Iru vs Irassharu, and other lexical substitutions in Japanese: focusing on second language acquisition by Swedish learners

Joakim Wikman

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine the difference between Swedish learners of Japanese and Japanese native speakers when they use lexical substitutions. The hypotheses made for this thesis was that second language learners would find it difficult to apply humble lexical substitutions to themselves and their social group. The other hypothesis proposed that when not knowing what form to use, the verb equivalent would be adapted. To examine these hypotheses, two surveys were sent out; one to Swedish learners of Japanese and one to Japanese native speakers. These surveys consisted of multiple-choice questions and had no altering research questions except for finding out certain specifics about the participants. The answers were later examined, and it became apparent that when exalting a member in a conversation, both groups agreed to what form would be used, only with insignificant exceptions. However, the Swedish group gave differing answers when using humble lexical substitutions with themselves or their belonging social group; this confirming the first hypothesis to be correct. Contrary to the first hypothesis, the second one was not correct. It showed that those with less experience with the language used a mix of lexical substitutions and the verb equivalent, even if the answers did not match the Japanese group.

Keywords: Lexical substitutions, verb equivalent, honorifics, politeness, second language acquisition, keigo, Japanese

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor Axel Svahn for all the feedback and guidance that made this thesis what it is today. I would also like to thank all those who took time out of their busy schedules to answer my surveys and made this research possible.

Table of Contents

CONVENTIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS

This thesis will be using the modified Hepburn system when transcribing the Japanese vocabulary. All Japanese words will be written in italic and long vowels are marked with double letters instead of macrons, except for *ei* and *ii*.

Double quotation marks are used for the English translations and single quotation marks are applied for citations.

For glossing, the thesis uses the Leipzig glossing rules with some modifications to the glosses. Abbreviations used are listed below

NOM - nominal
NPST – non past
POL - polite
HON - honorific
PRO - pronoun
LOC - locative

1. Introduction

When speaking Japanese, there is a continuous need that is required to be met. Hasegawa (2015:255-256) states that this necessity is the use of politeness also known as honorifics, which is essential to comprehend all aspects of the language. Depending on the situation and the people included in a conversation, one cannot fully participate without deprecating oneself or exalting the other members. Although seemingly cumbersome and meaningless to non-native speakers of Japanese, the use of honorifics is seen as meaningful and indispensable by native speakers, because it can confirm and affirm relationships. This is different from for example Swedish, as different verb forms depending on the situation are absent within the language. The main research in this thesis does not concern the acquisition of knowledge surrounding politeness with different verb forms, as it has been written about before in Strömblad (2017). The present thesis is centered around how Swedish learners of Japanese and Japanese native speakers distinguish the use of the verb and its lexical substitution, for example *iru* vs. *irassharu*.

The question asked in this thesis is:

- What difference can be seen in the choice between Swedish students of Japanese and Japanese native speakers of the language when choosing the verb and its lexical substitution?

To answer this, a survey was conducted targeting the participant groups.

1.1. Structure of the thesis

Firstly, in chapter 2 the background about Japanese politeness will be presented, starting with the origin from the Meiji era and its development until now. Secondly, the grammatical use of *keigo* will be presented with an explanation of its incorporation. Thirdly, lexical substitutions will be explained. Lastly is the utilization of *keigo* in social context including politeness theories and second language learners' use of politeness. Chapter 3 will introduce and describe the methodology. The results of the thesis will be introduced in chapter 4 and final remarks will be made with the conclusion in chapter 5.

2. Background

2.1. Keigo from the Meiji era until now

If a Japanese individual would have been asked what *keigo* is today, most people would be able to provide a definition. However, if the same question would have been asked to a Japanese person during the Meiji era (1816 - 1912), the answer would differ. The reason, according to Wetzel (2004:1–20), is that the research about *keigo* began during this time period as linguists gave the already existing polite speech a name for the first time. It was also during this time that *keigo* received a description of its structure. When the language was utilized, it was necessary for the speaker to pay heed to three re-occurring points. The first is the social status of the participating members, the second point is the subject of conversation, whilst the third point is dependent on the social rank of the member the conversation is directed towards. According to Wetzel (2004:21–23), this is the framework that established future research about the subject. The author explains that *keigo* was described for the first time in the year 1892 in the book *Hoobunjoo no keigo,* translated as "vernacular *keigo*", that was composed by the author Mitsuhashi Kanaya, which separated how to refer to people in two different categories. *Tashoo-keigo* translated to "other-reference *keigo*" is the first, pertaining to how the speaker should exalt its target, which is not only about the individual in question, but also their behavior and belongings. *Jishoo-keigo* meaning "self-reference *keigo*" reflects how the speaker should deprecate themselves in the presence of one higher standing member in the social hierarchy. Comparable to *Tashoo-keigo*, not only the speaker, but the associated behavior and belongings are also applicable. These two terms were later changed to different names, but with a slight change in meaning. *Tashoo-keigo* became *sonkeigo*, and *Jishoo-keigo* got the title *kenjoogo*. In 1941 a new term was introduced, featuring the Japanese way of beautifying the language. Wetzel (2004:23) mentions that this received the name *bikago*.

2.2. Grammatical use of keigo

Keigo is applied to appear more polite as well as to make a conversation go smoothly and to forestall conflicts. As previously mentioned, there are ways to implement politeness in speech to achieve this, which is separated into two different categories. Hasegawa (2015:255–268) and Shibatani (1990:374–380) note this and differentiate the categories as a receiving and a giving part. Within *keigo*, these two applications correspond to an exalting of the referent

called *sonkeigo* and the humbling of the speaker and their belonging social group with the term *kenjoogo*.

When the speaker addresses someone of higher social rank, it is common that the polite form is used, which would be the parallel *desu-masu* form for verbs. To employ this, Cook and Shibamoto-Smith (2018:128) as well as Jones and Ono (2008:11-13) refer to the polite suffix *-masu* being added to the verb stem.

Table 1. Plain to Polite and exalting forms

Plain	Polite	Honorific	*-(r)areru*	Gloss
yomu	*yomimasu*	*o-yomi ni narimasu*	*yomareru*	To read

An example of this is when the verb *yomu* meaning "to read" is conjugated to *yomimasu*. Both mean the same, but the difference is that *yomimasu* is perceived as more polite. To achieve higher politeness, an *o* is used in front of the verb stem whilst it ends with *ni narimasu* to exalt the referent. *Yomu* would have been conjugated to *o-yomi ni narimasu*. There exists another form which is rarer than the examples named above. The bound morpheme *-(r)areru* can be used on the verb's stem, which would re-shape the verb *kariru,* meaning "to loan", to *karirareru*. It is rarely used because it is commonly confused with the passive verb form.

Table 2. Humble forms

Plain	Polite	Humble	Gloss
au	*aimasu*	*o-ai suru*	To meet

The table above shows the different forms of *au* to appear humble in front of others. An example of this is the verb *au* meaning "to meet". An *o* is put in front and it ends with a *suru*, which would conjugate *au* to *o-ai suru*.

As well as verbs, adjectives can also be conjugated for polite application. For a sentence to possess this effect, the polite copula *desu/da* is adhered after the word. To acquire the elevation in politeness an *o* is added in front of adjectives that stem from Japanese. The prefix *go* is used with Sino-Japanese adjectives.

Table 3. Polite adjectives

Adjective	Japanese	Sino-Japanese	Gloss
yasashii	*o-yasashii*		Friendly
yuufuku da		*go-yuufuku da*	Affluent

Hasegawa (2015:261–263) explains that the same principle is followed when *bikago* is used and shaped to appear more polite, for example *o* with words which have a Japanese heritage and *go* for Sino-Japanese nouns. This is used additionally with verbs derived from nouns, as *o* and *go* are preceding of nouns ending with *ni naru*, or the even more polite *ni nasaru*. An extensively courteous form, replacing *ni naru* with *ni asobasu* exists, though used exclusively in the most formal conditions.

Ide and Yoshida (1999:470–471) note that first-person pronouns have various politeness levels. Gender neutral pronouns for the polite vocalization of "I" are *watashi*, or the more formal *watakushi*. Gender specific pronouns are on the contrary perceived as cruder, for example with the masculine words *ore* and *boku*. Referring to other people can be done even without addressing names. This is done with the words second person pronouns *anata, kimi*, but impolite with *omae*. Third person pronouns include the impolite *aitsu,* the plain *kare, kanojo* and the polite *ano kata*.

2.2.1. Lexical substitutions

To achieve desired politeness, the evaluation of the interpersonal relation with the receiving end and the employment of the correct forms is crucial. Regularly, this is done with previously explained about forms, ending the verb with the suffix *-masu.* Hasegawa (2015:258-264) and Oishi (1983:18) note that in some cases, an already existing word or sentence can replace these words, called lexical substitutions. Examples of this can be seen below.

