The Ins and Outs of Japanese

Perception of group dynamics in Japan

Author: Simon Wiklund

Supervisors: Arthur Holmer

Rika Hayashi

Peer reviewed by: Ida Hammar

Abstract

In 1973, the psychologist Tajfel proposed the Social Identity Theory which claimed that human behaviour is affected by the social relation of the people involved in a given situation, as documented by Burke (2006). The culture and language of Japan seem to embody the aspects of this theory as social relation is portrayed frequently, if not constantly, through the use of language. Academics such as Shibatani (1990), Wetzel (1988) and Hasegawa (1998; 2005) have conducted research on how the presence of in- and out-groups affect the use of language in Japan. If a group is considered to be intimate or distant to the speaker, language that addresses that intimacy or distance is applied. This concept, known as *Uchi* and *Soto,* is widely considered to be central to the Japanese language and encompasses numerous aspects of that language. However, due to the general nature of the concept, there is little acknowledgement of to what extent the Japanese population shares this notion of how groups are perceived, which is what this thesis aims to explore. Two core aspects of how group relations are expressed in Japanese will be focused on in this thesis: The levels of politeness and the verbs of giving and receiving. Using polite language towards a person indicates a social difference between speaker and addressee, making it highly likely that the two do not belong to the same obvious social group while using casual language between people indicates the opposite. Japanese shows a stark difference in language between the various levels of politeness that can be expressed. In the case of giving and receiving, the aspect of a fluid notion of self can lead to the speaker describing another person receiving a gift as if the speaker had received it as well. While these verbs have guidelines as to how one accurately describe one group giving to or receiving from another group, if one defines groups differently to the other, differences in language should also appear. As such, it's in this thesis' interest to investigate if group-relations in a given social situation are perceived similarly in Japan which will be done through reviewing previous research regarding *Uchi* and *Soto* as well as own studies.

Keywords: Groups, politeness, giving, receiving, *Uchi, Soto,* sociolinguistics, Japanese

Acknowledgements

Contents

Conventions and Abbreviations

This thesis uses a modified version of the Hepburn system for transcribing the Japanese vocabulary. In the case of words with double vowels, double letters are applied, instead of macrons, except for the case of the long *e* which has been transcribed as *ei.* Also in the instances of Japanese words that utilize the *hiragana* character つ, otherwise transcribed as *tsu,* will drop the *s* in the transcription. Furthermore, Japanese words with the *hiragana* character ち, will be transcribed as *ti* instead *chi* and hiragana character し, as *si* instead of *shi.* All Japanese words and names that appear as examples in the text will be shown in italics, while words or sentences translated into English will be highlighted by single quotation marks. In order to avoid confusion, English quotations will be marked by double quotation marks. Lastly, the glossing in this thesis follows the Leipzig set of glossing rules to present the example meanings with their grammatical breakdown and translation. Names of referenced authors are written as they appear in their respective research while names of places are written according to the dictionary.

The abbreviations used in this thesis follow the same system used by Shibatani (1990) with the exceptions of PLAIN and POLITE, which are derived from Wetzel (1998) while HON, HUM originate from the same writings, but have been abbreviated by the author for the sake of brevity in this thesis.

ACC - accusative
ADV - adverb(alizer)
DAT - dative
FP - final particle
HON - honorific
HUM - humble
NOM - nominative
O - object
PAST - past (tense)
PLAIN - plain form
POLITE - polite form
TOP – topic

1. Introduction

1.1 Topic

Among many other aspects of Japanese linguistics where the sociolinguistics concept known as *Uchi* and *Soto* can be seen prevalently, the two that will be focused on in this thesis are Politeness in Language and the verbs of Giving and Receiving. *Uchi* and *Soto* can be seen in social interactions where the perceived difference or equality between the referee(s) and addressee(s) is notable and expressed through language. Japanese is a language which undergoes such changes depending on the referee's relation to the addressee, with different forms of language for the different levels of politeness.

Furthermore, the Japanese language utilizes an array of verbs to describe the act of giving and receiving. They are used to express the direction of the act and the level of intimacy or in-group status between the giver and receiver in question as well as potential out-group status. This means that an understanding of how intimate, or distant, the relation between them can be derived from which verb is used by either party to describe the act.

Both honorific language and the verbs of giving and receiving are highly dependent on the context of the social situation in order to apply the grammar that most accurately describes the relation between the referee and addressee. This requires an understanding of how one's position in a given situation relates to the referee. However, Hasegawa (1998) stated that the Japanese notion of self has been claimed to be unstable, constantly shifting, and and context dependent as opposed to a fixed point regardless of the context. Therefore, it is interesting to ponder if the changes in group-dynamics are perceived similarly by Japanese and if it is, whether or not these changes are expressed the same way through language as well.

1.2 Organization

This thesis will begin by introducing and explaining *Uchi* and *Soto* mainly through its linguistic importance, but will incorporate a minor aspect of the social psychology to which the concept is explained through Japanese as well as non-Japanese perspectives.

In continuation, previous research that has been conducted regarding the featured grammar as well as *Uchi* and *Soto* will be presented separately and later discussed collectively in the third part. The following part of this thesis will be that of the present study with the goal of determining the extent that Japanese natives share their perception of group dynamics which will be summarized as well as where the results method will be evaluated. All of this will reach to the conclusion in the closing fourth part of the thesis.

2. Previous research

The English poet John Donne famously wrote that "no man is an island", implying that human beings are defined not by themselves, but by the people surrounding them. A couple of centuries later, the psychologist Tajfel, proposed the Social Identity Theory (SIT) in 1973, as explained by Burke in 2006. The theory, in its original form, claimed that people derive a lot of their sense of pride and self-esteem through their social groups. SIT also focuses heavily on how humans tend to categorize his/her social groups into two basic categories: In-groups and out-groups. In-groups are groups which we feel a sense of belonging to while out-groups are groups to which we feel no belonging to. In its essence, SIT is about humans defining their perception of "us" and "them".

Not only that, but through this social categorization we behave differently towards groups which we define as an in-group, while our behaviour towards out-groups can be vastly different. Today, SIT still retains relevance in sociological research as well as showing that its hypotheses apply across several countries and cultures. One of these is Japan.

The Japanese language can be considered a nigh impenetrable network with its complex writing style, pronunciation and grammatical structure from the point of an outsider. As a student of the language, one of the more intimidating aspects of applying one's language skills in practice is the concern of speaking inappropriately to the addressee. Among many different possible causes for this, one of the perhaps more common ones is the uncertainty of how one speaks to the addressee. This can be due to how the speaker (or referee) perceives the possible differences in social relation or even the lack of such a difference to the addressee. This difference falls under the central Japanese system of linguistics known as *Uchi* and *Soto.*

2.1 What is *Uchi* and *Soto?*

To begin to understand this certain concept, it is highly practical to understand the meaning of the terms *Uchi*(内) and *Soto*(外). Lee (2000) presented the lexical meanings of the two in their varying respective meanings. Amongst these were contrasting word-pairings such as:

<div align="center">

indoors - outdoors

self(ves) - other(s)

included - excluded

engaged - detached

"us" - "them"

</div>

Just based on these 5 pairs, one can observe *Uchi* and *Soto*'s relation to Tajfel's theory as a concept based on interaction between in-groups and out-groups and how these groups affect behaviour and, more relevant to this thesis, language.

For instance, consider the following situation of addressing a person of hierarchical superiority (such as the workplace boss) as opposed to addressing someone of equal status (coworker, friend etc) in English. If you would ask the addressee if they wanted something simple, like a cup of coffee, it is not impossible to assume that you would address your workplace superior with a sentence such as:

Would you like a cup of coffee?

Now consider how you would normally address someone that you deem equal or close in terms of relation:

Do you want a cup of coffee?

While these two sentences are identical in meaning and intention (i.e expressing if the addressee wants a cup of coffee) and very similar in terms of both usage of vocabulary, simply changing the first and third word creates a notable difference of social relation between the two parties in this social exchange. This change is affected by the notion that perhaps one wants to express a certain level of respect or politeness towards one's superior as it's expected in most workplaces due to the perceived difference between the two. On the other hand, when referring to a person who is deemed close or equal it affects the situation in a way that social norms do

not require use of a more polite form of speech. Because of that, using a less polite sentence defines the lack of social difference between the two. Such a sociolinguistic dynamic is what *Uchi* and *Soto* embodies: Adjusting and applying behaviour as well as language to define and portray the social situation between addressee(s) and referee(s).

2.2 Politeness language and the concept of "face"

Brown and Levinson (1978:66-68) claimed that all adult members of society have what they refer to as "face", which they defined as a self-image which all members want to claim for themselves. The notion of face was then divided into two different categories:

a. Negative "face": basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction

b. Positive "face": consistent positive self-image or "personality" (with the desire that the self-image is appreciated and approved of)

In its essence, Brown and Levinson suggest that adult members of society want to not be inhibited or impeded by any other person as well as his/her wants to be desirable to others. Also, they defined performing an act in which one opposes another person's negative of positive face as a "face-threatening act" (FTA). To put it simply, to ask someone of to do a task would oppose that person's negative "face" since it would mean denying that person's desire to act by his/her own accord. To oppose someone's positive 'face' would include acts such as disagreeing with that person's opinion or disapprove of that person negatively since that goes against the self-image of that person. However, to reinforce the other person's "face", either negatively or positively, would then be interpreted as politeness. For instance, to address another person's self-image in a positive way would be interpreted as a confirmation that that person's self-image is viewed as desirable. Lastly, to satisfy that person's want to have his actions unimpeded by others through asking whether or not that person wants to agree to one's requests would also be considered polite because it acknowledges that the person would not want to perform actions not according to his/her own wants (adapted from Longcope 1995:6). However, according to Larsson (2008:7), this theory has received criticisms by having limited itself to the viewpoint of Western/European cultures, rendering it inadequate to address Asian languages such as Japanese. The Brown and Levinson model implies that politeness is done out of a person's own choice, with one's self as the fixed point of reference. However, Hasegawa (1998) writes that the Japanese notion of self does not follow the Western pattern as

it is not based on any fixed point, but is defined by the situation and relations between individuals are of higher priority than the self of an individual.

Hasegawa also writes that the Japanese notion of self is fluid, which can be seen in the situation where a secretary would utilize humbling language when referring to the company president's absence to an customer to the company because at that time, the customer is the out-group while the secretary is then in the same in-group as the company president. This is a prime example of how the in-group and out-group dynamics in the Japanese culture are ever changing and cannot be assumed to be fixed in any way or form, which will be discussed later in the thesis. This does, however, bring up the question of to what extent Japanese natives share the perception of these dynamics of in-groups and out-groups. Hence, a politeness model in which politeness is viewed to originate from a fixed point is not applicable to Japanese. Though, this would then mean that the Japanese sense of politeness and how it's applied in language is fundamentally different to European or American cultures.

2.3 Honorific language

Japanese is widely known around the world as a language centered around showing respect towards the referee while at the same time humbling oneself, to the point where it's most likely one of the main stereotypes of that particular culture. The online news source Japan Today published an article in 2013 presenting the results of a poll vote from the website Madame Riri where people of Western origin (i.e. European/American) were asked to choose words they deemed to summarize the Japanese culture the most. Among the 10 most commonly used ones were words such as Respectful and Formal. However, the most common word used to describe Japan was the word Polite.

According to Loveday (1986:291), the language of politeness in Japan are divided into two main categories: Referent honorifics and addressee honorifics. Both categories share a purpose in that they are used to "honor" someone, to put it simply. However, they have traits that do set them apart in distinct ways. Loveday (1986:291) describes referent honorifics as being used to describe a someone's actions, belongings and other affiliated person while addressee honorifics are used towards the person to whom the referee is speaking to at that present moment. Loveday also clarified that the person whom the referent honorifics are directed towards can be the addressee, but that the distinction between the two categories remains and is still important to keep in mind.

Referent honorifics, by themselves, have two subcategories that Wetzel (1988:8) presented as following.

