

**The Dissertation Committee for Holly Anne Ogren Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:**

**BENDING THE “RULES”: STRATEGIC LANGUAGE USE IN ROLE AND STATUS  
NEGOTIATION AMONG WOMEN IN A RURAL NORTHEASTERN JAPANESE  
COMMUNITY**

**Committee:**

---

Elizabeth Keating, Supervisor

---

Joel Sherzer, Supervisor

---

Pauline Turner Strong

---

Jurgen Streeck

---

Miyako Inoue

**Bending the “rules”: Strategic language use in role and  
status negotiation among women in a rural Northeastern  
Japanese community**

by

Holly Anne Ogren, B.A., M.A., M.A.

**Dissertation**

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of  
The University of Texas at Austin  
in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements  
for the Degree of

**Doctor of Philosophy**

**The University of Texas at Austin**

**August, 2002**

## **Dedication**

In loving service to HH Tamal Krishna Goswami Srila Gurudeva, who passed from this world on March 15, 2002.

## Acknowledgements

Many people have contributed to the successful completion of this work, and I gratefully acknowledge their support and assistance. First and foremost gratitude goes to my parents and family, who have encouraged and supported me along the way. Also to my spiritual master, His Holiness Tamal Krishna Goswami Srila Gurudeva, who started this journey with me in 1995. Without his loving support and guidance, this work would not have been possible.

I would also like to extend a special thanks to my committee members, who formed a well-integrated team that provided me with the support and pressure necessary to complete my Ph.D. In particular I wish to acknowledge Elizabeth Keating and Joel Sherzer, who have worked with me since I started my graduate work at the University of Texas at Austin. I have benefited greatly from their insights into and critiques of my work throughout my graduate career, and am fortunate to have had the chance to work with them. Miyako Inoue has provided both dissertation and “big-picture” career advice over the past two years, and for that I am most thankful. I am grateful to Polly Strong for her attention to me both as a budding scholar and a person whose life extends beyond the realm of academic concerns. Jurgen Streeck provided a welcome perspective from outside the discipline of Anthropology in the strictest sense, and I always looked forward to hearing his thoughts on developing my work.

Jeff Kaplan worked closely with me over the past year and a half behind the scenes, and now is the time to ask him to come forward and “take a bow”.

At the University of Texas, I benefited greatly from readings and critiques on early drafts by Alice Chu, Elaine Chun, Pete Haney, Sandya Hewamanne, and Chantal Tetreault. I was fortunate to have their friendship and support.

Gergely Mohasci, Peter Siegenthaler, Cindi Sturtz, Yukako Sunaoshi, and Takashi Kobayashi all provided helpful input through introduction to scholarly sources, and in reading early drafts. I am thankful to have had their input at the early stages of this work.

My colleagues in the Department of Languages and Literatures, and the Japanese Studies faculty at Earlham College have been wonderfully supportive of my completing my degree, and allowing me the flexibility and time needed to do so while teaching full-time. I am thankful to them and my students for reminding me of why I began graduate school in the first place.

I am also thankful to all of my god brothers, god sisters, and other extended spiritual family members. The members of the Dallas ISKCON community - especially Nila Madhva and her family - have been especially supportive.

Thanks also to friends who have supported me throughout my graduate career, especially Becky Sedam, Cris Wolf, and Ruth Mullen. Thank you for your long-standing friendship and support.

To the people of Towa I must extend a special heartfelt “thank you,” for the love and support with which they have showered me. You have treated me as a member of the community since our first meeting in 1990, and I am fortunate to have been able to share some momentous times of my life with you. I hope that our relationship will continue for many years. The women at my research sites were all very helpful and accommodating, and I am most grateful for their help, without which this research would not have been possible. I was fortunate to have the support of the Towa Town Government, and would like to acknowledge the many large and small ways in which I was aided by that support. In particular I wish to thank the Lifelong Learning Division of the Board of Education, Rikizoh Aoki, Matsuo Obara, Mineo Odashima, Akira Sasaki, Yoshiko Sasaki, and Kikuko Yoshida for their help with practical matters related to my research, and for their moral support throughout my research and writing. The Aoki family, the Fujio family of Morioka, the Hayashi family, Yuhko Monma, the Odashima family, Atsuko Oikawa, Fumiko Ohishi, and Minako Yoshida all provided friendship and companionship. My time in Towa was greatly enriched by knowing you, and my research benefited from your native insights. Thanks also are due to Mayumi Chieda and Seiko Itoh for the long hours they contributed to transcribing the conversational material gathered for this research..

All thanks goes to those who have worked with me in seeing this project to its completion, and particularly to the many people who have supported me since the beginning of my graduate career.

Any mistakes in this work are mine.

**Bending the “rules”: Strategic language use in role and status negotiation among women in  
a rural Northeastern Japanese community**

Publication No. \_\_\_\_\_

Holly Anne Ogren, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2002

Supervisors: Elizabeth Keating and Joel Sherzer

This dissertation focuses on shifts in women’s use of three sets of linguistic features – gender-marked language, speech levels (*desu/-masu* and plain), and a local language variety - in Japanese within naturally occurring conversational interactions as sites where speakers negotiate role and status. The analysis complicates previous models that limit research on women’s language usage in Japanese to a focus on gender-marked forms, by broadening the focus to women’s language use, rather than women’s use of “Japanese women’s language. It also contributes to work that argues for more fluid models of status and hierarchy by showing how speakers use linguistic resources to negotiate roles, including shifting status within the same interaction.