(1a) Watashi ga iki-masu

   I   NOM go-POL-NPST

"I am going to go"

(Politeness towards the addressee in 1a)

(1b) Watashi ga   mai-rimas-u

      I   NOM go.HON-NPST

"I am going to go"

(Politeness towards the addressee in 1b)

Lexical substitutions can also appear in the same instances as verbs in the *desu/-masu* form.

(2a)Sensei ga doko   ni i-ru   ka   shi-rimas-u ka

    teacher NOM where LOC be-NPST NOM know-POL-NPST

"Do you know where the teacher is"

(Politeness towards the addressee in 2a)

(2b) Sensei ga   doko   ni   irasshar-u   ka   shi-rimas-u ka

    teacher NOM where LOC be.HON-NPST NOM know-POL-NPST

"Do you know where the teacher is"

(Politeness towards the teacher and the addressee in 2b)

Table 4. Lexical substitutions

Plain	Humble plain Lexical substitution	Referent plain Lexical substitution	Gloss
iku/Kuru	*mairu*	*irassharu*	To go/ To come
iru	*oru*	*irassharu*	To be
taberu	*itadaku*	*meshiagaru*	To eat
miru	*haiken suru*	*goran ni naru*	To see
suru	*itasu*	*nasaru*	To do
shiru	*zonjimasu*	*go-zonji desu*	To know
iu	*mousu*	*ossharu*	To say

The method of lowering oneself and exalting others is shown in the chart. If a lexical substitution exists for the chosen verb, it is more likely employed than its conjugated equal. Henceforth in the text for clarity, the word "Referent lexical substitution" will be used from the examples seen above, for exalting lexical substitutions. "Humble lexical substitutions"

will be used for the lexical substitutions used for humble lexical substitutions, and the term "Verb equivalent" will be applied for either the plain or the polite forms of the verbs.

2.3. The use of keigo in social context

The choice of *keigo* can vary and is a debated topic. Depending on the situation as well as how the speaker utilizes it, notable consequences can occur. Haugh (2018:608–612) remarks that it is proposed that *keigo* is a tool of not being seen negatively by others. This has been debated as there are other purposes for politeness. Examples of this are the observable social effects of social distance, expression of competence, status, fondness between participants, but also other factors such as irony and disdain. The way to achieve politeness with familiarity is also further clarified, with the speech members establishing roles of intimacy, comradery, companionship, friendliness, but also contempt. This can sometimes be opposites to the use of *keigo* as explained in Cook and Shibamoto-Smith (2018:128-129), as primary use of honorifics are for situations such as business relations, times when distance is an important factors in order to achieve politeness.

2.3.1. Politeness theories

Different theories elaborate on the use of *keigo*. Ide and Yoshida (1999:447), Hasegawa (2015:269–271) and Haugh (2018:608–614) all make reference to Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness, originally presented in 1987. It describes the usage of politeness as limited to what they refer to as "face". This is described as the speaker's public self-image by Strömblad (2017:8) and is what every member wants to claim for themselves. Politeness is used in varying situations when the "face" is threatened, such as when commands, demands, inquiries or certain criticism is given, but also moments when the members in the conversation disagree. The reason being that it is viewed as intrusive and in some cases an adverse gesture towards the receiving party. The choice of strategy must be taken into consideration, because if there is not enough assertion behind the chosen words, it might get disregarded. The theory suggests that the speaker should employ only one of five strategies to counterweigh the occurring problems called FTAs (Face Threatening Acts). Strategy number one entails to not engage in a situation where one's "face" is in danger. The second one makes the speaker's request simpler to understand by adding clues and suggestions to what is desired. Ide and Yoshida (1999: 447), Hasegawa (2015:269) and Haugh (2018: 614) employ the term "negative politeness" for the third strategy and express it as consideration of social status, as in using keigo for someone that is in a socially higher position. The fourth uses the

word "positive politeness" to show friendliness, intimacy, and companionship, with the topic and wording of the conversation being friendly instead of it rude. The fifth FTA prevention strategy focuses on not trying to directly remark or simplify their personal wish in social context.

However, this theory has been criticized by Ide and Yoshida (1999:445–456) since it isolates one aspect and categorizes it as *keigo's* only function. It is most notable in situation where the speaker's "face" is not established as negative by the listener. *Keigo* used in additional grammatical instances emphasizes this point, as shown when facts like "The earth is round" is uttered. The theory published in the year 1987 was not gainsaid, but merely considered incomplete as one of two belonging pieces. The first part termed *wakimae* is about distinguishing the social hierarchy of the other speakers for the sole purpose of achieving politeness. The second part is described as the will of the conversation by picking the smartest strategy to make the proposition sound advantageous to all members. Without these two points, politeness is not achievable. On the contrary, Hasegawa (2015:271–274) and Haugh (2018:613–615) write that this has been argued against by other linguists. In situations where a person who commits a dishonorable act, honorifics will not be utilized. To exemplify, if the speaker's superior would have committed robbery or other crimes. In occurrences when face-saving is not seen as necessary, the underlying risk of being observed as rude always exists. Another argument presents that politeness is not exclusively a product of *keigo*. As mentioned above, Ide and Yoshida (1999:445–446) also commented that *keigo* has a grammatical aspect. If this theory were true, impolite words would not exist in the Japanese lexicon, but instead be seen as incompetence and not a choice of politeness level. For these reasons, the first theory is still observed as superior in contrast to what Ide and Yoshida (1999:445–456) proposed.

Hasegawa (2015:274) explains that Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness published in 1987 can be criticized. Evidence shows that *keigo* is also used to maintain a psychological distance between conversation members but is occasionally used to show deference. Comparatively, deference is considered polite while distance is not necessarily, but can be combined to enhance the speaker's politeness level. Although distance and deference are considered as "negative politeness", treating others in the conversation as superior is seen as "positive politeness". Since the Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness states that only one out of five FTA prevention strategies can be utilized, the speaker violates the given rules.

The usage of *keigo* then represents another challenge; to attract the receiver's need to be superior and to be respected, which is seen as a necessity by the speaker to fulfill. If this

politeness theory is used, having the rule that only one of the strategies can be applied, it proves to be impossible. The authors of the theory published in 1987 highlights this problem and explains that depending on the situation, multiple requirements needs their own strategy. Hasegawa (2015:277) states however that there is no reason for a such a one-dimensional thought process since no argument exists to use a single strategy per occurrence. The third and last reason noted by the author, is that the theory constrains *keigo* for only polite purposes, which she denies. This is suggested when politeness is employed to emphasize sympathy, due to the speaker's use of *keigo* in this situation is not likely caused by their "face" being threatened.

Additionally, Hasegawa (2015:279–281) states that with some changes, such as less focus on the protection of "face", the theory might be operational. The modifications would include a balance between numeral FTA preventing-strategies in a conversation instead of just one, constituting all parties' requirements. Beginning a discussion should be done according to the other members' wish while in remembrance of the social norm. Emphasis should be put on how the speaker wishes to present themselves, what intimacy is shown, but also the risk of FTAs. The continuation of the conversation shall comply with the established politeness level, which is achieved according to how the negative and positive politeness is formulated. In conversations when the topic is impolite or *keigo* is not apparent, positive politeness is minimal, while negative politeness is a varying factor. With the combination of *keigo*, the negative factor increases and decreases without it.

2.3.2. Politeness in second language learners

As briefly mentioned before (see section 1), Hasegawa (2015:255-256) mentions that second language learner's can see the acquisition of politeness as cumbersome and meaningless, but all aspects of verbal communication in Japanese is not completed in its absence. Native speakers of Japanese apply politeness with almost no obstacle as it is their first acquainted language but attributes a challenge for non-natives. Freed (1995:197-224) conducted a study measuring exchange students' capability in Japan with politeness in different scenarios. Interviews focusing on the participants levels were made during different time periods and during stages with observational growth in politeness. The deviations displayed results that showed highly frequented usage of polite forms, plain forms were predominantly displayed after skills enhanced. Except for common lexical errors, most cases show serious irregularities of employing too many predicates.

Another pattern examined by Freed (1995:206-211) was requesting-behavior, consisting of a roleplay act with a family member. Results show that students were quite adept and successful with parts of utmost necessity, such as beginning the conversation, explaining the situation of their need, displaying their wants and ending the request. The most prominent success was at the beginning and end of the roleplay. Appropriate addressing terms were added, and gratitude was displayed with occurring grammatical issues and unnecessary alteration of politeness.

Freed (1995:213-216) notes that the use of pronouns also shows that most were uttered in third person, an apparent improvement with the students' development with language skills. However, issues emerged regarding lexical items. Problems concerning personal titles of those with more kinship, for example family members, displayed some difficulty with discerning appropriate neutral and honorific terms.

