some behaviors that are like that in Japan are the following : tickle (daredare wo kusuguru), cling to (daredare ni shigamitsuku) or butter up (daredare ni oseji wo iu). Wonder if younger-brother did butter up older-brother—would that really maintain his "face" ? Yes, it would (except he would look slightly worse than he is supposed to look).

But there are a couple of problems. First, if younger-brother buttered up older-brother and older-brother knew what younger-brother was doing, then older-brother would look quite a bit less powerful than he is supposed to look—older-brother would lose "face". Affect control theory says that younger-brother would not want this to happen because younger-brother is trying to maintain BOTH his own face and older-brother's face, too. Moreover, if younger-brother makes older-brother lose face, then he can expect older-brother to respond by being stricter, the program says older brother might respond with acts like reform (daredare wo kaishin saseru) or admonish (daredare wo satsu). Finally, if younger-brother does butter up older-brother he can expect to feel some unpleasant emotions : the program says he would feel nervous, agitated, tense. On the other hand, if he just lets older brother act on him, then he would feel neutral emotionally.

Thus younger-brother probably will let older-brother do the action because younger-brother has so little power that he cannot create a really ideal experience. However, older-brother has all the necessary goodness, and quietness to create an almost perfect event. If older-brother suggests something (daredare ni shisa suru) to younger-brother then that event confirms the "face" of both, the event leads to pleasant emotions for older-brother (like feeling secure, generous, appreciative) while younger-brother feels emotionality neutral, and event keeps older-brother acting in his normal way rather than getting stricter with younger brother.

NEGATIVE FACE

Affect control theory says that a person can take on a negative "face" as well as a positive "face", and if someone has a negative "face" then that person will seek experiences to maintain the negative "face", and even create events that make the self look during the period right after you caught them, even if you are not present anymore? I asked the computer program what would happen in Japan in this situation. The program assumes the couple will try to confirm the new ugly "faces" they have acquired, that they actually will create events that give them the experience of being a male-paramour and a female-paramour. Here is what the program said they might do.

The male-paramour might jeer (daredare wo hiyakasu), make fun of (daredare wo chakasu), worry (daredare wo shimpai saseru), scold (daredare ni kogoto wo iu), or deride (daredare wo karakau) the female-paramour. These are the kind of actions that confirm a very bad, weak, and somewhat lively person when that person is interacting with someone who also is bad and somewhat lively and who is even weaker. If the male-paramour scolded the female-paramour, then he is predicted to feel irritated, nervous, resentful, or cynical.

On the other hand, suppose that the female-paramour acts to confirm their ugly "faces". Then she might engage in behaviors like tease (daredare wo yayu suru), get even with (daredare ni shikaesi suru), irritate (daredare wo iraira saseru), or ridicule (daredare wo guro suru). And if she ridiculed the man she might feel aggravated, irritated, annoyed, or fed up. Thus, what was once a pleasant relationship becomes an unpleasant relationship because the two people start to maintain ugly "faces", and ugly "faces" produce nasty emotions when experiences confirm those "faces".

NEW FACES

Affect control theory also suggests what kind of "face" we might assign a person when we discover that person doing something unexpected. The idea here is that we see that the person has engaged in a behavior with respect to another person, and

we judge that such a behavior does not maintain the "face" that we thought the person had. Thus, we surmise that the person must be confirming another "face". Then we have to figure out what "face" would be confirmed by the behavior that we saw happen.

For example, suppose that you see a man with a boy, and you know that they are father (chichi) and son (musuko), You would expect the father to confirm the "faces" of father and son by engaging in acts like persuade (daredare wo settoku suru), quiet (daredare wo shizuka ni saseru), guide (daredare wo settoku suru), convince (daredare wo nattoku saseru).

But suppose that instead of these acts you see the man thrashing (daredare wo sekkan suru) the son. This does not confirm the father "face" at all (especially if you are a Japanese female). So you figure the man is trying to maintain some "face" other than father, and in any case he does not deserve the "face" of father. You have to find another "face" that fits the act of thrashing a son. Again I went to the computer program to see what kind of "faces" might work in Japan. The program suggested that the man might be seen as a menace (kikenjinbutsu) or a violent person (ranbousha).

Of course, it is possible that boy deserved the thrashing. In that case, you might decide that the boy does not have the right to the "face" of son, and you need to find a new "face" for the boy that explains why he is being thrashed. The predicted identities include delinquent (oyafukoumono) and germ-carrier (hokinsha). That is, you could better understand the father thrashing the boy if you knew that the boy was a delinquent or a germ-carrier.

CONCLUSION

Affect control theory provides many more details than I have given you. The theory has been developed for 25 years, and you can take a Ph. D. in America by doing research on the theory. However, I hope that this little talk has proved to you that sociologists do know something about "face". And hopefully the examples helped demonstrate that the theory can make plausible predictions about how "face" operates in social interactions.

I want to end by emphasizing a difference be-

tween America and Japan in how “face” affects people’s lives.

As I said right at the beginning, the maintenance of “face” is the central process shaping social interactions in America. Affect control theory works well in explaining American social relationships, and that proves “face” is important to Americans.

Yet “face” obviously is considered far more important among Japanese than among Americans. Americans seem more able to joke away a loss of “face”, or just forget about it. Moreover, Americans have no cultural tradition in which a loss of “face” is understood to be so devastating that it might justify suicide.

In other words, “face” is important in America, but “face” seems much more important in Japan. I do not know why. Can you tell me ?