(1) The two different referent honorifics

      a.   *Asita*   *irasshai-masu.*

              tomorrow   come-HON

              'He/she/them/they will come tomorrow'

      b.   *Asita*   *mairi-masu.*

              Tomorrow   come-HUM

(1a) utilizes the subject honorification language form known as *Sonkeigo*, which Loveday defines as a form of referent honorifics that are used to exalt the subject to a level above the speaker. The sentence (1b), on the other hand, makes use of object honorification, *Kenjoo-go,* which serves as a mean to humble the subject in order to elevate the object by appearing less important compared to the object. Both of these forms of grammar fall under the common name *Keigo*[1]. Tsuji (1947:17) stated that while this form of politeness in language is a general concept, it's paramount to bear in mind the applications of *Keigo* in everyday life, which is understandable due to the widespreadness and importance that polite language has to Japanese. What has to be considered is that while Japanese is a language based on a Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) model, in situations such as these, it is not unusual to drop the subject altogether as it is widely accepted that unless a subject is specified, the subject is usually "I" or "we". In the case of subject honorifics, however, the subject would instead be one of the non first-person pronouns to be dropped, as it is practically unheard of in the Japanese culture to exalt oneself above others and therefore, this particular form of language is reserved to people other than the speaker.

Where one would most likely encounter both object and subject honorifics is in a typical Japanese workplace where there is a hierarchy defined clearly through social conventions such as work-titles (boss or supervisor compared to normal worker or secretary) or the *Senpai/Koohai* relationship[2] between workers. Another setting where a similar hierarchy can be

---

[1] Roughly translated as 'respect language'

[2] A *Senpai* is a person deemed to be an elder within a group not only by being of a higher age but also through the amount of time spent within that group. A *Koohai* is a person who is the younger or less experienced member of the group, often taken care off by the *Senpai*. A common example of this relation is 3rd year High-school students (*Senpai*) taking care of 1st year students (*Koohai*). In the case of a

found within the Japanese society is that of a student speaking to a teacher. The difference in hierarchy is defined through both difference in age, experience and "title". Consider the following example, presented by Shibatani (1990:376).

(2) Subject Honorifics, *Sonkeigo* (referent-controlled)

    a. *sensei*   *ga*   *warat-ta* (plain)
        teacher   NOM   laugh-PAST
        'The teacher laughed'

    b. *sensei*   *ga*   *o-warai*   *ni*   *nat-ta* (honorific)
        teacher   NOM   HON-laugh   ADV   become-PAST

Looking at the sentence (2b), the subject (teacher) performs the action of laughing which is then exalted by the referee (student) through the use of *Sonkeigo.* Honorific language is triggered not only by the fact that the group of the teacher is an out-group to the referee, but due to the relation between the subject and the referee, the use of honorific language is warranted, even expected.

However, if the teacher is the object of the sentence, meaning that in order to portray the difference between the subject and the teacher, honorifics cannot be applied the same way. As stated before, in such a case the use of object honorifics, *Kenjoo-go*, is warranted in order to downgrade one's own actions in order to put oneself to a level that is below the object. This is shown in the example below.

(3) Object Honorifics, *Kenjoo-go* (referent-controlled)

    a. *Taroo*   *ga*   *sensei*   *o*   *tasuke-ta* (plain)
                    NOM   teacher   ACC   help-PAST
        'Taroo assisted the teacher'

    b. *Taroo*   *ga*   *sensei*   *o*   *o-tasuke si-ta* (honorific)
                    NOM   teacher   ACC   HON-help do-PAST

---

workplace, a *Senpai* would be someone who has been an employee longer than the *Koohai* but does not have a higher position in the hierarchy.

In both (1) and (2), the only aspect of the sentences subjected by change when increasing politeness is the verb. While the verb-stem remains unchanged, the change in verb-ending as well as the addition of the beautification *o-* is the telltale sign of the form that is taught in textbooks such as Genki 2 (2011:189). What has to be recognized in (3b) is that it is highly unusual to use *Kenjoo-go* to describe the actions of a person other than oneself (in this case, Taroo). This odd instance where the subject is a third party (Taroo) can probably be a indicator to societal changes to the Japanese language since the example meanings were documented (1990). It bears mentioning, however, that the intentions and consequences of (3b) remains the same, as it is used as a way to exalt the object through humbling the subjects actions.

However, it is worth mentioning that it is not necessarily the only form of expressing politeness through exalting another person in Japanese. For example, Bjervås (2012) wrote extensively on the Japanese suffixes (e.g. *sama, san, chan* and *kun)*, which are simple expressions added by the referee to the addressee's name. The suffix acts as an indicator of the relation between the referee, with some more formal than others. While this thesis will not explore other forms of politeness in Japanese, it does acknowledge that there exist other ways to exalt and express respect towards another person.

Another mention-worthy aspect of honorific language is that while it does follow a seemingly strict set of rules, there are situations where the use of object honorifics can seem odd and even faulty, but due to the social situation and fluidity of group dynamics is completely correct. This will be shown in the chapter on the fluidity of self in Japanese in 2.5.

2.4 Polite and casual language

While the aspect of honorific language is a very central element to the Japanese language, it is also imperative to understand the dynamic between where the line between casual and polite language is drawn. Honorifics are used to express an extremely high level of politeness, and only used in very formal situations. Even the casual form of Japanese and normal polite language have different levels to them. To speak of Japanese politeness, one also has to address the aspect of normal politeness as well as causal language, since understanding the lack of politeness is necessary to gain a perspective on how and why the language changes according to the present social context.

These two forms in the Japanese language can be shown in the following examples, as presented by Shibatani (1990:377).

(4) Casual and polite forms

    a. **Vulgar**

        Ore aitu   ni au   yo.

        I   that fellow to meet FP

        'I'll see that fellow.'

    b. **Plain, informal**

        Boku kare ni au   yo.

        I   he   to meet   FP

        'I'll see him.'

    c. **Polite, informal**

        Boku kare ni ai-masu   yo.

                meet-POLITE   FP

        'I'll see him.'

    d. **Polite, formal**

        Watakusi kare ni ai-masu.

        I

        'I'll see him.'

Comparing these forms, one can clearly observe how clearly the line between non-polite and polite language is drawn, and even how that line can be blurred. Following the given examples, where the causal and polite forms differ is how the verb is conjugated, changing from dictionary form to *masu*-form. Within the two different forms, however, whether or not the form is vulgar as opposed to informal, or informal instead of formal is determined by the different politeness levels of the personal pronouns and use of final particles.

This is because each sentence indicates the referee's social relation to the addressee and to the object. Looking at (4a), the use of the verb's dictionary form immediately indicates that the social context is relaxed and casual. Additionally, the use of personal pronoun *Ore* suggests that the speaker is a most likely male and that the social relation between the speaker and the speaker is probably that of two friends or associates. Not only that, but the use of the pronoun *aitu* for the object suggests that the subject's relation to the object is close, or at least does not warrant even the slightest use of politeness. Shibatani (1990:377) writes that the level of informality in the situation "frees" the speaker of any obligation to use honorifics, or even polite

language. Although, he also writes that there are situations when despite an intimate relation between the referee and addressee where honorifics are still used due to referring to a respected third party, meaning that the social context alone does not decide the formality of the conversation. While it would appear as a concept of relative ease to attain, Usami (2002) has described how exchange students studying in Japan have been known to address their Japanese friends with polite language when first arriving. Furthermore, after becoming accustomed to casual language would proceed to use non-polite forms towards teachers. As such, it is impressive how the Japanese population are taught both through education and passive social interaction how to address different groups appropriately at an early age and are able to switch between forms fluently. Cook (1999:104) writes that a switch to from the plain, informal short form of the verb to the polite *masu*-form is triggered by the referee consciously recognizing that the addressee does belong to a higher social status. This could then mean that while the Japanese language is saturated with different aspects of politeness, it is not to the point where every situation is processed and evaluated subconsciously. This means that there can definitely exist instances where the polite language is used noticeably differently due to the possible complexity and variance that a social situation can have in a Japanese conversation. However, it would not be unheard of to suggest that the awareness of the relationships within a conversation to be largely spread throughout the Japanese population due to the emphasis the language and society puts upon the politeness language. Therefore, whether or not the extent of such an awareness is universal and if that awareness applies similarly to other aspects of the language is of high interest to this thesis and will be discussed later.

What is noticeable in the politeness levels used in a conversation is how they indicate to what extent the addressee belongs to the speaker's *Uchi* (an in-group) or *Soto* (an out-group). Considering that the situations where one would be expected to use the honorific forms of the language are virtually exclusive to one's where there is a noticeable distance between the status of the speaker to the addressee, the highest levels of politeness show clearly that the addressee does belong to the speaker's *Soto*. Respectively does the lack of politeness shown in a conversation indicate similarly that the addressee belongs to the speaker's *Uchi* as such language tends to be reserved to people whom one has an intimate social relation to (such as friends, lovers etc.). In the midst among these two sides of politeness language lies what one might refer to as normal polite language, which does not utilize honorifics, but rather the *masu*-form of the verb which is known as the polite form. This form is commonly used between people that, while not sharing the same *Uchi*-group, the difference between the groups does not warrant the use of honorifics, making it the form for when meeting people for the first time.

It has to be recognized, however, that none of the sentences in (4) does Shibatani make use of the topic-marking particle *wa* or the nominative *ga* after the subject. Both of these particles can be translated into English into words such as "is", "was", "am" (if the subject is the speaker). This omission can be attributed to the original author not deeming these particles to be crucial to the understanding of the differences of the politeness levels as they would be used in all four sentences. Another possible reason is that their use is not considered necessary in a conversation by the author. The absence of these particles do not change how the difference in politeness manifest themselves, so while it's acknowledged, it does not affect the statements made in this thesis.

2.5 Fluidity of self

Hasegawa (1998) wrote that the Japanese language and society is highly regarded as being based around groupism and contextualism, the former claiming that Japan's is very group-oriented and the latter that the Japanese define their concept of the self based on the context of the situation. This means that the Japanese notion of self is relative and changes depending on with whom one is interacting with. Hasegawa also refers to the research that Kondo conducted in 1990 that to be able to use the Japanese language properly is to know that people is always involved socially with several people. Hence the line between the Japanese self and other people is not fixed but rather fluid.

Shibatani (1990:379) showed an example of the fluidity of the Japanese self through how a secretary would refer to the company president's actions to another member of the company as opposed to an outsider, as shown on in (5).

(5) Difference in honorifics

    a. *Shatyoo-san*   *wa*   *ima*   *o-dekake*   *ni*   *nat-te i-masu*

       president-HON   TOP   now   HON-go out   HON   be-POLITE

       'The president is gone out now' (used when referring to the president while talking to a colleague)

    b. *Shatyoo*   *wa*   *ima*   *dekake-te ori-masu*

       president   TOP   now   go out   be-POLITE

       'The president is gone out now' (used when referring to the president while talking to a customer, who wants to meet the president)

Consider how much the Japanese society puts an emphasis on the importance of using honorifics to exalt the people who have a higher position in the social hierarchy. This leads to the notion that a secretary using object honorifics to describe his/her superior's absence appears strange, since using such language humbles the status of the president and made to seem less important. Shibatani (1990:379) rationalizes by suggesting that honorific language create a sense of "psychological" distance between the referee and addressee, meaning that when the referee uses honorifics towards the president, the referee creates the sense that there is a tangible disparity between them. Hence, while the company president is distant, as he/she is an out-group member within the company, the distance between a person who has no affiliation with the company is even more distant. This triggers a new group dynamic where the secretary identifies him/herself as part of the president's in-group due to them both belonging to the same company while, the customer (an outsider to the company) becomes the new out-group. As such, the secretary is then expected to exalt the out-group member by humbling the actions of the in-group.

2.6 Social deixis and the verbs of giving and receiving

Politeness stems from what is known in linguistics as Social Deixis. Lyons (1977:636) defined social deixis as the following.

> By deixis is meant the location and identification of persons, objects, events, processes and activities being talked about, or referred to, in relation to the spacio-temporal context created and sustained by the act of utterance and the participation in it, typically, of a single speaker and at least one addressee.