Least successful according to Freed (1995:216-222) was the choice of honorifics with members of higher social quo, habiting plain forms and displaying struggle switching styles appropriately, though the knowledge of both politeness styles was expressed. Theories arise explaining these problems, one of the main one being the frequent use of plain form in home environments. The rarity of receiving negative feedback on common adjustable mistakes also hinders growth.

The Japanese language places a lot of importance on its hierarchical nature and is therefore given the reputation of a polite language. Ishiyama (2016:33-34) notes that even though the importance of honorifics is clear, instructions on how to utilize it, except for its grammatical usage, are not. Situation is an important factor often disregarded, which leads to trouble for second language learners. Examples of this are grammatically correct sentences being used inappropriately by socially lower-standing people, as when students evaluate their teacher's work and desires. Often they make the people with a higher social status feel like they are indebted for a favor, as this speech behavior is accounted inappropriate. Textbooks not indicating such are one of the reasons why second language learners find it difficult to apply what Ishiyama (2016:34-36) calls "friendly" and "respectful" politeness. The author compares this to the Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness, originally introduced in 1987's version of "positive politeness" which is synonymous to "friendly politeness", and "negative politeness" is analogous to "respectful politeness".

Wants and needs can be expressed effectively in Japanese by conjugating verbs and adjectives. Despite this fact, there is a difference that second language learners might perceive challenging when distinguishing between conveying their own and other's wishes. Ishiyama (2016:42-43) notes that when speaking Japanese, the distinction lies within saying for example "I want" and "you want" instead of saying "It looks like they want". While expressing your individual or another person's aspirations directly work with intimate relationship, it is not appropriate to assume someone's desires if they are in a higher social position than the speaker. In the context of a question, it would imply that "if you want it/to do it, I will let you" as it could be interpreted as "friendly politeness", but not as "respectful politeness".

Caltabiano (2008:131-132) mentions that speakers who can communicate with sociolinguistic competence can navigate through different politeness levels, competence learned from experience. The choice between speech styles usually establishes if the conversation is formal or informal and through four different categories: age, gender, social position and outgroupness.

The question the author Caltabiano (2008:132-133) asks is: 'What difference can be seen between a Japanese person and a Japanese learner?'. This was discovered by the author by conducting an experiment, using conversations of two second language learners and comparing their amount of style shifting to a Japanese person put through similar testing. The participants were a boy and a girl, both having similar experience in the language, and a difference could be noted in their use of politeness as the girl was more adept than the boy.

Results show that the biggest difference between the Japanese participant and the learners was the employment of plain and formal forms applied in statements and questions. Caltabiano (2008:139-142) notes that the boy used the plain form when answering questions more frequently than the Japanese person. The learners also used more honorific forms with verbs than nouns, while the native speaker did the opposite. Honorifics used with main clauses were more frequent than with subordinate clauses with the Japanese participant, while none of the second language learners did the same and preferred the plain form. The last difference was seen when using the formal form in response to their teacher as both the girl and the native speaker spoke politely, while the boy used plain forms instead. With the results summarized, it could be seen that the Japanese participant use of honorifics were at 80% and plain forms at 20% throughout the testing while the learners used 67% honorifics and 27% plain forms. The difference between the boy and the girl however could be quite easily determined. 74% were

formal and 26% were plain by the girl, and the boy showcased 51% formality and 49% plain forms. These results were brought to four judges, asking 'Which one of them would most likely succeed working in Japan? '. Although the girl used more honorifics than the boy, three of the judges chose the boy. As age was quite distinguishable with judges, it might be one of the reasons as to why as the older members thought he was rude, while the younger judges thought he spoke appropriately. Another reason that Caltabiano (2008:140) notes, is that it might be universally accepted that women should use more polite forms than men, as the author quotes Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness, originally presented in 1987.

3. Methodology

This section of the thesis will focus on the structure of the survey, presenting the material including design and categorization of the questions. The study was made to analyze when Swedish speakers learning Japanese use lexical substitution compared to when Japanese natives do it. A multiple-choice survey was made and sent to both participant groups.

3.1. Method and material

There are two participant groups researched in this study, one Swedish and one Japanese, meaning two surveys were required to ask individual questions, respectively. The questions chosen for this survey are based on different social situations in real life, with all based on the lexical substitutions found in Hasegawa (2015:259-264). Some of the sentences used in the research were also found within these pages. Character roles were chosen depending on social standing with its value fluctuating, but most members had a higher place in the social hierarchy. The questions contained exalting and deprecating lexical substitutions with its corresponding verb.

3.2. Dissemination of the survey

The data was collected through two multiple-choice survey made in Google Forms, one for the Japanese and one for the Swedish students to examine the differences in their knowledge. The only constant in the part asking questions about the participants were sex and age. Afterwards, questions were asked, such as "Where in Japan do you come from?" for the Japanese group, as well as "How long have you studied Japanese?" and "Have you lived in Japan?" for the Swedish participants. They could answer either yes or no to both questions and answering yes would result in having to specify for how long. It was sent out via the internet to reach more participants. In total, there was 25 questions for the Swedish participants and 24 for the Japanese. The structure for the research questions asked in this thesis were constructed in a way explaining each scenario, followed by four different alternatives. The questions in each scenario explain a certain situation, such as "Since your upperclassmen have not come to club practice yet today, you ask one of their classmates where they are". Answering these would result in choosing between sentences containing an exalting lexical substitution, a deprecating lexical substitution, and its corresponding verb. The fourth answer differentiates from the others as it can be selected if they do not know the

answer. Even though it is unlikely that the Japanese native speakers would not know which answer to pick, the option is still present in both surveys for uniformity. Another trigger would be if the participants would choose another more appropriate, or a not included answer instead. The questions were all mandatory making all questions necessary to finish the survey, except for a last voluntary question, asking if the participant found they had comments or critique about the questions.

The important factors in making the questions were that each chosen lexical substitution for the surveys would appear in two different scenarios, one that would prompt the participants to either exalt the referent or humble themselves or the social group they belonged to

Although previously stated that this research was targeting Swedish students of Japanese, non-students were able to answer as well, with the only requirement that they had studied the language at some point. The survey for Swedish people were sent to Stockholm, Gothenburg, and Lund University, but also Facebook groups aimed for people having any connection to the Japanese language. The survey targeting Japanese natives was also shared through Facebook, to groups where Japanese speakers visited.

3.3. The different answers and choices

The aim of this study is, as introduced in the beginning of this chapter, to examine the different use of lexical substitutions between Swedish learners of Japanese and Japanese native speakers. The purpose is to see if they exalt or deprecate the target in the made-up situation set up, or if they use its polite verb equivalent. Aside from the fact that some scenes are in a setting where the most anticipated answer is to either exalt or humble, the possibility still exists for either its less polite version to be used, or the unexpected lexical substitution to be picked instead. There is also the possibility of the participant disagreeing with the options available to them, therefore choosing the other category. With that fact established, there are no prominently wrong choices, only the participants expectation of future consequence and choice of politeness strategy.

3.4. Hypothesis

One hypothesis made in this thesis is that while Swedish learners of Japanese might have a basic understanding on how to exalt a member, difficulty might arise in deprecating

themselves or their social group. The reason for this hypothesis is that the same concept does not exist in Swedish in the same manner as in Japanese, thus finding the application meaningless. With that stated, in the case where the Swedish participants might not know if a lexical substitution or its verb equivalent should be used, it can be speculated that in order to still be polite, the latter will be applied. Differences in social hierarchy is vastly different depending on culture and is better comprehended by those who have spent their lives in it. Therefore, regardless of the Swedish learner's flexibility in choice of different politeness levels and their level of understanding Japanese culture, choice of lexical substitutions might be divergent. An important variable in the research is time spent in Japan because understanding of social situations and statuses as well as of culture and tradition grants understanding of the language.

4. Results

4.1. The participants

The number of participants consisted of 28 second language learners and 40 Japanese native speakers. Among the second language learners, there were 15 women, 12 men and one person who identified as neither. The age of these participants varied, as the youngest were 20 years old and the oldest 42, and the most amount of people of the same age group were those of 28 years of age. The time of studying varied as well, the majority had studied for more than six terms. The amount of people answering if and for how long they had lived in Japan gave a more equal response amongst the answers, the majority had lived there for around six months to an entire year.

Amongst the Japanese people, there were 24 women and 16 men. Unlike the Swedish participants, the age group was bigger with the youngest at 19 years of age and the oldest participant was 64 years old. The oldest participants however were a 45- and a 46-year old. People from all over Japan answered, but most of the people lived in Tokyo.

4.2. The answers

The surveys were sent out the 15th of April and closed on the 27th of the same month. This part will present the answers collected during these 12 days which show the results of the second learners of Japanese and the native-speakers side by side. Every question have its referent and humble lexical substitution along with its verb equivalent and is displayed through the charts below. Aside from the 14 tables showing every answer individually, the table below shows all the summarized answers, compared to each other. The table was categorized in a way that shows all of the available answers that was available for the participants, alongside the scenarios. The answers are sorted into three different groups depending on the answer chosen by most of the Japanese members. The three categories are the referent lexical substitutions, getting a majority of the answers from the Japanese in scenarios (7) and (9), humble lexical substitutions with the scenarios (2), (6), (11) and (13), and the verb equivalent group with scenarios (1), (3), (4), (5), (8), (10), (12) and (14).

Table 1. All the results from the different scenarios

	Scenarios	Referent lexical substitution	Humble lexical substitution	Verb equivalent	Another answer/ Do not know
Swedish learners of Japanese	(7) (9)	21 (5,4%)	5 (1,3%)	**25 (6,4%)**	5 (1,3%)
	(2) (6) (11) (13)	24 (6,1%)	**40 (10,2%)**	28 (7,1%)	20 (5,1%)
	(1) (3) (4), (5) (8) (10) (12) (14).	35 (9%)	29 (7,4%)	**127 (32,4%)**	33 (8,4%)
Japanese native speakers	(7) (9)	**62 (11,1%)**	1 (0,2%)	15 (3%)	2 (0,4%)
	(2) (6) (11) (13)	1 (0,2%)	**113 (20,2%)**	8 (1,4%)	38 (7%)
	(1) (3) (4), (5) (8) (10) (12) (14).	29 (5,2%)	6 (1,1%)	**246 (43,9%)**	39 (7%)

The first group shown in the above table is the answers from table (7) and (9), where 11,1% of the Japanese speakers chose the referent substitution as its most occurring answer. In the same group, only 5,4% of the second language learners chose the same answer, with the most selecting the verb equivalent. The answers from scenarios (2), (6), (11) and (13) show that 20,2% of the Japanese native speakers chose the humble lexical substitution. The Swedish speakers chose the same, but with 10,2% instead. Scenarios (1), (3), (4), (5), (8), (10), (12) and (14) is the group with the most answers collected, with 43,9% of the Japanese native speaker picking this option. The Swedish learners of Japanese also chose this option, but with 32,4% instead.

Scenarios

Scenario 1

Shukudai o suru tokoro de senpai ni ai, nani o shiteiru ka kikaretara, nan to kotaemasuka?

"You are about to do your homework when you meet your upperclassmen and is asked what you are doing. What do you tell them?"

The possible answers are "I am about to do my homework" are with Referent and Humble lexical substitutions, its verb equivalent and the answer "Another answer/ Do not know".

Table 2. Answers for scenario 1

	Swedish learners of Japanese	Japanese native speakers	Difference
Shukudai o nasaru tokoro desu (Referent lexical substitution)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Shukudai o itasu tokoro desu (Humble lexical substitution)	2 (7,1%)	0 (0%)	2 (7,1%)
Shukudai o suru tokoro desu (Verb equivalent)	**21 (75%)**	**37 (92,5%)**	16 (17,5%)
Another answer/ Do not know	5 (17,9%)	3 (7,5%)	2 (10,4%)

The most selected answer amongst the Swedish speakers were the verb equivalent with 75%, followed by the 17,9% percent who either did not know the answer or did not think either of the answers were correct. Humble lexical substitution was chosen by 7,1% and no one chose the referent lexical substitution. The Japanese native speakers chose the verb equivalent as well, but with a higher percentage of 92,5%. Choosing "Another answer/ Do not know" was 7,5%. No one chose either the humble lexical substitution or exalting alternative.

Scenario 2

Kyoo wa shachoo ga Okayama ni imasu. Okyaku san kara shachoo ni aitai to iwareta toki, nan to kotaemasuka?

"Today your boss is in Okayama. When the customers ask to meet your boss, how should you answer?"

The possible answers are "Our boss has gone to Okayama today" are with Referent and Humble lexical substitutions, its verb equivalent and the answer "Another answer/ Do not know".

Table 3. Answers for scenario 2

	Swedish learners of Japanese		Japanese native speakers		Difference	
Shachoo wa kyoo ga Okayama e dekakete irasshaimasu (Referent lexical substitution)	**12**	**(42,9%)**	1	(2,5%)	11	(40.4%)
Shachoo wa kyoo ga Okayama e dekakete orimasu (Humble lexical substitution)	10	(35,7%)	**30**	**(75%)**	20	(39,3%)
Shachoo wa kyoo ga Okayama e dekakete imasu (Verb equivalent)	2	(7,1%)	3	(7,5%)	1	(0.4%)
Another answer/ Do not know	4	(14,3%)	6	(15%)	2	(0,7%)

42,9% of the Swedish learners used the sentence with a referent lexical substitution while 35,7% used the humble form, 7,1% chose the verb equivalent and 14,3% wanted to answer differently or did not know. This differs a lot from the Japanese where 2,5% chose the referent lexical substitution, 75% answered with the humble form, 7,5% chose the verb equivalent and 15% wanted either a different choice or did not know. The difference seen between the two groups when choosing the humble option is 39,3%, showing a big difference

and a potential difficulty for the Swedish learners to employ humble options for their belonging social group.

Scenario 3

Tomodachi to no kaiwa de, sensei ni tsuite hanashiteimasu.

"You speak about your teacher with your friend"

The possible answers are "It seems our teacher cooks by himself" are with Referent and Humble lexical substitutions, its verb equivalent and the answer "Another answer/ Do not know".

Table 4. Answers for scenario 3

	Swedish learners of Japanese	Japanese native speakers	Difference
Sensei wa jibun de ryoori nasaru soo da (Referent lexical substitution)	5 (17,9%)	13 (32,5%)	8 (14,6%)
Sensei wa jibun de ryoori itasu soo da (Humble lexical substitution)	2 (7,1%)	0 (0%)	2 (7,1%)
Sensei wa jibun de ryoori suru soo da (Verb equivalent)	**18 (64,3%)**	**22 (55%)**	4 (9,3%)
Another answer/ Do not know	3 (10,7%)	5 (12,5%)	2 (1,8%)

While 17,9% of the second language learners chose the referent lexical substitution, 7,1% chose the humble form, but most chose the verb equivalent with 64,3%. 10,7% either did not know the answer or would have preferred another alternative. With the native-speakers, 32,5% chose the referent lexical substitution, 55% chose the verb equivalent and 12,5% wanting another answer or not knowing the answer. Not much difference can be seen between the two groups.

Scenario 4

Kinoo anata no ie ni senpai ga kite, okaasan ga tsukutta ryoori no reshipi ni tsuite kikaremashita ga, zenzen shirimasen deshita. Nan to iimasu ka?

"Yesterday your upperclassmen came to your house and asked for one of your mother recipes, but you did not know it at all. What do you say?"

The possible answers are "I am sorry, but I do not know that recipe so please ask my mother" are with Referent and Humble lexical substitutions, its verb equivalent and the answer "Another answer/ Do not know".

Table 5. Answers for scenario 4

	Swedish learners of Japanese	Japanese native speakers	Difference
Sumimasen. sono reshipi o zenzen go-zonji janai node, haha ni kiite kudasai (Referent lexical substitution)	3 (10,7%)	0 (0%)	3 (10,7%)
Sumimasen. sono reshipi o zenzen zonjinai node, haha ni kiite kudasai (Humble lexical substitution)	3 (10,7%)	5 (12,5%)	2 (1,8%)
Sumimasen. sono reshipi o zenzen shiranai node, haha ni kiite kudasai (Verb equivalent)	**17 (60,7%)**	**29 (72,5%)**	12 (11,8%)
Another answer/ Do not know	5 (17,9%)	6 (15%)	1 (2,9%)

Most of the participants from both groups chose the verb equivalent in this scenario, whilst similar results can be seen on all answers with only a small difference. The only major difference is that the Japanese group did not choose the referent lexical substitution at all even

if 10,7% from the Swedish group did, seeing an around 10% difference with the verb equivalent.

Scenario 5

Ohiru gohan ni senpai o sehi sasoitai to omoimasu. Nan to iimasu ka?

"You want to invite one of your upperclassmen for lunch. What do you say?"

The possible answers are "Do you want to eat together?" are with Referent and Humble lexical substitutions, its verb equivalent and the answer "Another answer/ Do not know".

Table 6. Answers for scenario 5

	Swedish learners of Japanese		Japanese native speakers		Difference	
Issho ni meshiagarimasen ka (Referent lexical substitution)	5	(17,9%)	4	(10%)	1	(7,9%)
Issho ni itadakimasen ka (Humble lexical substitution)	3	(10,7%)	0	(0%)	3	(10,7%)
Issho ni tabemasen ka (Verb equivalent)	**19**	**(67,9%)**	**34**	**(85%)**	15	(17,1%)
Another answer/ Do not know	1	(3,6%)	2	(5%)	1	(1,4%)

Swedish learners of Japanese chose the verb equivalent as the most likely with 67,9%, 17,9% with the referent lexical substitution, 10,7% answered with the humble form while 3,6% answered they did not agree with the answers or did not know. The Japanese native speaker agreed as 85% chose the verb equivalent, 10% choosing the referent lexical substitution and 5% wanted another answer or did not know. Both groups seem to agree somewhat to what the answer should be even if a small difference can be seen.