Looking at the features of the different politeness levels of Japanese, from the vulgar form to the highly honorific forms, and the fluid nature of how one apply them properly, it is not difficult to recognize that social deixis encompasses central and essential aspects of the Japanese language, including *Uchi* and *Soto*. Wetzel (1998:8) described social deixis in terms of *Uchi* and *Soto* as a model for determining the reference point for how to apply the different polite forms. This is done through the speaker's relation to the member of in-groups and out-groups present in the situation. This model of language can also be applied to when identifying oneself with another person or group of people through speech or narration, signaling a sense of empathy and belonging to a group, which is known as a "deictic projection". This form of speech can be demonstrated in the Japanese verbs for giving and receiving.

To describe the act of giving or receiving something in the Japanese culture requires a firm grasp of how the deictic nature of the situation and where the point of reference of whom is giving to whom. This is because the Japanese verbs for these actions are divided into categories that indicate whether or not the act of giving is done by an in- or out-group with the same applying for the act of receiving. The verbs are also part of the politeness language, with certain verbs describing these acts done towards or by a person or group who is deemed to have a higher social status. Let's consider the three most basic of these verbs, as presented by Wetzel(1988:8).

(6) The three basic verbs of Giving and Receiving

    a. *Ageru*
      'give (PLAIN)'

    b. *Kureru*
      'give (PLAIN)'

    c. *Morau*
      'receive (PLAIN)'

While, at first, it might seem strange to have two general words for the act of giving, once one factors in the speaker's relation to deictic situation as well as the point of reference of the act is accounted for it becomes more clear. Wetzel describes the verb *ageru* as giving to an out-group of the giver while *kureru* as giving to an in-group. She compared the following question to portray the difference between these verb.

(7) The different ways of giving in Japanese

    a. *Hon   o   ageta.*
      book   O   give-PAST (to someone belonging to an out-group)
      '[I/we] gave a book [to them].'

    b. *Hon   o   kureta.*
      book   O   give-PAST (to the speaker or someone belonging to an in-group)
      '[They] gave [me/us] a book.'

Observing these two sentences, the both do not specify the subject as previously shown in 1, which indicates that the subject is either the speaker or a group including the speaker, as is commonly done in the Japanese language. Comparing these two sentences in terms of social deixis, other than giving towards in-groups as opposed to out-groups, the point of difference between them lies in the direction of the giving. As can be seen in 7a, the act is directed away from the speaker, making that person or group the giver and the receiver is someone outside of that in-group, while 7b describes the giving as an act done towards the subject. Wetzel (1998:9) claims that how to appropriately use these two verbs is largely dependent on how the speaker perceives the *Uchi* (i.e the in-group dynamic). Hence, the verb *kureru* is considered to signify a more intimate relation between the speaker and receiver, as the receiver does not have to be the speaker, as will be discussed later.

What has to be addressed, however, is that while *kureru* is used exclusively to describe an act of giving towards the speaker or the speaker's group, *ageru* can be used in sentences in that describe a situation where the speaker is not involved in any way, which also leads to how the verb receiving verb *morau* is used, despite its apparent contrast to *ageru*. Consider the following sentence as presented by Wetzel (1998:9-10).

(8) The other facet of *ageru* and its contrast to *morau*

a. *Tanaka-san   wa   Suzuki-san   ni   hon   o   agemasita.*
   Tanaka   TOP   Suzuki   to   book O   give-PAST-POLITE
   'Tanaka gave Suzuki a book.'

b. *Tanaka-san   wa   Suzuki-san   ni   hon   o*
   Tanaka   TOP   Suzuki   from book O

   moraimasita.
   receive-PAST-POLITE
   'Tanaka got a book from Suzuki.'

These two sentences are virtually identical to each other, utilizing the exact same vocabulary apart from the verb. However, not only does the change verb affect whether or not the sentence describes an act of giving as opposed to receiving, but it also reverses the direction of the action, as *ageru* implies that the action is directed away from the subject and *morau* towards the subject. These two share a difference to the examples of (7) in that the speaker has no part in

the events described. However, through the use of the verbs of giving and receiving, one can draw an outline of the relation the speaker has to the object and subject. Focusing on the verb used in the example sentences of (8), Wetzel (1998:10) refers to Kuno's research in 1976 that sentences such as the one's shown in (8) do not appear to demand that *Tanaka* is closer to the speaker than *Suzuki*. In other words, neither *Tanaka* nor *Suzuki* appear to necessarily belong to a group that's included in the speaker's notion of *Uchi* (i.e. an in-group)*,* but it does not completely deny the possibility nor confirm that *Tanaka* or *Suzuki* belong to an out-group. Because of the how vaguely the formality between the people present is defined, the use of the personal prefix -*san* has been disregarded, despite its common translation as the English "Mr.", "Mrs." or "Ms.". Now consider the following example, as shown by Hasegawa (2005:119), where the *Uchi*/*Soto* dynamic between the speaker and the subject or object, alternatively, is more clearly defined through the use of the verb *kureru*.

(9) The *Uchi* implications of *kureru*

a. *Okada-san   ga   okane o   kasite   kure-ta.*
   Okada   NOM   money ACC   lend-INF   give-PAST
   'Mr. Okada gave [me a favor] lending money.'

b. *Okada-san   ga   haha ni   okane o   kasite   kure-ta.*
   Okada   NOM   mother DAT   money ACC   lend-INF   give-PAST
   'Mr. Okada gave [my mother a favor of] lending money.'

In these instances, it has been decided to include the personal prefix -*san* in the translation as the English "Mr.". Since the act of borrowing money from a friend would normally be described by dropping any prefixes or through using nicknames. As such, the prefix in this case suggests a more formal relation between the speaker and the subject (*Okada*). In (8a), since the action of lending money is done towards the speaker, the verb *kureru* applies. However, since the receiver of the favour in (8b) is not the speaker, one would presume that the correct verb would instead be the less personal *ageru.* However, due to the relation of the subject in (8b) has to the speaker (mother), the use of *kureru* appears as more natural due to the *Uchi* dynamic of these two persons. Previously, this thesis claimed that the verb *kureru* is an indicator of an intimate relation (in other words, an *Uchi*-group) between the speaker and receiver and these two sentences present evidence in favour of that claim. Since *Uchi* includes the self as well as in-groups to which one can project one's personal feelings through deictic projection. Hasegawa

(2005:119) described this as the extension of the self as one's mother belongs to an incredibly close in-group. As such, the use of the verb *kureru* can be applied as the speaker considers the favour done towards the member of the in-group (in this case, the mother being lent money) is equivalent of the speaker receiving that favour himself/herself.

Wetzel (1998:12) stated that in cases when the speaker is not a participant and is inquiring about events to people who were participants, their *Uchi*-relation between the parties in the conversation still affects these verbs, such as the following.

(10) *Kureru* without the involvement of the speaker.

> *Kekkon-siki   de   nani   o   kureta?*
> wedding   at   what   O   gave
> 'What did [they] give [you] at the wedding?'

In this situation, while the speaker can have been a part of the wedding, and even received gifts, Wetzel assumes that is not the case. If the speaker is not a participant in the events of the wedding, the above sentence example, the use of *kureru* as the verb of giving, it implies that the speaker does belong to the same *Uchi*/in-group that did receive gifts. Also, the verb implies that the speaker is closer to the addressee rather than the wed couple if the addressee is not a part of that couple. If the speaker would be closer to the couple than the addressee, that group-dynamic would then necessitate to phrase the sentence with the verb *ageru,* since they would be part of the speaker's *Uchi.*

The final aspect of these verbs is that they also can be conjugated to convey different levels of politeness. Wetzel (1998:8) presented the as following.

(11) The politeness levels of giving and receiving

> *Ageru* 'give (to out-group) (PLAIN)'
> *Sasiageru* 'give (to out-group) (POLITE-HUM)'
> *Oage ni naru* 'give (to out-group (POLITE-HON)'
> *Kureru* 'give (to in-group) (PLAIN)'
> *Kudasaru* 'give (to in-group) (POLITE-HON)'
> *Morau* 'receive (from out-group) (PLAIN)'
> *Itadaku* 'receive (from out-group) (POLITE-HUM)'
> *Omorai ni naru* 'receive (from out-group) (POLITE-HON)'

These sets of different politeness levels within these verbs are applied according to the *Uchi* and *Soto* dynamic between the giver and receiver. For instance, if one were to give something to a group or person which one identifies has a higher status in the hierarchy, the verb *sasiageru* would be applied. Conversely, when a group or person of a higher status in the hierarchy would give something to yourself or someone belonging to an in-group within one's *Uchi,* would warrant the use of the verb *kudasaru.* The verb *itadaku* is then a mean to describe receiving something from an out-group that has a higher social status than oneself or one's in-group.

However, the honorific versions of both *ageru* and *morau* are rarely, if ever, utilized in a conversation, which can be attributed to how the Japanese emphasize the importance of exalting another person to a higher status than oneself, or humble oneself to appear to be at a lower status than the other person. Since the function of the honorifics versions of *ageru* and *morau* work towards exalting and honoring the self, utilizing these forms would imply that the speaker perceives his/her social status as superior to the addressed parties and that in turn can be perceived as arrogant and rude. Hence, they are rarely used in any context. The reason why there's not humble version of *kureru* most likely stems from the notion that humbling the person or group that gives you something would be incredibly disrespectful and impolite.

2.7 Summary of previous research

It is fair to say that the group oriented concept of *Uchi* and *Soto* has a profound effect on how the Japanese population interact with each other based on the social situation. This means that the language utilized in a conversation describes the relation between the speaker and addressee in terms of difference in hierarchy, or rather whether or not the addressee belongs to the speaker's *Uchi* (an in-group) or *Soto* (an out-group). This can be seen very clearly in how the different levels of politeness in the Japanese language are applied according to the relation and psychological distance to the addressee that the speaker perceives. If the difference in hierarchy is considerably different, the use of referent and object honorifics are applied in order to exalt the addressee while humbling the speaker in an effort to make the addressee appear more important, as that difference warrants a higher level of politeness than to others. At the other side of the politeness scale lies the impolite ways of addressing a person, which can serve as an indicator that the addressee belongs to a group that is part of the speaker's *Uchi.* Since the relation between people who belong to the same in-group tend to have close, intimate relations and do not therefore perceive any need to use any form of polite language. What has to be acknowledged is that the notion of *Uchi* and *Soto* is not fixed on any point of reference, but

is fluid as a group that one perceives as an in-group can, in turn, be divided into subsets of in-groups and out-groups. As a result, one would address these sub-groups with different politeness levels according to social relation, but once one refers the group as a whole to a person who has no connection to that group, one would consequently refer to the group as an in-group. This dynamic of social linguistics in Japanese does create situations where how the speaker applies the politeness language appears to be faulty, but due to how the group dynamic manifests itself, referring to a person who would normally be part of one's *Soto* as a member of an in-group can be correct.

Other ways *Uchi* and *Soto* apply to the Japanese language is through the verbs of giving and receiving. The three basic verbs of these actions are utilized to describe the direction and nature of the act. There are two verbs of giving and the first one, *ageru,* applies to the act of either one's own group or an out-group giving to another out-group, while the second verb of giving, *kureru,* is reserved to a person or group giving to a personal in-group. As such, with *ageru,* the giver can be either oneself or an in-group giving to the member of the out-group or an out-group member giving to someone within that group or a different third out-group. On the other hand, *kureru* can only be used to describe giving in any form towards an in-group. The third of these verb is the one verb used to describe receiving something, and it shares the aspect of *ageru* in that it can be applied to both receiving from an out-group or situation which only involve other out-groups.

From these two aspects of the Japanese language can one come to the assumption that the population of Japan are taught the workings of *Uchi* and *Soto* almost passively by simply talking and interacting in Japanese. While this social concept encompasses much more than simply the aspects of polite language and the verbs of giving and receiving, it would be quite difficult for this thesis to address them all. The fact still remains that it would appear that the Japanese population share at least a general understanding of how the social dynamics and presence of groups affect how you apply language. This does not appear to be a far-fetched assumption since there appears to be little mention in available sources of situations where the importance and prevalence of *Uchi* and *Soto* is in decline, suggesting that this concept is deeply rooted throughout Japan to the point where it's just a matter of cause to learn this concept. The question is whether or not this concept is perceived similarly within the population and if that shared notion of in- and out-groups manifests in language similarly across the country.