Scenario 6

Resutoran de ueitaa ga o mizu o sosogou to shimasu ga, moo nomemasen. Nan to iimasuka?

"You are at a restaurant and the waiter tries to give you more water, but you cannot drink anymore. What do you say?"

The possible answers are "Excuse me, but I cannot drink anymore" are with Referent and Humble lexical substitutions, its verb equivalent and the answer "Another answer/ Do not know".

Table 7. Answers for scenario 6

	Swedish learners of Japanese	Japanese native speakers	Difference
Ano, juubun meshiagarimashita (Referent lexical substitution)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Ano, juubun itadakimashita (Humble lexical substitution)	5 (17,9%)	**23 (57,5%)**	18 (39,6%)
Ano, juubun nomimashita (Verb equivalent)	**16 (57,1%)**	0 (0%)	16 (57,1%)
Another answer/ Do not know	7 (25%)	17 (42,5%)	10 (17,5%)

While both groups agree that you should not use a referent lexical substitution, 17,9% of the Swedish learners of Japanese chose the humble lexical substitution. 57,1% answered with the verb equivalent and 25% wanted to choose something else. The Japanese group chose differently with 57,5% taking the humble option and 42,5% either did not know or wanted a different way to reply. A relevant difference can be observed as the groups disagree about which option they think is correct.

Scenario 7

Senpai wa kyoo bukatsu ni konai node, senpai no kurasumeito ni doko ni iru ka kikimasu.

"Since your upperclassmen have not come to club practice yet today, you ask one of their classmates where they are".

The possible answers are "Where is (upperclassmen) today?" are with Referent and Humble lexical substitutions, its verb equivalent and the answer "Another answer/ Do not know"

Table 8. Answers for scenario 7

	Swedish learners of Japanese		Japanese native speakers		Difference	
Senpai wa kyoo doko ni irasshaimasu ka (Referent lexical substitution)	6	(21,4%)	**25**	**(62,5%)**	19	(41,1%)
Senpai wa kyoo doko ni orimasu ka (Humble lexical substitution)	2	(7,1%)	1	(2,5%)	1	(4,6%)
Senpai wa kyoo doko ni imasu ka (Verb equivalent)	**18**	**(64,3%)**	12	(30%)	6	(34,3%)
Another answer/ Do not know	2	(7,1%)	2	(5%)	0	(2,1%)

Most of the Swedish group responded that they prefer the verb equivalent with 64,3%, with 21,4% responding with a referent lexical substitution. The humble form and the choice for neither of the questions are at the same percentage with 7,1%. The Japanese groups majority however chose the referent lexical substitution instead with 62,5%, differing itself with other scenarios when an upperclassman is present. 30% picked the verb equivalent, 2,5% chose the humble form and 5% did not prefer any of the answers.

Scenario 8

Anata ha ankeito o tsukuri, shiranai hito ni kyuujitsu ni doko ni iku ka kikimasu.

"You have created a survey and you are asking people you do not know where they go on their free time".

The possible answers are "Where do you usually go in your free time?" are with Referent and Humble lexical substitutions, its verb equivalent and the answer "Another answer/ Do not know"

Table 9. Answers for scenario 8

	Swedish learners of Japanese	Japanese native speakers	Difference
Fudan kyuujitsu ni doko e irasshaimasu ka (Referent lexical substitution)	**10** **(35,7%)**	11 (27,5%)	1 (8,2%)
Fudan kyuujitsu ni doko e mairimasu ka (Humble lexical substitution)	2 (7,1%)	0 (0%)	2 (7,1%)
Fudan kyuujitsu ni doko e ikimasu ka (Verb equivalent)	**10** **(35,7%)**	**29** **(72,5%)**	19 (36,8%)
Another answer/ Do not know	6 (21,4%)	0 (0%)	6 (21,4%)

The Japanese group chose the verb equivalent with 72,5% and 27,5% picked the referent lexical substitution. Swedish learners Japanese chose differently on those two answers though with both at the same percentage of 35,7%, something not seen in the other scenarios. The rest of the answers were divided amongst the humble lexical substitution with 7.1% with the rest not agreeing with any of the answers.

Scenario 9

Makudonarudo ni ikoo to shite, michi ni mayotteshimai, toori ga kakatta obaasan ni kikimasu.

"You are trying to get to McDonalds, but you lost your way and try to ask for directions from an old lady passing by".

The possible answers are "Excuse me, do you know where McDonalds is" are with Referent and Humble lexical substitutions, its verb equivalent and the answer "Another answer/ Do not know"

Table 10. Answers for scenario 9

	Swedish learners of Japanese		Japanese native speakers		Difference	
Sumimasen, Makudonarudo ga doko ni aru ka go-zonji desu ka (Referent lexical substitution)	**15**	**(53,6%)**	**37**	**(92,5%)**	22	(38,9%)
Sumimasen, Makudonarudo ga doko ni aru ka zonjimasu ka (Humble lexical substitution)	3	(10,7%)	0	(0%)	3	(10,7%)
Sumimasen, Makudonarudo ga doko ni aru ka go shitteimasu ka (Verb equivalent)	7	(25%)	3	(7,5%)	4	(17,5%)
Another answer/ Do not know	3	(10,7%)	0	(0%)	3	(10,7%)

Japanese native speakers were noticeably clear with their answer as 92,5% chose the sentence with a referent lexical substitution and 7,5% used the verb equivalent. The Swedish group were 53,6% sure that the exalting option were right, with 25% choosing the verb equivalent. Remaining answers were picked equally between the humble lexical substitution and either not knowing or not wanting to choose any of the other option. This is a situation also present

in scenario (7), as some forms might be preferred as lexical substitutions for Japanese people in general.

Scenario 10

Tomodachi no ie de benkyookai o shiteitara, tomodachi no oneesan ga tetsudattekureru koto ni nari, rikai dekinai mondai o zehi mitehoshii toki, nan to iimasu ka.

"You are studying at a friend's house and their older sister is helping you. When there is a problem that you cannot solve and you want her to look at it, what do you say?".

The possible answers of "Could you look at this question?" are with Referent and Humble lexical substitutions, its verb equivalent and the answer "Another answer/ Do not know"

Table 11. Answers for scenario 10

	Swedish learners of Japanese	Japanese native speakers	Difference
Kono mondai o go-ran kudasai (Referent lexical substitution)	2 (7,1%)	0 (0%)	2 (7,1%)
Kono mondai o haiken shite kudasai (Humble lexical substitution)	3 (10,7%)	0 (0%)	3 (10,7%)
Kono mondai o mite kudasai (Verb equivalent)	**17 (60,7%)**	**32 (80%)**	15 (19,3%)
Another answer/ Do not know	6 (21,4%)	8 (20%)	2 (1,4%)

The Swedish group were less clear with their answers compared to the Japanese group with 60,7% choosing the verb equivalent and 10.7% answering with the humble form. 7,1% picked the referent lexical substitution and 21,4% chose none of the other options. 80% of the Japanese group chose the verb equivalent and 20% wanted either another answer or that they did not know. Although both groups seem to agree on the verb equivalent being the most probable, a difference of 19,3% is still observable.

Scenario 11

Jooshi ga anata no hanashi o zenzen wakaranasasou de, mou ichi do iu beki kadou ka o kikimasu.

"It seems that one your superiors did not seem to get what you were saying at all and you therefore ask if you should repeat yourself"

The possible answers of "Should I say it again?" are with Referent and Humble lexical substitutions, its verb equivalent and the answer "Another answer/ Do not know"

Table 12. Answers for scenario 11

	Swedish learners of Japanese	Japanese native speakers	Difference
Moo ichi do osshaimasu ka (Referent lexical substitution)	4 (14,3%)	0 (0%)	4 (14,3%)
Moo ichido mooshimasu ka (Humble lexical substitution)	**15** **(53,6%)**	**24** **(60%)**	9 (6,4%)
Moo ichido iimasu ka (Verb equivalent)	4 (14,3%)	3 (7,5%)	1 (6,8%)
Another answer/ Do not know	5 (17,9%)	13 (32,5%)	8 (14,6%)

Amongst the Swedish speakers the most prominent answer was using the sentence with humble lexical substitution with a shared second place of 14,3% with both the verb equivalent and the exalting sentence. 17,9% chose that they did not know or that none of the above written answers should be chosen. 60% of the Japanese group chose the humble lexical substitution, 7,5% that the verb equivalent was right and 32,5% that they did not know or none of the answers were suitable. Very little difference can be seen between the groups.

Scenario 12

Kyoo wa yoochien ga shimatteite, dare mo kodomo o mitekuremasen. Jibun ga hataraiteiru kaisha no jooshi ni kikimasu.

"The kindergarten is closed today and there is no one who can watch over your children. You ask your superior".

The possible answers of "Is it okay if my children come?" are with Referent and Humble lexical substitutions, its verb equivalent and the answer "Another answer/ Do not know"

Table 13. Answers for scenario 12

	Swedish learners of Japanese	Japanese native speakers	Difference
Watashi no kodomo ga irasshatte mo ii desu ka (Referent lexical substitution)	2 (7,1%)	0 (0%)	2 (7,1%)
Watashi no kodomo ga maitte mo ii desu ka (Humble lexical substitution)	**14** **(50%)**	1 (2,5%)	13 (47,5%)
Watashi no kodomo ga kite mo ii desu ka (Verb equivalent)	6 (21,4%)	**25** **(62,5%)**	19 (41,1%)
Another answer/ Do not know	6 (21,4%)	14 (35%)	8 (13,6%)

Answers seems to differ between the two groups, as most of the Swedish group chose the humble lexical substitution with 50%, followed by the verb equivalent and not knowing or choosing a different answer at the same percentage of 21,4%. The least picked option was the referent lexical substitution as 7,1% selected it. Most Japanese native speakers chose the verb equivalent as 62,5%, 2,5% picked the humble lexical substitution and 35% not choosing any of the sentences above.

Scenario 13

Miseinensha ni mieru okyakusan ga anata no mise de osake o kaou to suru toki, sono mae ni ID wo minakereba narimasen.

"A customer who looks like a minor is trying to buy alcohol in your store, but before that you you have to look at their ID".

The possible answers of "Would it be alright if I looked at your ID?" are with Referent and Humble lexical substitutions, its verb equivalent and the answer "Another answer/ Do not know".

Table 14. Answers for scenario 13

	Swedish learners of Japanese	Japanese native speakers	Difference
ID o go ran ni natte mo yoroshii desu ka (Referent lexical substitution)	8 (28,6%)	0 (0%)	8 (28,6%)
ID o haiken shite mo yoroshii desu ka (Humble lexical substitution)	**10 (35,7%)**	**36 (90%)**	26 (54,3%)
ID o mite mo yoroshii desu ka (Verb equivalent)	6 (21,4%)	2 (5%)	4 (16,4%)
Another answer/ Do not know	4 (14,3%)	2 (5%)	2 (9,3%)

The Swedish group was divided in their answers as 28,6% chose the referent lexical substitution, 35.7% answered with the humble form and 21,4% had chosen the verb equivalent. The rest 14,3% were those who either did not know or wanted a different answer. Amongst the Japanese native speakers, the answers were vastly different as 90% chose the humble lexical substitution with the rest 10% were divided equally between the verb equivalent and the option of neither of the sentences above. Even though both participant groups seem to agree, the difference can once again point to that second language learners display difficulty applying humble lexical substitutions.

Scenario 14

Jugyoochuu ni sensei no itta koto ga mataku kikoenakatta node, tonari ni suwatteiru tomodachi ni kikimasu.

"Since you did not hear what your teacher said during the lesson you ask a friend sitting next to you".

The possible answers of "Did you hear what the teacher said?" are with Referent and Humble lexical substitutions, its verb equivalent and the answer "Another answer/ Do not know".

Table 15. Answers for scenario 14

	Swedish learners of Japanese		Japanese native speakers		Difference	
Sensei ga nani wo osshatta ka kikoeta (Referent lexical substitution)	8	(28,6%)	1	(2,5%)	7	(26,1%)
Sensei ga nani wo moushita ka kikoeta (Humble lexical substitution)	0	(0%)	0	(0%)	0	(0%)
Sensei ga nani wo itta ka kikoeta (Verb equivalent)	**19**	**(67,9%)**	**38**	**(95%)**	19	(27,1%)
Another answer/ Do not know	1	(3,6%)	1	(2,5%)	0	(1,1%)

67,9% of the Swedish students selected the verb equivalent, the referent lexical substitution was chosen with 28,6% and 3,6% either did not know or wanted another answer. Japanese native speakers also chose the verb equivalent as most likely, but with 95%, with the remaining participants were equal in choosing the referent lexical substitution as well as with either not knowing or wanting another answer. Even if the mention of someone with superior social rank is present within the conversation of two people who are equal in the social hierarchy, answers do not seem to much. The only exception is that more second language learners chose the referent lexical substitution.

4.3. Discussion

Although the circumstances affected the results between the groups, both groups seemed to agree when a referent lexical substitution should be used or not. In these scenarios, although a small percentage of Swedish participants chose humble forms, the group mostly agrees with the Japanese group about their choice. The biggest difference when exalting a member in a conversation is that Swedish students seemed to have some problems concerning the social position of the referee.

Both groups seemed to realise that when talking to a superior in a work-related situation, lexical substitutions would most likely be used. Outside those scenarios however, the answers would be mixed. The situations when the Swedish participants seem to agree with the Japanese group about using the equivalent verb is when an older outside member was involved, as when a friend's sibling or an upperclassman was referred. This excludes however the situation mentioning an older lady. In those cases, most of the Swedish participants prefer the verb equivalent, but differences were seen when the Japanese selected a referent lexical substitution.

A hypothesis might arise that certain words might be preferred as a referent lexical substitution more than others even if the situation remains unaltered. Those words might be *go zonji da* meaning "to know", *nasaru* which is "to do" and finally *irassharu* translated to "to go", "to come", "to be" amongst others as these words were chosen with its lexical substitution more frequently than others on the surveys. Further research would be necessary to make such conclusions, and nothing can be said yet. Situations that do not follow this pattern, is referencing a socially higher person in a conversation between two people of equal social rank, seen mostly in scenario (14). Here, most Japanese native speakers would choose the verb equivalent, a choice some made in the Swedish group, but not as definite as the aforementioned participants. Deviations can be observed amongst the second language learners as many more of them chose the referent lexical substitutions compared to the Japanese group.

The hypothesis proving to be correct is the one stating that second language learners might find difficulty using humble forms, seen clearly by the results from the surveys. Most notable in scenario (13), when the participant has the role of a store owner asking their customers for ID before buying alcohol. As the Swedish participants were unsure and answered differently from each other, the Japanese group were almost exclusive in choosing a humble lexical

36

substitution. Seemingly even more difficult for the Swedish group is the deprecation of their own group for the sake of another, especially when the target is higher socially than themselves. Seen as an example in scenario (2), the participants told the customers that wanted to meet the boss that they were currently gone, making it impossible to do so. While the second language learners most prominent answer was to use the referent lexical substitution and therefore exalting the boss, the Japanese native speaker instead used the humble form, deprecating their superior for the customers sake. Another scenario facing a similar situation was present, but instead of a higher-ranking person it was the participant's children. Facing a superior at work asking if their children could come since daycare was closed generated an answer by the second language learners using a humble lexical substitution. The Japanese group chose differently, using the verb equivalent instead.

An examination of every answer was done, looking at the first questions asked in the surveys to see the gender, age, where in japan the Japanese group were born, but also how long the Swedish group had studied the language. This was to observe if there were any visible changes in answer. Geographical location did not seem to make a difference to the Japanese group, but deviating answers were identified in some cases tied to gender and age. An example of this is the choices made by some of the males and females over 50 years of age, showing a preference amongst politeness levels as the women used more humble and referent lexical substitutions given the chance compared to the men, doing the opposite. The difference in the answers made by younger men and women seem to insignificant, although small changes may appear. It seems age and gender combined may be a factor, but further research would be necessary to reach a clearer conclusion.

As expected, the amount of Japanese studied and time spent in Japan heavily influenced the answers made by the Swedish group, but not as first hypothesized. It was theorized that those that had not studied much would choose the verb equivalent more often in comparison to those more fluent in the language. This proved to be false as the opposite could be observed in some cases as a mix of different answers were selected. Sometimes a high frequency of lexical substitutions was seen, other times the verb equivalent, but in some instances both which shows signs of what might be preference. Although the Swedish group sometimes understood when it was expected to use a lexical substitution, the results were heavily distinct from the Japanese group's choice, such as applying referent forms instead of a humble one, even when referring to themselves. This demonstrates their frequent use of negative politeness without concerning positive politeness and would sometimes be observable from

those who had spent between one to two years abroad. The second language learners would make the same mistake, although not quite as often as they understood how to protect their "face" with a politeness strategy that would be more appropriate from a Japanese individual's point of view. The lack of knowledge about the use of lexical substitutions though could be seen even by those who had studied a longer amount of time. No difference in answers in accordance to gender could be found, not even by the one individual who identified as neither male nor female. It must not be forgotten that only one person identified as neither. To draw a conclusion a more expansive study would have to be made.