3. Own Research

3.1 Introduction

As the conducted survey was divided into 4 scenarios, where first two of them focusing on the use of politeness language and the other two were focusing on the use of the verbs of giving and receiving, each scenario having 5 different social variations for a total of 20 questions answered per respondent. As such, this thesis will present that data accordingly. The survey collected personal information of the respondents such as age, gender, place of birth (both prefecture and town) as well as whether or not they had any work experience. Whether or not the respondent had any experience in the work-field was considered extremely vital to be aware of, since most workplaces in expect a certain level of polite language towards superiors meaning that respondents with work experience should yield very precise forms of such language. While this thesis will not discuss differences in the language utilized between genders in Japan or the aspect of regional differences in any of the grammars that will be discussed, it is deemed necessary to record for the purpose of discussion as well as for possible future studies to consider such influences. The honorifics forms of *ageru* and *morau*, being *oage ni naru* and *omorai ni naru* respectively, will not be discussed or listed in the results if absent due to the both being rarely, if ever used in normal circumstances. The survey was spread through the means of social media, Facebook in particular, through mainly a group dedicated to Japanese exchange students in Sweden, both currently and previously living in Sweden. Additionally, this survey was sent to private acquaintances of the author which was then spread further to the acquaintances. The merits of this method will be addressed in the discussion of this thesis.

While the survey recorded 28 people answered the questions of personal information, the number of respondents answering the following questions only ranged between 15-10 people, with 10 being the number of people answering all 20 questions of the survey and 15 answering at least 2 of the questions given. The gender of the respondents were not evenly distributed as 10 out of 15 were female and conversely, 5 out of 15 were male. Furthermore, the ages of the respondents were limited to ages from 19 to 23 with an average age of 20.6 years. Additionally, only 2 of the 15 total respondents claimed to not have working experience, which leads to the assumption that most of the respondents have been in situations where a firm understanding of how and when to apply polite language is highly expected. Furthermore, all 15 respondents were generally from the island Honshu, the most central of the four main islands of Japan, particularly from the southern areas of that island, with 4 people originating from the Aichi prefecture being the largest group from the same prefecture and 2 from the Gifu prefecture

being the second largest group, making it a total of 11 different prefectures represented in the data. While it is unfortunate that the respondents are not more widely spread, because of the relatively wide arrange of different geographical origins for the respondents limits the possibility of a single regional accent or dialect affecting the data negatively, but more importantly allows for a more accurate estimate whether or not the understanding of *Uchi* and *Soto* truly is the same across Japan.

3.2 Methodology

This thesis aims to research to which extent the Japanese population share the notion of *Uchi* and *Soto,* but since this concept encompasses the Japanese language so extensively, it was necessary to narrow down the researched grammar to a select few grammatical features of the language. Since these items would have to be able to describe situations where in-groups or out-groups are involved, they could not be too limited or too obscure, since that could lead to widely different responses, with the risk of rendering the data unusable to draw any conclusions or theories related to the subject of *Uchi* and *Soto*.

As such, it was decided that the two grammatical items to be featured and explored would be the aspect of politeness levels in the Japanese language as well as the verbs of giving and receiving, which was done out of two main reasons. One of these being that both of these Japanese grammars are highly prevalent in everyday conversations as well as playing a large role in the concept of *Uchi* and *Soto,* since both of them can be adapted and conjugated to describe situations and interactions involving both in-groups as well as out-groups. Since the survey was aimed to cover several different variations of social interactions covering different layers of *Uchi* and *Soto*, grammars that could also be applied to these scenarios in such a way that it would be natural to utilize them were preferred. Hence, the scenarios in the survey would be divided into two basic categories: Scenarios that warrant the use of different politeness levels in language and scenarios that warrant the use of the verbs of giving and receiving.

The first two of the scenarios would be tied to the aspect of politeness and would therefore encourage the respondent to utilize such grammar, but without expressing it in the questions. The first scenario would describe a situation where a person of higher social status than the respondent is involved and the second would not involve such a person, creating an element in the survey that could show polarizing uses of grammar in the responses.

The third and fourth scenario would then describe situations where an act of giving has occurred and whether or not the respondent was part of the group that received the gift. The third scenario would describe the company president having purchased a souvenir of food for

the office supervisor, who in turn graciously decides to distribute this food to the others in the office, including the respondent. The fourth and last scenario would be that of the office supervisor teaching the others in the office a useful skill, but the respondent could regrettably not be there at the time.

The addressee to whom the respondents describes these scenarios to would also be in turn, also be divided into a subset of categories where they are either part of an in- or out-group to the respondent. Lastly, since *Uchi* and *Soto* also affects language when speaking about someone who is not nearby, the survey would also include question where the object of the scenario (teacher or office supervisor) would be either nearby the speaker and able to hear the conversation or not present, unable to hear the conversation. Finally the situations and the social statuses of the addressee were established as follows.

(12) Scenarios for the use of polite language:
1) Talking about how the respondent went to the teacher's office to fetch homework that he/she did not get due to being ill when that homework was handed out, but the teacher was unfortunately not there at the time.
2) Talking about what the respondent is planning to do in the weekend, which is going to the cinema.

To whom the respondent is talking to:
a. Another teacher
b. A friend from the same school
c. Another student they have met for the first time
d. A friend from the same school, while the teacher is nearby
e. Another student they have met for the first time, while the teacher is nearby

(13) Scenarios for the verbs of giving and receiving:
1) Talking about how the company president purchased food for the office supervisor as a souvenir. The supervisor then kindly decides to distribute that food to all the workers in the office.
2) Talking about how the respondent regrettably was not present for the meeting in which a useful skill was taught, but was nevertheless pleased that the co-workers was given the opportunity.

To whom the respondent is talking to:

a. The office supervisor
b. A friendly co-worker
c. A co-worker they have met for the first time
d. A friendly co-worker, while the office supervisor is nearby
e. A co-worker they have met for the first time, while the office supervisor is nearby

The different social statuses of the other party in questions "a", "b" and "c" are intended to be divided into the three basic group-dynamics in Japanese. "A" being of a clear out-group (teacher/office supervisor) in terms of status in hierarchy while "b" being that of in-group nature through friendly relations. "C" is representing the aspect of formal out-group status not necessarily from group differences, but rather a certain lack of relation to begin with, hence their status of a person never met before. The last two questions, "d" and "e" aim to investigate if social status is a factor powerful enough to warrant use of language addressing that difference despite them not being part of the conversation, yet within distance to hear. These variations of *Uchi* and *Soto* are normally described to have an effect on the application of language and have therefore been selected for study.

Allowing the respondents to answer with their own words instead of having multiple choice answers was determined to be the more appropriate way to conduct the survey. Since a limited number of available responses could yield results that do not represent how the respondents would answer in a real-life situation. It was also decided that the descriptions of the scenarios would not explicitly ask the respondents to use any of the targeted grammar items in their responses, but rather attempt to focus the situations in such a way that it would appear natural to apply them. This would showcase whether or not the respondents would formulate their responses in using similar grammar, which would then tie into the thesis' hypothesis that Japanese native share a similar notion of *Uchi* and *Soto.*

3.3 Scenarios for politeness language

<u>**Scenario 1 (14 respondents)**</u>

Anata ga senjitu gakkou o byooki de yasunda toki ni, sensei ga dasita shukudai o tori ni ikimasita ga, sensei ga shokuinshitu ni inakatta to tutaetai desu.

'You want to express how you went to the staff room to pick up the homework the teacher handed out on the other day when you were at home due to sickness, but the teacher was not in the room.'

(14) Question 1

Anata wa gakkoo de hoka no sensei to hanasitara, dono yoo ni tutaemasuka?

'If you were talking to another teacher at the school, how would you express it?'

Answers in casual language	0
Answers in polite language	2
Answers in honorific language	9
Answers in humble language	1
Answers in honorific+humble language	1
Other answers	1

The responses in this question relied heavily on the use of polite and honorific language, particularly when referring to the teacher. The answers yielded only two instances of humble language, one being in combination of both humble and honorific. The other answer was a description of one's actions rather than what they would have expressed in spoken words. What has to be noticed is that one answer showed a combination of both polite and honorific versions of the verb *iru*[3] was used in the same sentence to describe the teacher, as shown in (15).

---

[3] *Iru*: to be (of animate objects), to exist. Used in this case to describe the teacher's presence in the staff room.

(15) Yasunda hi no shukudai o tori ni kitan desu kedo, sensei ga **imasen** desita. Doko ni **irassharuka** sitte masuka?

'I went to pick up the homework from the day I was sick, but the teacher wasn't there. Do you know where the teacher is?

Considering that previous research has stated that in a situation where the social statuses in the hierarchy is notably different and both parties are aware of it, as in this case (student is aware of the teacher's higher status), it appears even more necessary to refer to the teacher with honorific forms in every instance when the addressee is another teacher. However, in this case the polite, but non-honorific form of the verb *iru, imasu,* is applied to describe that the teacher was not in the staff-room, but the honorific version of the same verb, *irassharu,* to ask where the teacher is at the present. This is most likely due to one of the intricacies of the honorific language in that since the teacher was not in the staff-room, it is not important to use honorific form to state that fact with high honorifics. Instead, the place where the teacher is at the present moment is more of the important and therefore chooses to apply honorific language in reference to this unknown location. This implies that honorific language is more necessary to describe the current point in time as opposed to the past when two points in time are described in the same sentence. Another reason can be that using the honorific form twice in such close proximity to each other might be considered redundant and therefore, as stated before, the point in time closest to the now in the sentence takes priority to where the honorific language is applied.

(16) Question 2
Anata wa gakkoo de tomodati to hanasitara, dono yoo ni tutaemasuka?
'If you were talking to a friend at school, how would you express it?'

Answers in casual language	13
Answers in polite language	0
Answers in honorific language	0
Answers in humble language	0
Answers in honorific+humble language	0
Other answers	1

These answers reflected quite well of how conversations with a person belonging to a clear *Uchi*-group affects language. The answer that did not utilize heavy use of the casual short forms of the verbs was, just like (14), a description of the respondents actions and will therefore not be mentioned again in this thesis if such an answer should appear again. However, the answers showed 6 instances of a casual, negative past tense version of the humble verb *oru*, *orankatta,* which has the exact same literal meaning as the previously mentioned *iru.* Since the proper negative, past tense conjugation of the verb would be *oranakatta,* the dropping of the second *a* leads to the assumption that the verb has been abbreviated for the sake of easy pronunciation, but still kept in these very casual sentences. This can be attributed to the fact that since both parties in the given conversation belong to the same school, despite the informality of the situation, there is a certain awareness of the out-group dynamics present and therefore apply a casual version of an otherwise humble verb to address the difference in groups. This thesis still deems the sentences that utilized this verb-form as examples of casual sentences because of the casual use of the verb as well as the fact that this verb did not appear in any of the answers in (14), leading to the assumption that it's an expression mainly used for informal situations.

(17) Question 3

Anata wa gakkoo de doogakunen no shotaimen no gakusei to hanasitara, dono yoo ni tutaemasuka?

'If you were talking to a student from the same the year that you've just met at school, how would you express it?'

Answers in casual language	9
Answers in polite language	4
Answers in honorific language	0
Answers in humble language	0
Answers in honorific+humble language	0
Other answers	1

The instances of polite language in these answers are instances where the respondent posed a question to the addressee or when referring to the teacher and manifested themselves as the

polite *masu* form of the verbs *iru* and *shitteiru*[4] . Otherwise, the answers were expressed through highly casual language.The previously featured casual *orankatta* appeared three times which has been deemed a device for casual language. An important aspect to take note is that despite heavy use of short form verbs within the sentence, the copula *desu* firmly marks them as polite rather than casual language. The reason for the heavy use of casual language despite the fact that the addressed party has never met the respondent before can be because of the respondent identifying a student from the same year in the school as an in-group. Therefore, the casual levels of language are more appropriate than polite forms of speech.

(18) Question 4

Anata wa gakkoo de tomodachi to hanasite, sensei ga chikaku ni imasu. Anata wa sensei ga kono kaiwa ga kikoeru to omoimasu. Kono baai, dono yoo ni tutaemasuka?