Two answers that have almost not been explained yet exist, making use of the fourth answer in every scenario telling that they either did not know or would prefer another answer, and the last questions asking about feedback and thoughts concerning the survey. On the 15th of April two surveys were sent out, although different from the current surveys. After receiving feedback concerning the questions and the frequent choice of the fourth option on most scenarios, a fix was inevitable. Although it was expected that those answering would disagree with some questions, the choice "I don't know/Another answer" were selected most of the time, making a revision necessary as most responded with that some of the scenarios were unlikely to happen in real life. The changes made are seen in this paper, with the number of participants choosing the last answer within acceptable parameters. Some of the participants prompted for other answers than the ones displayed. Some would explain that some words filled out space making a shorter answer more appropriate. All answers could not be collected from these questions as not all of them answered what they wanted differently.

4.4. Research conclusion

According to this research, although both the Swedish and the Japanese group exalts the referent similarly to each other, differences can be observed by the Swedish group when using humble forms on either themselves or their belonging social group. Deviations in the answers can also be seen by how long the students have studied Japanese and spent time in Japan. Instead of more sentences with the verb equivalent used, a mix of answers was seen. Although application is more frequent of all the forms, it differs from the utilizations made by the Japanese group.

5. Conclusion

5.1. Summary

As a summarization, two online surveys were sent out to measure the use of lexical substitution between Swedish learners of Japanese and Japanese native speakers. The results of the surveys show that both groups seem to agree in the instances when exalting a member, although a few insignificant differences were apparent. It seems to be understood that some people higher than the speaker in the social hierarchy were expected to be met with lexical substitutions. The second language learners sometimes addressed the referent with the verb equivalent or even with the humble lexical substitution even in scenarios when it was not expected to do so by the Japanese native speakers. Even in the scenarios where sentences with the verb equivalent was the norm, it would deviate as some of the participants in the Swedish group chose a lexical substitution instead. Factors of this were dependent on both knowledge of the language and in country experience, as those participants made choices similar to the other group.

It seems however that the second language learners have difficulties deprecating themselves, compared to the Japanese group. Even more differences could be found as the deprecation of their belonging social group in certain situations were in focus. They would sometimes exalt the person in the context or utilize the verb equivalent instead of humbling them, separating the answers from the other group. Instead of the majority choosing one certain answer, the answers were often spread across the different options. A scenario where this can be seen is when most participants chose a humble lexical substitution when speaking about their children in front of their superior, differing from the Japanese group as they selected the verb equivalent instead. This was not only an observable trait by those who did not have much knowledge concerning the language, but also concerning the members who had studied and lived in Japan for a longer time, although up to a certain limit.

A hypothesis that proved to be false was that members who had not studied for longer periods of time would use the verb equivalent as a safety measure. This was wrong as a mix of answers were selected, which was most likely due to preference. Applied lexical substitutions would often not be applied in the same way the Japanese group did though.

Gender does not seem to play a role in choice in either the Swedish group or young people in the Japanese one but seen sometimes by the older members of the native speakers of Japanese. No conclusion could be given concerning the member in the Swedish group who

identified as neither male nor female, as only one participated. Such conclusion can only be made by further research.

If the same study would be made again the surveys would change slightly to confirm and add more information to certain theories. More consideration would be had about the received feedback, rearranging the questions and answer alternatives so it would be more suitable for all participants.

5.2. Concluding remarks

Swedish learners of Japanese use a similar amount of lexical substitution compared to the Japanese native speakers when exalting members in a conversation. The biggest difference that is seen is when applying sentences with humble lexical substitutions as the groups disagree. The amount of study and time in Japan also affected the answers to a noticeable level.

References

Caltabiano, Y.I. (2008). *Consequences of Shifting Styles in Japanese:*
L2 Style-Shifting and L1 Listeners' Attitudes. Diss, University of California at Davis.
http://www.lingref.com/cpp/slrf/2007/paper1740.pdf

Cook, H.M. och Shibamoto-Smith, J.S. (2018). *Japanese at Work: Politeness, Power, and Personae in Japanese Workplace Discourse*. Springer International Publishing : Imprint: Palgrave Macmillan

Freed, B.F. (1995). *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context*. John Benjamins Pub. Co.

Hasegawa, Y. (2015). Politeness and honorifics I and Politeness and honorifics II. *Japanese: A linguistic introduction*. Cambridge University Press. E-book

Haugh, M. (2018). Linguistic Politeness. Yoko Hasegawa (red.). *The Cambridge handbook of Japanese linguistics*. Cambridge University Press. E-book

Ide, S. and Yoshida, M. (1999). *Sociolinguistics: Honorifics and Gender differences.* Blackwell Publishers Ltd

Ishiyama, O. (2016). Friendly and respectful politeness: A functional analysis of L2 utterances. Kabata, K. and Toratani, K (red). *Cognitive-Functional Approaches to the Study of Japanese as a Second Language*. De Gruyter. E-book

Jones, K and Ono, T. (2008). *Style shifting in Japanese*. John Benjamins Pub. Co.

Ōishi, H. (1983). *Atarashii keigo : utsukushii kotoba*. Shoogakkan, Shoowa

Shibatani, M. (1990). *The languages of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Strömblad, E.H. (2017). How Japanese Language Learners Choose Speech Levels. Bachelor's thesis, Lund University

Wetzel, P.J. (2004). *Keigo in modern Japan: polite language from Meiji to the present*. University of Hawaii Press

Enkät för kandidatuppsats

Jag är en elev på Lunds universitet och skriver för tillfället en kandidatuppsats. För att svara måste du studera/ha studerat japanska och ha svenska som modersmål. Den insamlade informationen kommer att endast användas till kandidatuppsatsen. Det tar ungefär 15 minuter att slutföra denna enkät.
Alla deltagare är anonyma.
Tack så mycket för att ni deltar!

* Required

1. Kön *

○ Man

○ Kvinna

○ Annat

2. Ålder *

Your answer

3. Hur länge har du studerat japanska? *

○ 1 termin

○ 2 terminer

○ 3 terminer

○ 4 terminer

○ 5 terminer

○ 6 terminer

○ Mer än 6 terminer

4. Har du bott i Japan? *

○ Nej

○ Ja, 0-3 månader

○ Ja, 3-6 månader

○ Ja, 6 månader till 1 år

○ Ja, 1 år till 2 år

○ Ja, 2 år till 3 år

○ Ja, 3 år eller mer

Olika val kommer att presenteras. Välj det svar du tycker är lämpligast

---

5. Hur frågar du när du är ute och handlar med en vän och vill veta hur mycket det dom köpte kostar. *

○ それはいくらですか。

○ それはいくら。

○ それはいくらなんだ。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

---

6. När du beställer mat som du inte har ätit innan på en restaurang och tycker att detta var gott, hur förmedlar du detta? *

○ それを注文して良かったです。

○ それを注文すれば良かったです。

○ それを注文して良くなかったです。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

7. När du träffar på någon från klassen över dig när du gör din läxa och dom frågar vad du gör, hur svarar du? *

○ 宿題をするところです。

○ 宿題をいたすところです。

○ 宿題をなさるところです。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

8. Din chef är i Okayama idag. När en kund frågar om dom kan få se chefen idag, hur svarar du? *

○ 社長は今日は岡山へ出かけていらっしゃいます。

○ 社長は今日は岡山へ出かけております。

○ 社長は今日は岡山へ出かけています。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

9. Du pratar med din vän om läraren. *

○ 先生は自分で料理するそうだ。

○ 先生は自分で料理いたすそうだ。

○ 先生は自分で料理なさるそうだ。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

10. Innan lektionen börjar så måste du skriva ditt namn, men du har glömt din penna. Du frågar din kompis om du kan få låna en penna. *

○ ペンを持ってる？

○ ペンを持っていますか。

○ ペンを持っていらっしゃいますか。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

11. Någon från klassen över dig besökte ditt hem igår och frågar nu efter receptet din mamma tillagade, men du kan inte det. Hur svarar du? *

○ すみません、そのレシピを全然ご存知じゃないので、母に聞いて下さい。

○ すみません、そのレシピを全然知らないので、母に聞いて下さい。

○ すみません、そのレシピを全然存じないので、母に聞いて下さい

○ その他 / 分かりません。

12. Runt lunchtid så vill du bjuda med någon från klassen över dig så att ni kan äta tillsammans. *

○ 一緒に食べませんか。

○ 一緒にいただきませんか。

○ 一緒に召し上がりませんか？

○ その他 / 分かりません。

46

13. Servitören på restaurangen du är på frågar om du vill ha mer vatten, men du är inte törstig längre. Hur svarar du? *

○ あの、十分頂きました。

○ あの、十分召し上がりました。

○ あの、十分飲みました。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

14. En från klassen över dig kommer inte till dagens klubbaktivitet och du frågar därför deras klasskamrat var dom är. *

○ 先輩は今日どこにいますか。

○ 先輩は今日どこにおりますか。

○ 先輩は今日どこにいらっしゃいますか。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

15. En kund försöker köpa en tv i butiken du jobbar på, men har glömt sin plånbok. Du berättar för dom att det går bra att betala vid en annan tidpunkt. *