'You are talking to your friend at school, while the teacher is nearby. You think the teacher can hear this conversation. In this case, how would you express it?'

Answers in casual language	9
Answers in polite language	0
Answers in honorific language	2
Answers in humble language	0
Answers in honorific+humble language	0
Other answers	3

In this question 3 respondents answered through description of how they would act in this scenario rather than what they would express through speech and will therefore not be included in the discussion of these results, but will be addressed later in the evaluation of the method.

With the majority of the answers being in casual form, it certainly would appear that the teacher has no impact in how the *Uchi* and *Soto* dynamics apply to language, leading to a completely informal conversation between two friends. However, this question yielded two answers where the honorific *irassharu* was used to express the fact that the teacher was not in the staff-room at the time, but in its short form past tense conjugation, *irassharanakatta.* To use

---

[4] *Shiru*: to be aware of, to know, to be conscious of. The form *shitteiru,* in turn, means to know or to be aware of the present state (in this case, the whereabouts of the teacher).

this less polite form as opposed to the fully polite form, *irasshaimasen deshita,* is most likely another case where the informal status of the addressee affects the conjugation of the verb, but due to the nearby presence of the teacher, honorific form is still used.

(19) Question 5

Anata wa gakkoo de doogakunen no shotaimen no gakusei to hanasite, sensei ga chikaku ni imasu. Anata wa sensei ga kono kaiwa ga kikoeru to omoimasu. Kono baai, dono yoo ni tutaemasuka?

'You are speaking to a student from the same the year that you've just met at school, while the teacher is nearby. You think the teacher can hear this conversation. In this case, how would you express it?'

Answers in casual language	8
Answers in polite language	0
Answers in honorific language	3
Answers in humble language	0
Answers in honorific+humble language	0
Other answers	3

These results show very similar traits to the ones presented in (18), in that while the forms of the respondents' answers were generally based around the notion that the conversation can be conducted in an informal manner, despite the proximity of the teacher. The heavy use of casual language in this situation also reinforces the results from (17) in that a student from the same year is generally considered a part of the respondent's in-group, in spite of the fact that the two have supposedly never met before. However, with 3 respondents answering the question using honorific language when referring to the teacher implies that this case has shifted the group-dynamic in such a way that approaching the conversation in a more informal way is slightly more likely to happen, when comparing to the results from (18).

Konshuumatu nani o suruka o setsumeisimasu. Eigakan ni ikoo to omotteimasu.

'You will explain what you are going to do for during the weekend. You are planning to go to the cinema.'

(20) Question 1 (15 respondents)

Anata wa gakkoo de sensei to hanashitara, dono yoo ni tutaemasuka?

'If you were talking your teacher at the school, how would you express it?'

Answers in casual language	0
Answers in polite language	14
Answers in honorific language	0
Answers in humble language	0
Answers in honorific+humble language	0
Other answers	1

The results show clearly that normal polite language is the most normal to apply in this situation which is accomplished through frequent use of the *masu* form in combination with the verb-gerund form (-*teimasu* form) as well as the copula *desu* which is usually dropped or conjugated into its casual counterpart *da* in informal situations. This shows that the relation between student and teacher is not different enough to require higher levels of politeness when referring to one's own actions, which is an instance where the dynamic of *Uchi* and *Soto* interacts leniently with how one is expected to speak to the addressee.

(21) Question 2 (15 respondents)

Anata wa gakkoo de tomodati to hanasitara, dono yoo ni tutaemasuka?

'If you were talking to a friend at school, how would you express it?'

Answers in casual language	14
Answers in polite language	0
Answers in honorific language	0
Answers in humble language	0
Answers in honorific+humble language	0
Other answers	1

As expected, when considering the results from (16), the results show how a friendly relation to the addressee completely shifts the use of language to a casual level where no added politeness is expressed. Almost all of the respondents utilized casual variations of language through means seen in the previous questions, with the most prevalent being the short form of the sentence verb. Furthermore, the respondents tended to drop either the topic marking particle *wa* or the particle *ni*, that marks the direction of where the respondent was planning to go (the cinema). There was even instances where all sentence particles were dropped altogether, which appears only in highly informal conversations. Examples are shown in (22).

(22)   Shuumatsu eiga iku

       'I will go to the movies this weekend'

       Lit. 'Weekend movie go'

(23) Question 3 (14 respondents)

Anata wa gakkoo de doogakunen no shotaimen no gakusei to hanasitara, dono yoo ni tutaemasuka?

'If you were talking to a student from the same the year that you've just met at school, how would you express it?'

Answers in casual language	10
Answers in polite language	3
Answers in honorific language	0
Answers in humble language	0
Answers in honorific+humble language	0
Other answers	1

The responses show many similarities to the results from (21) in that the casual language used is determined through the use of short forms as well as dropping of sentence particles, but the results are not mirrored completely in this case. There were 3 cases where polite language was used through the use of either the basic copula *desu* or verb-gerund *masu* form. This indicates that there is a subtle difference in how the respondents identify the *Uchi* and *Soto* aspects of this particular situation, much like the results shown in (17). This does add to the notion that Japanese natives do have a very similar perception of how group dynamics work but that there is a difference between different people.

(24) Question 4 (14 respondents)

Anata wa gakkoo de tomodachi to hanasite, sensei ga chikaku ni imasu. Anata wa sensei ga kono kaiwa ga kikoeru to omoimasu. Kono baai, dono yoo ni tutaemasuka?

'You are talking to your friend at school, while the teacher is nearby. You think the teacher can hear this conversation. In this case, how would you express it?'

Answers in casual language	13
Answers in polite language	0
Answers in honorific language	0
Answers in humble language	0
Answers in honorific+humble language	0
Other answers	1

As expected, the results from this questions were completely based around casual language, because of the fact that the teacher has no bearing on the actions of the respondent in this situation and therefore does not affect the language used. Since the addressee is that of a friend, it is of little wonder that the applied language does not show any indication of difference between groups, as there is none. Hence, the results in this question, as well as the results in (20) follow the pattern one would expect the Japanese language to be affected (or rather unaffected) by this particular group dynamic.

(25) Question 5 (14 respondents)

Anata wa gakkoo de doogakunen no shotaimen no gakusei to hanasite, sensei ga chikaku ni imasu. Anata wa sensei ga kono kaiwa ga kikoeru to omoimasu. Kono baai, dono yoo ni tutaemasuka?

'You are speaking to a student from the same the year that you've just met at school, while the teacher is nearby. You think the teacher can hear this conversation. In this case, how would you express it?'

Answers in casual language	10
Answers in polite language	3
Answers in honorific language	0
Answers in humble language	0
Answers in honorific+humble language	0
Other answers	1

The presence of an addressed party that the respondent has not met before, once again leads to a few answers utilizing polite expression such as copula *desu* and verb-gerund *masu* form, which reinforces the notion that the teacher has no bearing on the conversation. However, one might assume that the presence of the teacher discourages the respondent of any language that could be viewed as vulgar, but since the situation do not call for any such language, it is not surprising that it has been left out. As it stands, the fact remains that the answers were largely phrased in casual terms.

3.4 Scenarios for the verbs of giving and receiving

Senshuu, shatyoo wa ryokoo ni itta toki ni, anata no butyoo ni omiyage tosite okasi o katteagemasita. Demo, butyoo wa anata no ofisu no minna ni dasiteagemasita. Sorede, uresikunarimasita.

'Last week, the company president bought and gave the office supervisor snacks as a souvenir. But, the office supervisor gave it to all of the people in your office. Because of that, you are happy.'

(26) Question 1

Anata wa butyoo to hanasitara, dono yoo ni tutaemasuka.

'If you were speaking to the office supervisor, how would you express it?'

Verb	Instances of each verb
Ageru	0
Sasiageru	0
Kureru	0
Kudasaru	2
Morau	0
Itadaku	2
Other answers	7

The instances where the verbs of giving and receiving occurred in the answers were verbs that signified the *Uchi* receiving the gift in the forms of *kureru* and *morau*, which appear in their respective honorific forms, *kudasaru* and *itadaku*. While *kudasaru* can be interpreted more as the act of giving to the in-group of the office as a whole, which *itadaku* does describe as well but can be viewed as more focused on the speaker receiving the gift. Additionally, one of the instances of *itadaku* is the verb *itadakimasu* which is used as a word to signify eating or drinking, rather than receiving. Another issue with this question is also whether or not the respondents answered under the assumption that the addressed supervisor was the one who

distributed the snacks, or a different one. The answers were none of these three verbs were focused on expressing gratitude towards the addressee, which will be discussed later in the evaluation of the method.

(27) Question 2
Anata wa naka ga yokute, ofisu ni hataraiteiru hito to hanasitara, dono yoo ni tutaemasuka?
'If you were speaking to a person close to you, who is working at the office, how would you express it?'

Verb	Instances of each verb
Ageru	0
Sasiageru	0
Kureru	7
Kudasaru	0
Morau	1
Itadaku	0
Other answers	3

In these cases, the normal, non-honorific form of the verbs of both *kureru* and *morau* are applied, insinuating that in each cases of where the respondent expressed the act of giving, it was done towards that person's *Uchi*, which follows the previously described interactions of these verbs. Since the addressed party is a part of the respondent's in-group, it makes sense that there is a heavier emphasis on the in-group oriented verb *kureru,* with only one instance where *morau* was used*.* Another aspect of the results is the politeness levels applied in the results. Three of the answers showed the use of the slightly more polite *desu* while the other 7 featured heavy use of casual expressions, including the answer that did not use any of the verbs of giving and receiving. It makes sense that talking to a co-worker to which one has a friendly relationship to would trigger language of lower expressed politeness towards the addressee.

(28) Question 3

Anata wa ofisu ni hataraiteiru shotaimen no hito to hanasitara, dono yoo ni tutaemasuka?

'If you were talking to a person who works in the office that you are meeting for the first time, how would you express it?'

Verb	Instances of each verb
Ageru	0
Sasiageru	0
Kureru	3
Kudasaru	1
Morau	2
Itadaku	2
Other answers	3

These results show how this scenario, in particular, poses an *Uchi* and *Soto* dynamic in which the in-group and out-groups are less obvious.This is made fairly apparent through the polarizing results in that both normal polite *kureru* and *ageru* are used three times and two times respectively, while the honorific form *kudasaru* is used once and *itadaku* used twice. As the normal polite forms *kureru* and *morau* would be used if the respondent identified the addressee as a member of an in-group which would not necessitate the use of honorific forms to describe the actions of their superior. Conversely, it would be fair to assume that the instances of honorific version of the verbs would indicate that the respondent perceives the addressee as an out-group and therefore addressing the difference of social status between the respondent and the office supervisor can become necessary. However, there was only a single use of casual language expressed towards the addressee, the other answers being in normal polite forms, which does indicate that while the addressee might be a member of the in-group, the formality of a work environment does warrant a higher level of politeness in general.

(29) Question 4

Anata wa naka ga yokute, ofisu ni hataraiteiru hito to hanasite, butyoo ga tikaku ni imasu. Anata wa butyoo ga kono kaiwa ga kikoeru to omoimasu. Kono baai, dono yoo ni tutaemasuka?

'You are talking to a person close to who is working at the office, while the office supervisor is nearby. You think the supervisor can hear this conversation. In this case, how would you express it?'

Verb	Instances of each verb
Ageru	0
Sasiageru	0
Kureru	5
Kudasaru	2
Morau	0
Itadaku	1
Other answers	3

In this case, the results are similar to (27) in that the in-group status of the addressee is easily identifiable, hence the abundant use of different versions of *kureru*, with 2 instances of the honorific *kudasaru* as well as 10 instances where casual language was used*.* However, there are two instances where *kudasaru* is applied in the answer, which could imply that either the close proximity of the supervisor slightly affects the perception of group or the existence of groups within Japan that deem it necessary to address the difference between groups at all times.

(30) Question 5

Anata wa ofisu ni hataraiteiru shomentai no hito to hanasite, butyoo ga tikaku ni imasu. Anata wa butyoo ga kono kaiwa ga kikoeru to omoimasu. Kono baai, dono yoo ni tutaemasuka?
'You are talking to a person who works in the office that you are meeting for the first time, while the office supervisor is nearby. You think the supervisor can hear this conversation. In this case, how would you express it?'

Verb	Instances of each verb
Ageru	0
Sasiageru	0
Kureru	3
Kudasaru	2
Morau	1
Itadaku	3
Other answers	2

As seen in the results from (28) this kind of situation does seem to divide the respondents in how they identify the group dynamics as the applied verbs of giving and receiving are split fairly evenly between *kureru* and *morau.* However, with 5 respondents utilizing the honorific versions of the verbs implies that the aspect of group difference is slightly more prevalent than in the answers shown in (28), which can be due to the presence of the office supervisor, which warrants a higher level of politeness if that person can indeed hear the conversation. This is according to the proposed dynamics of *Uchi* and *Soto* as exalting someone of a clearly higher status in the hierarchy is necessary to avoid appearing rude or disrespectful.

Scenario 4 (10 respondents)

Senshuu, kaigi ni butyoo ga anata no ofisu no minna ni tokubetuna sukiru o osieteagemasita. Demo, anata wa sono hi kaze o hiite, kaigi ni korarenakatta desu. Anata wa zannen datta keredo, ofisu no minna ga tokubetuna sukiru o naraeta node uresii desu.

'Last week, the office supervisor taught everyone in the office a special skill during a meeting. However, you had caught a cold that day and could not come to the meeting. You regret that, but you are happy that everyone could learn that skill.'

(31) Question 1

Anata wa butyoo to hanasitara, dono yoo ni tutaemasuka.

'If you were speaking to the office supervisor, how would you express it?'

Verb	Instances of each verb
Ageru	0
Sasiageru	0
Kureru	0
Kudasaru	0
Morau	1
Itadaku	5
Other answers	4

These answers are phrased in such a way that the respondent expresses the desire to learn the skill for themselves, which manifests itself as variations of *morau,* as the respondent was not present when skill was taught. Since everyone else was taught the special skill, the respondent can not apply any form of *kureru* as it would imply the whole group having to relearn that skill one more time. Consider the following sentence in (32)

(32) Tokubetuna sukiru o osieteitadaku tansu o nogasitesimai, totemo zannen ni omoimasu.
'I think it's regretful that I missed the chance to learn the special skill.'

This is because the respondent is the only person among the in-group that has not learned the skill, and can therefore not apply language which would express belonging to the group that did, even if those people are part of the in-group. This leads to the speaker refraining from using the verbs *kureru* or *kudasaru*, as they imply that the speaker was also taught the skill.

(33) Question 2
Anata wa naka ga yokute, ofisu ni hataraiteiru hito to hanasitara, dono yoo ni tutaemasuka?
'If you were speaking to a person close to you, who is working at the office, how would you express it?'

Verb	Instances of each verb
Ageru	0
Sasiageru	0
Kureru	2
Kudasaru	0
Morau	1
Itadaku	0
Other answers	7

While the large majority of the in this question did not feature either verbs of giving or receiving, answers that did stand in slight contrast to the results from (32) in that the respondents tended to describe the learning of the skill through the verb *kureru.* This implies that the respondents identified as part of the in-group that learned the skill, despite the fact that the answers were previously focused on the individual and not the group as a whole. This would further mean that when speaking to an in-group member, it is more common to use language that expresses one's own membership to that group. The one instance of *morau* does imply that such might not always be the case. The polite language used in this scenario is limited to only one instance, as casual language was featured in the majority of the answers.

(34) Question 3

Anata wa ofisu ni hataraiteiru shotaimen no hito to hanasitara, dono yoo ni tutaemasuka?

'If you were talking to a person who works in the office that you are meeting for the first time, how would you express it?'

Verb	Instances of each verb
Ageru	0
Sasiageru	0
Kureru	1
Kudasaru	1
Morau	2
Itadaku	0
Other answers	6

Once again, the verbs of giving and receiving are featured in a minority of the answers, with 1 instance of *kureru* and *kudasaru* as well as 2 instances of *morau* which can imply that the fact that the addressee is a person the respondent has never met before, despite the fact that they belong to the same office, they are not part of the same in-group. This claim is supported by the fact that all responses utilized polite speech, with no instance of casual speech, meaning that the respondent tend to not identify the addressee as someone in the in-group.

(35) Question 4

Anata wa naka ga yokute, ofisu ni hataraiteiru hito to hanasite, butyoo ga tikaku ni imasu. Anata wa butyoo ga kono kaiwa ga kikoeru to omoimasu. Kono baai, dono yoo ni tutaemasuka?

'You are talking to a person close to who is working at the office, while the office supervisor is nearby. You think the supervisor can hear this conversation. In this case, how would you express it?'

Verb	Instances of each verb
Ageru	0
Sasiageru	0
Kureru	1
Kudasaru	0
Morau	0
Itadaku	1
Other answers	8

Unfortunately, these results are difficult to draw any theories or assumptions from in terms of how the verbs of giving and receiving since they are rarely applied, which will be discussed later in the evaluation of the method. What can be seen from the results is the only use of honorific forms is the use of *itadaku* which refers to the receiving from the out-group (the supervisor) which follows how polite languages should be applied. However, the use of polite language appeared twice among the answers, which could potentially mean that referring to the in-group receiving something from an out-group without the respondent being a part of the event can be referred to through more polite language as it describes the out-group teaching the in-group.

(36) Question 5

Anata wa ofisu ni hataraiteiru shomentai no hito to hanasite, butyoo ga tikaku ni imasu. Anata wa butyoo ga kono kaiwa ga kikoeru to omoimasu. Kono baai, dono yoo ni tutaemasuka?

'You are talking to a person who works in the office that you are meeting for the first time, while the office supervisor is nearby. You think the supervisor can hear this conversation. In this case, how would you express it?'

Verb	Instances of each verb
Ageru	0
Sasiageru	0
Kureru	1
Kudasaru	1
Morau	0
Itadaku	2
Other answers	6

In this final question, there was a higher number of respondents using honorific language with 2 instances of *itadaku* and one instance of *kudasaru* (the last instance of a verb of giving or receiving being *kureru*), which is a similar pattern as the answers shown in (30). This would support the notion of the out-group status of the addressee makes it more likely that the respondent would apply honorific language, as opposed to casual language to a person of an in-group. However, the lack of any use of the verb *ageru,* which describes giving towards and out-group would imply that the respondent does not identify the never met before addressee as a non out-group.

4. Conclusion

4.1 Summary

While the results from the scenarios of politeness language exemplifies how conversations with a person from an out-group can be vastly different from those with a person from an in-group. This has been shown through the clear change of language from highly polite language when addressing a teacher to the quite casual forms of the Japanese language when addressing a friend, as could be observed in the results of (14) and (16). Additionally, it has been shown that while an in-group to the speaker's *Uchi* is generally defined by personal relation to the addressee, it has been shown that despite the addressee never having met the speaker being part of a group the speaker's group allows for the conversation to be carried out in non-polite casual language, as have been shown in the case of two students never met before using such language to each other, which can be seen in (23) and (25). It would also explain why the respondent would not use the verb *ageru* in any forms when talking to a person the respondent had never met in scenarios of (34) and (36) since the addressee being part of the office, a general in-group, verbs that describe the act of giving towards the in-group are more appropriate, despite the addressee having no other relation to the respondent. The majority of the answers of the first two scenarios both showed these changes of how group dynamics affects language consistently in this fashion, which does leads one to believe that it's a universal truth in the Japanese society.

However, due to the fact that there were instances of polite language in the previously mentioned scenarios where a minority utilized the polite language consistently throughout these situations, which would imply that while the Japanese notion of *Uchi* and *Soto* may remain consistent, how one perceives the group relation does differ from different persons, albeit through similar means.

Unfortunately, the results from the third and fourth scenarios does not support these theories of the Japanese language as they show vastly different uses of language and little consistency between the scenarios, which can be considered a shortcoming of the method itself, rendering the data of little actual use in the context of this thesis. Although, it does show that in cases where group dynamics are relatively unclear, the use of Japanese shows to be vastly different, implying that the perception of group-dynamics may very well be vastly different than previously believed.

4.2 Evaluation of method

While some of the results that have been shown in this thesis have been proven to be quite interesting for possible future results, it is advisable to take the shortcomings of the method applied as well as the gathered data into account.

Firstly, because of the low average age of the respondents, the results are not representative of the Japanese population as a whole which is an unfortunate side effect of distributing the survey through social media and acquaintances, which severely limits the age group to that of younger people who are frequent users of such media. This leads to the data being applicable exclusively to that age group alone which does undermine the data from the scenarios involving the office relations since it is likely that while a lot of the respondents did have work experience, it is more likely to not involve such a formal environment found in an office.

Secondly, the social status of the addressee being a person the respondent has never met as shown in questions (28), (30), (34) and (36) would not be applicable as an office workplace generally consists of people whom one would have met in some fashion, meaning it would be highly inadvisable that those scenarios be used in in future research.

Lastly, the third and fourth scenarios, while sound in theory to trigger the use of the verbs of giving and receiving, due to the ambiguity of how the respondent's were supposed to word their answers led to the wide arrange of different answers in which the majority did not use any of these verbs. These results suggest that in order to trigger these verbs one has to consider any ambiguities within the question that could potentially sway the responses. Careful planning and structuring of the question sentences is highly advised. Ways to improve the method for future research will be discussed in the concluding remarks of this thesis

4.3 Conclusion

While the data gathered did yield some interesting results, the small group of respondents does limit the extent the data can be generalized towards other groups. If this study would be reproduced, it would be highly recommended to aim for a larger sample of people in order to determine if the small group of people that answered in the minorities in this thesis are truly the minority or if the difference in how people perceive *Uchi* and *Soto* does follow the results as have been shown. If one would aim to conduct further research such as this in the future, the merits of the method used here and the alternatives should be explored.

For example, one has to consider the alternatives of this method whether or not to explicitly tell the respondents to utilize the desired language. However, this would run the risk of generating

answers that are not representative of how the respondents would express themselves in the given situation. Using multiple choice answers with prepared sentences could also be a viable alternative for future research. Although, this could lead to inaccurate data not representative to how the respondents would answer unless the choices were highly relevant to the situation and mirrored the possible real-life answers, which could potentially be very time consuming as well as easily lead to inaccurate data. On the other hand could approaching *Uchi* and *Soto* with a case study, using interviews could yield a more in-depth view on how a handful of people would perceive a given group situation and how they would act within that situation.

Since *Uchi* and *Soto* encompasses much more than simply politeness and the social implications of giving and receiving, continuing to explore the extent that the Japanese perceive the in-groups and out-groups in a situation is highly possible and should in the opinion of the author be carried out to establish the limitations of such a wide and generalized system of thought. This would allow us to further our understanding of the ins and outs of Japanese.

References

Banno, E, 2011: *Genki 2: An Integrated Course in Elementary Japanese*. Tokyo: Japan Times.

Bjervås, A, 2012: *Vem Kan Säga Vad till Vem? - Om Japanska Personsuffix. (Who can say what to whom? - About Japanese Personal Suffixes)* Bachelor's thesis, Lund: Lund University.

Burke, P, 2006: "Social Identity Theory." *Contemporary Social Psychological Theories*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Social Sciences.

Cook, H, 1999: *Situational Meanings of Japanese Social Deixis: The Mixed Use of the* Masu *and Plain Forms.* In: Journal of Linguistic Anthropology. American Anthropological Association: University of Hawaii, 87-110.

Gerhold, P, 2013. *The Top 10 Words to Describe Japanese People (according to Foreigners)*. Japan Today.

Hasegawa, Y, 1998. "Linguistic Systems and Social Models: A Case Study from Japanese." *General Session and Parasession on Phonetics and Phonological Universals: Proceedings of the Twenty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, February 14-16, 1998*. Berkeley, CA, 117-128.

Lee, K, 2000. "Crossing the Uchi/Soto Boundary: The Case of Verb-te kuru in Japanese." *The Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese*. JSTOR Journals.