○ 今は払わなくてもいいです。

○ 今は払う必要がありません。

○ 今は払わなくても大丈夫です。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

16. マクドナルドに行こうとして、道に迷ってしまい、通りがかかったおばあさんに聞きます。 *

○ すみません、マクドナルドがどこにあるか知っていますか。

○ すみません、マクドナルドがどこにあるかご存知ですか。

○ すみません、マクドナルドがどこにあるか存じますか。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

17. 友達の家で勉強会をしていたら、友達のお姉さんが手伝ってくれることなり、解決出来ない問題をぜひ見て欲しい時、何と言いますか。 *

○ この問題を見てください。

○ この問題を拝見してください。

○ この問題をご覧ください。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

18. 上司があなたの話を全然わかっていないようなので、もう一度言うべきかどうかを聞きます。 *

○ もう一度申しますか。

○ もう一度言いますか。

○ もう一度おっしゃいますか。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

19. Det ser ut som att någon som är i en högre position än dig på jobbet inte förstod vad du sade och du frågar därför om du ska repetera det. *

○ もう一度申しますか。

○ もう一度言いますか。

○ もう一度おっしゃいますか。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

20. Dagiset är stängt idag, och det finns ingen som kan passa dina barn. Du frågar någon på jobbet som är i en högre position om det är okej om dom följer med dig idag. *

○ 私の子供が来てもいいですか。

○ 私の子供がいらっしゃってもいいですか。

○ 私の子供が参ってもいいですか。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

21. Din elev frågar dig om råd, och du berättar hur dom ska klara av det. Hur uttrycker du dig? *

○ このようにしなさい。

○ このようにしたらどうですか。

○ このようにした方がいいです。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

22.   Kunder som ser ut som minderåriga försöker köpa alkohol i din butik, men du måste se deras ID först. *

○ IDを見てもよろしいですか。

○ IDをご覧になってもよろしいですか。

○ IDを拝見してもよろしいですか。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

23.   Din lillasyster tog ditt spel utan att fråga först och du vill att hon ska omedelbart lämna tillbaka det. Hur uttrycker du dig? *

○ ゲームを返しなさい。

○ ゲームを返して。

○ ゲームを返してくれる。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

24.   Mitt i lektionen så hörde du inte vad din lärare sade, så du frågar din kompis som sitter bredvid dig om dom vet. *

○ 先生が何をおっしゃったか聞こえた？

○ 先生が何を申したか聞こえた？

○ 先生が何を言ったか聞こえた？

○ その他 / 分かりません。

Ifall ni har några kommentarer om frågorna, var vänlig skriv.

Your answer

Tack så mycket för att ni deltog i undersökningen

Submit

Never submit passwords through Google Forms.

This form was created inside of Lund University. Report Abuse

Google Forms

論文のアンケート

現在私はスウェーデンのルンド大学で卒論を書いております。卒論のためにアンケートを作りました。日本語母語話者だけ答えてください。データは論文だけに使います。アンケートは約15分かかります。
参加者は全員匿名です。
よろしくお願いいたします。

* Required

性別 *

○ 男性

○ 女性

○ 回答しない

2.　年齢 *

Your answer

3.　日本の中で、出身地はどこですか。 *

Your answer

色々な場面が書かれています。その場面において、自分が何と言うか答えてください

4. あなたは友達と一緒に買い物をして、友達が買った物の値段を知りたい時、どのように聞きますか。 *

○ それはいくらですか。

○ それはいくら。

○ それはいくらなんだ。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

5. レストランで食べたことがない食べ物を注文して、すごく美味しかった時、あなたはどのように言いますか。 *

○ それを注文して良かったです。

○ それを注文すれば良かったです。

○ それを注文して良くなかったです。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

6. 宿題をするところで先輩に会い、何をしているか聞かれたら、何と答えますか。 *

○ 宿題をするところです。

○ 宿題をいたすところです。

○ 宿題をなさるところです。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

7. 今日は社長が岡山にいます。お客さんから社長に会いたいと言われた時、何と答えますか。 *

○ 社長は今日は岡山へ出かけていらっしゃいます。

○ 社長は今日は岡山へ出かけております。

○ 社長は今日は岡山へ出かけています。

○ その他／分かりません。

8. 友達との会話で、先生について話しています。 *

○ 先生は自分で料理するそうだ。

○ 先生は自分で料理いたすそうだ。

○ 先生は自分で料理なさるそうだ。

○ その他／分かりません。

9. 授業の前に名前を書かなければいけない時、ペンを忘れてしまいました。友達にどのように聞きますか。 *

○ ペンを持ってる？

○ ペンを持っていますか。

○ ペンを持っていらっしゃいますか。

○ その他／分かりません。

10. 昨日あなたの家に先輩が来て、お母さんが作った料理のレシピについて聞かれましたが、全然知りませんでした。何と言いますか。 *

○ すみません、そのレシピを全然ご存知じゃないので、母に聞いて下さい。

○ すみません、そのレシピを全然知らないので、母に聞いて下さい。

○ すみません、そのレシピを全然存じないので、母に聞いて下さい

○ その他 / 分かりません。

11. お昼ご飯に先輩をせひ誘いたいと思います。何と言いますか。 *

○ 一緒に食べませんか。

○ 一緒にいただきませんか。

○ 一緒に召し上がりませんか？

○ その他 / 分かりません。

12. レストランでウェイターがお水を注ごうとしますが、もう飲めません。何と言いますか。 *

○ あの、十分頂きました。

○ あの、十分召し上がりました。

○ あの、十分飲みました。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

13. 先輩が今日部活に来ないので、先輩のクラスメートにどこにいるか聞きます。 *

○ 先輩は今日どこにいますか。

○ 先輩は今日どこにおりますか。

○ 先輩は今日どこにいらっしゃいますか。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

14. お客さんがテレビを買おうとしていますが、さいふを忘れたようです。その店は後払いができることを伝えます。一番良い選択を選んでください。 *

○ 今は払わなくてもいいです。

○ 今は払う必要がありません。

○ 今は払わなくても大丈夫です。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

15. あなたはアンケートを作り、知らない人に休日にどこに行くか聞きます。 *

○ 普段休日にどこへ行きますか。

○ 普段休日にどこへ参りますか。

○ 普段休日にどこへいらっしゃいますか。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

56

16. マクドナルドに行こうとして、道に迷ってしまい、通りがかかったおばあさんに聞きます。 *

○ すみません、マクドナルドがどこにあるか知っていますか。

○ すみません、マクドナルドがどこにあるかご存知ですか。

○ すみません、マクドナルドがどこにあるか存じますか。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

17. 友達の家で勉強会をしていたら、友達のお姉さんが手伝ってくれることなり、解決出来ない問題をぜひ見て欲しい時、何と言いますか。 *

○ この問題を見てください。

○ この問題を拝見してください。

○ この問題をご覧ください。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

18. 上司があなたの話を全然わかっていないようなので、もう一度言うべきかどうかを聞きます。 *

○ もう一度申しますか。

○ もう一度言いますか。

○ もう一度おっしゃいますか。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

57

19. 今日は幼稚園が閉まっていて、誰も子供を見てくれる人がいません。自分が働いている会社の上司に聞きます。 *

○ 私の子供が来てもいいですか。

○ 私の子供がいらっしゃってもいいですか。

○ 私の子供が参ってもいいですか。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

20. あなたが自分の生徒に相談されて、その解決法を教える時に何と言いますか。 *

○ このようにしなさい。

○ このようにしたらどうですか。

○ このようにした方がいいです。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

21. 未成年者に見えるお客さんがあなたの店でお酒を買おうとする時、その前にIDを見なければなりません。 *

○ IDを見てもよろしですか。

○ IDをご覧になってもよろしいですか。

○ IDを拝見してもよろしいですか。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

58

22. 妹が勝手にゲームを使っているので、今すぐ返してほしい時、何と言いますか。 *

○ ゲームを返しなさい。

○ ゲームを返して。

○ ゲームを返してくれる。

○ その他 / 分かりません。

23. 授業中に先生の言ったことが全く聞こえなかったので、となりに座っている友達に聞きます。 *

○ 先生が何をおっしゃったか聞こえた？

○ 先生が何を申したか聞こえた？

○ 先生が何を言ったか聞こえた？

○ その他 / 分かりません。

質問内容などについてご感想があればお書きください

Your answer

調査にご協力いただき、ありがとうございます。

Submit