Longcope, O, 1995: *The Universality of Face in Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory: A Japanese Perspective.* Pennsylvania, University of Pennsylvania.

Loveday, L, 1986. *Japanese Sociolinguistics*. Journal of Pragmatics 10.3, 287-326.

Lyons, J, 1977. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Merriman, C. D, 2000. *Meditation XVII by John Donne*. Jalic Inc.

Shibatani, M, 1990. *The Languages of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Tsuji, K, 2009. *"Haru" Keigo Koo: Kyootogo no shakai gengosi.* ("Haru" Thought in Respect Language: The Sociolinguistic family of the language in Kyoto). Tokyo, Hitsuji Shoboo.

Usami, M, 2002. *Nihongo・ Nihongo Kyooiku o kenkyuu suru 18: Poraitonesu riron to taijin komyunikeishon kenkyuu (Research on the Japanese Language and the Japanese Language Education 18: Research on the Politeness Theory and Interpersonal Communication).* Japan Foundation.

Wetzel, P. J, 1988 "*Japanese Social Deixis and Discourse Phenomena.* The Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese 22.1, 7-27.

Mobile phone dictionary:

Takoboto: Japanese dictionary for Android OS (version 1.0.0) [Mobile application software].
        Retrieved from https://play.google.com.

Appendix

This survey was created by the author with the online survey builder Kwiksurveys (http://kwiksurveys.com) and was spread through the popular social networking website Facebook (www.facebook.com). It was launched at the 20th of March 2015.

Personal Information

出身地

統計データにしようするため、下のテキストボックスに質問をお答え下さい。

1) １．都道府県 ２．市 ３．性別 ４．年齢

2) アルバイト経験がありますか。	
はい	
いいえ	

Scenario 1

一番目の場面

あなたが先日学校を病気で休んだ時に、先生が出した宿題を取りに行きましたが、先生が職員室にいなかったと伝えたいです。下の場合に、自分の言葉でお答え下さい。

3) あなたは学校で他の先生と話したら、どのように伝えますか。

4) あなたは学校で友達と話したら、どのように伝えますか。

5) あなたは学校で同学年の初対面の学生と話したら、どのように伝えますか。

6)
あなたは学校で友達と話して、先生が近くにいます。あなたは先生がこの会話が聞こえると思います。この場合、どのように伝えますか。

7)
あなたは学校で同学年の初対面の学生と話して、先生が近くにいます。あなたは先生がこの会話が聞こえると思います。この場合、どのように伝えますか。

Scenario 2

二番目の場面

今週末何をするかを説明します。映画館に行こうと思っています。下の場合に、自分の言葉でお答え下さい。

8) あなたは学校で先生と話したら、どのように伝えますか。

9) あなたは学校で友達と話したら、どのように伝えますか。

10) あなたは学校で同学年の初対面の学生と話したら、どのように伝えますか。

11)
あなたは学校で友達と話して、先生が近くにいます。あなたは先生がこの会話が聞こえると思います。この場合、どのように伝えますか。

12)
あなたは学校で同学年の初対面の学生と話して、先生が近くにいます。あなたは先生がこの会話が聞こえると思います。この場合、どのように伝えますか。

Scenario 3

三番目の場面

先週、社長は旅行に行った時に、あなたの部長におみやげとしてお菓子を買ってあげました。でも、部長はあなたのオフィスのみんなに出してあげました。それで、うれしくなりました。下の場合に、自分の言葉でお答え下さい。

13) あなたは部長と話したら、どのように伝えますか。

14) あなたは仲が良くて、オフィスに働いている人と話したら、どのように伝えますか。

15) あなたはオフィスに働いている初対面の人と話したら、どのように伝えますか。

16)
あなたはあなたは仲が良くて、オフィスに働いている人と話して、部長が近くにいます。あなたは部長がこの会話が聞こえると思います。この場合、どのように伝えますか。

17)
あなたはオフィスに働いている初対面の人と話して、部長が近くにいます。あなたは部長がこの会話が聞こえると思います。この場合、どのように伝えますか。

Scenario 4

四番目の場面

先週、会議に部長があなたのオフィスのみんなに特別なスキルを教えてあげました。でも、あなたはその日風邪をひいて、会議に来られなかったです。あなたは残念だったけれど、オフィスのみんなが特別なスキルを習えたのでうれしいです。下の場合に、自分の言葉でお答え下さい。

18) あなたは部長と話したら、どのように伝えますか。

19) あなたは仲が良くて、オフィスに働いている人と話したら、どのように伝えますか。

20) あなたはオフィスに働いている初対面の人と話したら、どのように伝えますか。

21)
あなたはあなたは仲が良くて、オフィスに働いている人と話して、部長が近くにいます。あなたは部長がこの会話が聞こえると思います。この場合、どのように伝えますか。

22)
あなたはオフィスに働いている初対面の人と話して、部長が近くにいます。あなたは部長がこの会話が聞こえると思います。この場合、どのように伝えますか。

Respondent Answers

These sets of answers are sorted in order of prefecture, city, age and gender, followed by their responses to each scenario. The answers are divided into a table for each scenario, the first table being the personal information. An empty box indicates a blank response for that question.

愛知	一宮	女	19	はい

Scenario 1

先日お休みした際に出た課題を受け取りに行ったのですが、A先生(自分の担任)は生憎ご不在でした。
この前私が休んだ時の課題職員室取りに行ったらさ、A先生おらんかったんやって。
この前私が学校休んだ時に出た課題を職員室に取りに行ったんだけどA先生いなかったんだよね。
この前私が学校休んだ時に出た課題を職員室に取りに行ったんだけどA先生いなかったんだよね。
担任の先生くらいならば、他の大人に聞かれていようとそこまで敬語は意識しない。

Scenario 2

今週末映画に行く予定なんですよー!
今週末映画いくんだよねー!
今週末映画行く予定なんだよー!
今週末映画行くんだよねー!
今週末映画行く予定なんだよー!

Scenario 3

おすそ分けありがとうございます。美味しかったです、ごちそうさまでした。
この前社長が旅行行ったらしくて、部長がそのお土産おすそ分けしてくれたんですよ、美味しかったです。
先日社長が旅行に行ったそうで部長が頂いたお土産おすそ分けしてくれたんですよ、美味しかったです。
この前社長が旅行行ったらしくて、部長がそのお土産おすそ分けしてくれたんですよ、美味しかったです。
ついでに、部長が電話とかしてなくて受け答えできそうな状態だったら、部長の方みて、ごちそうさまでしたって言うかな。

Scenario 4

先日のご指導受けられなくて残念でした。またの機会お時間ありましたらお願いします。いつもありがとうございます。
この前部長がなんか教えてくれたんだよね、いいなー。いい上司に恵まれたよねー。
先日部長がスキルのご指導してくださったそうで、私は生憎寝込んでまして、羨ましいです。いい上司に恵まれましたね。
この前部長がスキル教えてくれたんでしょ？いいなー。自己管理の甘さが悔やまれるよ。私たちいい上司に恵まれたよね。
先日部長がスキルのご指導してくださったそうで、私は生憎寝込んでまして、羨ましいです。私たちいい上司に恵まれましたね。

愛知県	一宮市	男	21	はい

Scenario 1

○○先生(他の先生)、▲▲の授業を受講している××(自分の名前)です。先日、授業を欠席したので、宿題を取りに来ましたが、□□先生(授業の先生)はどこにいるか知ってますか？
あのさ、先週俺授業休んだやん？で、さっき宿題を取りに行こうとしたけど、□□先生おらんかった。。どうしよう？
すみません。僕、この前の授業休んだから、宿題を取りに行こうとしたんだけど、□□先生がいなかったんですよ。知ってますか？
あのさ、先週俺、体調が悪かったから、授業休んだやん？で、宿題やろうと思って取りに行ったら、□□先生がいなかったんだって！早く取りに行かんとなぁ！
すみません。この前授業休んだから、宿題取りに行こうとしたんだけど、□□先生がいなかったんですよ。なので、すぐ取りに行こうかなぁって思ってます。

Scenario 2

□□先生、僕今週、○○の映画観に行ってきます♪
ねえねえ、俺今週○○(映画の名前)観に行くよ♪
そういえば俺ね、今週○○観に行くよ♪
ねえねえ、俺今週○○観に行くよ♪
そういえば俺ね、今週○○観に行くよ♪

Scenario 3

ありがとうございます(^^)
ねえねえ、部長がさ、社長が旅行にいたときのおみやげを、みんなに分けてくれた～♪
さっきですね、僕、部長から社長のおみやげ分けてもらいました！
14と同じ
15と同じ

Scenario 4

部長、先週部長が特別なスキルをみんなに教えたじゃないですか？僕は風邪でいけなかったんですけど、みんな喜んでましたよ♪
この前、部長がみんなに特別なスキル教えてくれたじゃん？俺は風邪で来れなかったけど、みんなよかったね～
この前、部長がみんなに特別なスキルを教えてくれたんですよね？僕は風邪で来れなかったんですけどね。よかったですね～
19と同じ
20と同じ

愛知県	東海市	女	19	はい

Scenario 1

Scenario 2

わたしは今週末、映画館に行こうと思っています。
わたし今週末映画みにいく！！

Scenario 3

Scenario 4

愛知県	刈谷市	男	21	はい

Scenario 1

先生 は 職員室 に は いらっしゃいません でした。
先生職員室 に いなかった。
先生 は 職員室 に は いません でした。
先生 は 職員室 に いらっしゃらなかった。
先生 は 職員室 に いらっしゃらなかった。

Scenario 2

週末 に は 映画 を み に 行く こと を 予定 して おります。
週末映画 いく ー
週末 は 映画 に 行く 予定 です。
週末映画 いく ー
週末 に は 映画 いく 予定 です。

Scenario 3

ありがとうございます。いただきます。
部長 から お菓子 もらった ー!
部長 から お菓子 を いただきました。
部長 から お菓子 もらった！部長 やさしい よ ね。
部長 から お菓子 を いただきました。

Scenario 4

私 に も その スキル を 教えて た いただけません か？
そのスキル教えて~
そのスキルを教えてもらえませんか？
そのスキル教えて~
そのスキル教えていだけませんか？

岐阜県	岐阜市	男	21才	はい

Scenario 1

休んだ日の宿題を取りに来たんですけど、先生がいませんでした。どこにいらっしゃるか知ってますか？
宿題取りに来たんだけど、先生知ってる？
すいません。あの、先生しってますか？
先生のところに行ってくるね。
ありがとう。先生のところに行ってくるね。

Scenario 2

今週末に映画をみにいくんですよ。
今週末に映画みるんだよね。
そういえば、今週末、映画をみにいくんですよ。
今週末、映画をみにいくんだよね。
そういえば、今週末、映画をみにいくんですよ。

Scenario 3

お土産ありがとうございます。
お土産おいしかったね。
お土産おいしかったですね。
お土産おいしかったね。
お土産おいしかったですね。

Scenario 4

休んでしまってとても残念です。
どんなスキルを習ったの？
どんなスキルを習ったのですか？
どんなスキルを習ったの？
どんなスキルを習ったのですか？

岐阜県	岐阜市	男	21才	はい

Scenario 1

休んだときにだされた宿題を、職員室に取りに行きましたが、先生がいらっしゃいませんでした。
休んだときの宿題を、職員室に取りに行ったけど、先生いなかったよ。
休んだときに出された宿題を、職員室に取りに行ったけど、先生いなかったんだよ。
休んだときに出された宿題を、職員室に取りに行ったけど、先生いなかったんだよ。
休んだときに出された宿題を、職員室に取りに行ったけど、先生いらっしゃらなかったよ。

Scenario 2

今週末は映画館に行こうと思ってるんですよ。
週末、映画館に行こうかなって思ってる。
今週末、映画館に行こうと思ってるんだよ。
週末、映画館に行こうかなって思ってる。
今週末、映画館に行こうと思ってるんだよ。

Scenario 3

社長がわざわざ買ってきてくださったんですね。
社長がわざわざ買ってきてくれたんですね。
社長がわざわざ買ってきてくださったんですね。
社長がわざわざ買ってきてくださったんですね。
社長がわざわざ買ってきてくださったんですね。

Scenario 4

僕は体調不良で出席できなかったのですが、他の方が学べたので良かったです。
体調不良で出席できなかったですけど、みなさんが学べて良かったです。
僕は体調不良で出席できなかったのですが、他の方が学べたので良かったです。
僕は体調不良で出席できなかったですけど、みなさんが学べて良かったです。
僕は体調不良で出席できなかったですけど、みなさんが学べて良かったです。

東京都	東京特別区,品川区	男	21歳	はい

Scenario 1

先日、授業を休んだ際の課題をいただこうと、〇〇先生のところに伺ったら、〇〇先生がいらっしゃらなかったです。
この前、授業を休んだから、その時の課題を先生に貰おうとしたら、先生いなかったんだよね。
この前、授業を休んだので、その時の課題を貰おうと、先生のところに伺ったら、先生いなかったんですよ。
この前、授業を休んじゃったから、その時の課題を先生に貰おうとしたら、先生いらっしゃらなかったんだよね。
この前、授業を休んでしまったので、その時の課題を貰おうと、先生のところに伺ったら、先生いらっしゃらなかったんですよ。

Scenario 2

今週末は、映画を見に行こうかと考えています。
週末、映画見に行こうかな。
週末は映画見に行こうと思ってます。
週末、映画見に行こうかな。
週末は映画見に行こうと思ってます。

Scenario 3

すみません、ありがとうございます。社長からのお土産をいただけるなんて、大変嬉しいです。
お土産！？嬉しいー！
社長からのお土産をくださるなんて嬉しいですね。
社長からのお土産をくださるなんて、嬉しいー!
社長からのお土産をわざわざくださるなんて、嬉しいですね！

Scenario 4

静岡県	静岡市	女	20	はい

Scenario 1

先日病気で学校を休んだので、そのとき出された課題を受け取りに職員室に行ったのですが、∞先生はいらっしゃいませんでした。
この前病気で学校を休んだからそのとき出された課題をもらいに職員室に行ったんだけど、○○先生いなかったの。
実は、私この前病気で学校を休んだんだ。だからそのとき出された課題をもらいに職員室に行ったんだけど、∞先生いなかったの。
この前病気で学校を休んだからそのとき出された課題をもらいに職員室に行ったんだけど、○○先生いなかったの。
実は、私この前病気で学校を休んだんだ。だからそのとき出された課題をもらいに職員室に行ったんだけど、∞先生いなかったの。

Scenario 2

私は、今週末は映画館に行こうと思っています。
今週末は映画館に行こうと思ってるよ！
私今週末は映画館に行こうと思ってるんだ！
今週末は映画館に行こうと思ってるよ！
私今週末は映画館に行こうと思ってるんだ！

Scenario 3

先週、オフィスの社員全員にお菓子をくださりありがとうございました。とても嬉しく思いました。
先週部長が、社長からもらったおみやげのお菓子をオフィスのみんなにくれて嬉しかったね。
先週部長が、社長からもらったおみやげのお菓子をオフィスのみんなにくれたじゃないですか。嬉しかったですね。
先週部長がオフィスのみんなにお菓子配ってくれて、嬉しかったね。
先週部長がオフィスのみんなにお菓子配ってくれて嬉しかったですね。

Scenario 4

先週私は風邪をひき、会議を欠席しました。特別なスキルを教えていただくチャンスを逃してしまい、とても残念に思います。しかし、オフィスの仲間が特別なスキルを教えていただいたので嬉しく思います。
先週の会議、私風邪引いていけなかったんだよね。特別なスキルを習えなくて残念。でも、オフィスのみんなが習えたから嬉しいな。
先週の会議、私風邪引いていけなかったんですよ。特別なスキルを習えなくて残念です。でも、オフィスのみんなが習えたのは嬉しいく思います。
先週の会議、私風邪引いていけなかったんだよね。特別なスキルを習えなくて本当に残念だな。でも、オフィスのみんなが習えたのは本当に嬉しい。
先週の会議、私風邪引いていけなかったんですよ。特別なスキルを習えなくて残念です。でも、オフィスのみんなが習えたのは嬉しいく思います。

| 神奈川県 | 横浜市 | 女性 | 21歳 | **はい** |

Scenario 1

他の先生に、休んだ分の宿題を取りに来たことを目的の先生に伝えてもらえるようにお願いする。
宿題を取りに来たけど先生がいなかったことを報告する。
先生に用事があったことだけを話す。
先生と話した時に、「もしかしたら聞こえてたかもしれませんが…」と前置きして目的を話す。
先生に宿題を取りに来たことだけをつたえる。

Scenario 2

自分が何の映画を観るのか伝えて、先生のオススメの映画をたずねる。
どんな映画を観るのか、また誰と観るかなどを話す。
映画のタイトルを話し、どのようなタイプの映画が好きが聞く。
どんな映画を観るかつたえる。
先生のオススメの映画を聞いたあとに。自分がどんな映画を観るか伝えて。、

Scenario 3

Scenario 4

茨城県	水戸市	女性	23歳	いいえ

Scenario 1

すみません、○○先生に用事があるのですが、どちらにいらっしゃるかご存知ですか？(細かいことは他の先生には話さない)
先生に休んでた時の宿題もらおうと思ったんだけど、職員室にいなかったんだー
この前体調崩しちゃって学校休んじゃったんだけど、さっき職員室に先生がいなくてその間の宿題もらえなかったんだー
先生に直接話しかけに行く
先生に直接言いに行く

Scenario 2

週末は映画を観に行こうと思ってます。
週末映画に行くけど、一緒に行く？
週末は映画を観に行くんだー
9と同じ
10と同じ

Scenario 3

社長からのお土産、美味しかったですね！(この状況では普通、部長個人へのお土産ではなく社員達と分けることが前提だととらえる。)
社長が買ってきてくれたお土産、美味しかったんですよー
社長にこの前、美味しいお土産をいただいたんです
14と同じ
15と同じ

Scenario 4

参加できなくて、残念でした。とても実りある会議だったと聞きました。
この前の会議行けなかったんですー残念.
この前の会議のことご存知ですか？私はいけなかったんですが…
19と同じ
20と同じ

千葉県	印西市	女	21	はい

Scenario 1

先日、宿題を取りに〇〇先生のところに伺ったのですが、いらっしゃらなかったので、受け取れませんでした。
この前宿題取りに○○先生のところに行ったんだけど、先生いなかったから宿題もらえなかったんだよね
この前宿題取りに○○先生のところに行ったんだけど、先生いなかったから宿題もらえなかったんだよね
この前宿題取りに○○先生のところに行ったんだけど、先生いなかったから宿題もらえなかったんだよね
この前宿題取りに○○先生のところに行ったんだけど、先生いなかったから宿題もらえなかったんだよね

Scenario 2

今週末は映画を見に行こうと思っています。
週末は映画行こうかなー
週末は映画行くよ
週末は映画行くよ
週末は映画行くよ

Scenario 3

Scenario 4

| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

兵庫県	神戸市	女	20	はい

Scenario 1

この前学校休んだときの課題を職員室に取りに行ったんですけど、その先生がいらっしゃりませんでした
この前休んだときの課題を職員室に取りに行ったんやけどさ、その先生おらんかった
この前学校休んだときの課題を職員室に取りに行ったんやけどさ、その先生おらんかったんよね
この前学校休んだときの課題を職員室に取りに行ったんやけどさ、その先生いはらんかった
この前学校休んだときの課題を職員室に取りに行ったんやけどさ、その先生いはらんかったんよね

Scenario 2

今週末は映画館に行く予定です
今週末は映画館行く予定やで
今週末は映画館行く予定かな
今週末は映画館行く予定やで
今週末は映画館行く予定かな

Scenario 3

社長からのお土産のおすそわけ、とても美味しくいただきました。ありがとうございました。
部長がくれた社長のお土産美味しかったよね!
部長から頂いた社長のお土産、美味しかったですね
部長から頂いた社長のお土産、美味しかったね!
部長から頂いた社長のお土産、美味しかったですね!

Scenario 4

先週の会議、風邪のために欠席してしまい申し訳ありませんでした。同僚から、大変素晴らしいスキルを部長から教えて頂いたと伺いました。私も是非部長から直接伺いたかったのですが、代わりに同僚に教えてもらうつもりです。
先週の会議でいいスキル教えてもらったんだってね！羨ましいよ！今度私にも教えて！
先週の会議でいいスキルを教えてもらったらしいですね！風邪で休んだのが悔やまれますよ。
先週の会議でいいスキルを教えていただいたらしいね！羨ましいよ！また私にも教えて！
先週の会議でいいスキルを教えていただいたらしいですね！風邪で休んだのが悔やまれますよ。

京都府	長岡京市	女	20	はい

Scenario 1

この間休んだ時の宿題を○○先生から受け取りに職員室に行っていたんですが、○○先生がいませんでした。
この前学校休んだ時の宿題取りに行こうと思って職員室行ったんやけど先生おらんかった。
この前学校休んだ時の宿題取りに行こうと思って職員室行ったんやけど先生おらんかった。
この前学校休んだ時の宿題取りに行こうと思って職員室行ったんやけど先生いてなかった。
この前学校休んだ時の宿題取りに行こうと思って職員室行ったんやけど先生いてなかった。

Scenario 2

今週末は映画を観に行こうと思っています。
今週末映画観に行くねん。
今週末映画観に行くねん。
今週末映画観に行くねん。
今週末映画観に行くねん。

Scenario 3

お菓子美味しかったです。ありがとうございます。
部長がお菓子配ってくれて美味しかった!
うちの部長がお菓子を配ってくれて美味しかったんです。
部長がお菓子配ってくれて美味しかった!
うちの部長がお菓子を配ってくれて美味しかったんです。

Scenario 4

みんなが特別なスキルを習えて良かったです。私も習うことができたら良かったんですが。
特別なスキルを習えて良かったね！私も習いたかったな。
みんなが特別なスキルを習えて良かったです。私も習うことができたら良かったんですが。
特別なスキルを習えて良かったね！私も習いたかったな。
みんなが特別なスキルを習えて良かったです。私も習うことができたら良かったんですが。

三重県	桑名市	女	20歳	**はい**

Scenario 1

先日欠席した分の宿題を取りに職員室に伺いましたが、〇〇先生はいらっしゃいませんでした。
休んだ分の宿題取りに職員室行ったんやけど〇〇先生おらんかった。
休んだ分の宿題を取りに職員室に行ったんだけど、〇〇先生いなかったんだ。
休んだ分の宿題取りに職員室行ったんやけど〇〇先生おらんかった。
休んだ分の宿題を取りに職員室に行ったんだけど、〇〇先生いなかったんだ。

Scenario 2

今週末は映画館に行くつもりです。
今週末は映画館行こうかな一思っとる。
今週末は映画館に行くつもりなんだ。
今週末は映画館行こうかな一思っとる。
今週末は映画館に行くつもりなんだ。

Scenario 3

Scenario 4

大阪府	大阪市	女	21歳	いいえ

Scenario 1

宿題もらいに行ったんですが、〇〇先生いはりませんでした。
宿題もらいに行ってんけど先生おらんかったわー。
宿題もらいに行ってんけど先生おらはらんかってん。
宿題もらいに行ってんけど、先生おらはらへんかったわー。
宿題もらいに行ってんけど、先生おらはらへんかってん。

Scenario 2

週末映画見に行こと思ってるんですよー。
週末映画見に行くねん。
週末映画見に行こう思ってるねん。
週末映画見に行くねん。
週末映画見に行こう思ってるねん。

Scenario 3

わざわざみんなにありがとうございます。美味しかったです。
部長あのお菓子嫌いやったんかな。でもおいしかったなー。
あのお菓子おいしかったよねー。
あのお菓子めちゃ美味しかったな。
あのお菓子美味しかったよねー。

Scenario 4

この前の会議出席できなくてほんと残念です。また色々教えて頂きたいです。
この前のん行けんくてめちゃショックやったわー。
この前の会議行けなくてほんま残念でしたわー。
この前のんほんま行きたかったわー。残念や。
この前の会議ほんま行きたかったんですけど行けなかったんですよね。残念でしたわ。