The methodological approach integrates close analysis of particular interactions with background information on the participants and settings of these interactions, and is situated within the larger context of gender relations in contemporary rural Japan.

The findings on speech level shifts attest that speakers shift levels both as a means of marking discourse shifts (e.g., when closing a topic) and for particular interactional ends (e.g., to

make critiques). This aspect of the analysis also highlights the importance of including local language variety forms in interactional analysis, as these forms are an integral resource for speakers. In terms of gender-marked features, this dissertation demonstrates that women use feminine-marked features in interactionally effective ways, and that they make strategic use of masculine-marked features as well.

Taken together, these findings suggest the need for a reconsideration of women's language use in Japan, and a more complicated model of how role and status are created and modified by participants in interactions. This work also highlights the importance of future research that would examine regional ideologies about gender, and gender and language use, particularly in the face of current central-government programs aimed at promoting "gender equality".



## Table of contents

<b>Chapter One: Framework and setting.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter Two: Analytical framework and field sites.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Chapter Three: Activity-centered interactions.....</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>Chapter Four: Non-work interactions.....</b>	<b>156</b>
<b>Chapter Five: Conclusions.....</b>	<b>198</b>
<b>Appendix A: Dialect summary.....</b>	<b>207</b>
<b>Appendix B: Gender classifications for sentence-final forms (including IP).....</b>	<b>208</b>
<b>Appendix C: Dialectal forms in the data corpus.....</b>	<b>210</b>
<b>Appendix D: Transcript conventions.....</b>	<b>213</b>
<b>Appendix E: Uninterrupted transcripts.....</b>	<b>214</b>
<b>Bibliography.....</b>	<b>232</b>
<b>Vita.....</b>	<b>243</b>

## **CHAPTER ONE: Framework and setting**

### **FOCUS OF THE STUDY**

This work is fundamentally concerned with women's positions in Japanese society. In examining language usage among women in a specific community, I am interested in evaluating how well current models for women and language use (in Japan and more generally) account for the language usage I found among my research participants. Specifically, I investigate how these models help us – or do not - understand how women organize themselves socially through language use. Because I follow scholars who view language as both a resource for and a product of social interaction (Duranti 1997; Schiffrin 1994), I am interested in how women work within the parameters of the Japanese language (the “grammar”), and draw on the resources available to them within the language to create particular stances; to define, revise, and negotiate particular relationships as reflected in language use. Implicit in this stance is the idea that participants in interactions are social actors with agency (cf. Ahearn 2001); actors who do not always follow the “rules,” where “rules” refer to ideological/metalinguistic message about how people – particularly women – should speak. “Rules” also refer to the models and typologies that currently shape our perception and understanding of women's language use in Japanese society. They tell us what to expect of female speakers, and how to interpret female speakers' utterances. They are potentially limited in their applicability.

I begin with a broad introduction to investigating women's position in Japanese society, including the connections that have been made between women and language use, and women in Japanese society.

### **WOMEN IN JAPANESE SOCIETY**

What is the position of women in Japanese society? Popular writers and scholars both within and outside of Japan have devoted much time and energy to exploring this question (Henshall 1999, Hunter 1993, Imamura 1987, Iwao 1993, Lebra 1984, Morley 1999, Ogasawara

1998) but the findings are far from clear and consistent. On the one hand, this vast body of literature tells us that women are subordinate to men, as evidenced by, for example, corporate cultures and practices that generally keep women in short-term and/or low-level positions (Bishop 2000, Brinton 1993). On the other hand, the same body of work claims that women hold the reigns in the domestic sphere – for example, overseeing household finances and raising children. Popular writing and media paints a similar, seemingly contradictory, picture. Arthur Golden’s best-selling *Memoirs of a Geisha* (1995, see also Dalby 1999) presents a familiar image of “Japanese woman” as exotic, alluring and dependent. At the same time, well-known films such as *Minbo no onna* (‘A taxing woman’: 1987) portray a woman who is independent and effective enough to successfully fight against an organized crime (*yakuza*) gang.

In general, however, the perception of Japanese women in the west is as subordinate to men, particularly in the public sphere. Within Japan and among Japanese people themselves, there is general agreement that women in Japanese society are in different positions than men, but there is less agreement about the implications of this situation. One of the central debates within Japanese feminism since the turn of the (20<sup>th</sup>) century, for example, has been around what can be reduced to a question of “gender equality”.<sup>1</sup> On one side of this debate are those who argue that Japanese women and men should operate in “separate but equal” spheres; a position informed by notions that men and women are fundamentally and naturally different, but that their respective positions/roles should not be valued differently (see for example Ide 1997). On the other side are those who argue that both men and women should have equal access to all aspects of and positions in Japanese society (see for example Aoki 1997).<sup>2</sup> This debate is reflected in, for example, different opinions (primarily as expressed among feminists) about whether women should continue to be granted menstrual and childcare leave from the workplace. Some people maintain that women should be given such leave, but should not, as is sometimes the case now, be penalized for taking that leave (Ehara et al 1996, Kanai 1996, Ogasawara 1998).

---

<sup>1</sup> See the section on “Japanese feminism” in Chapter Two for details on this debate.

<sup>2</sup> Of course, not everyone falls neatly into one category or the other.

Other people argue that women should not be given such “special privileges”, or that similar privileges should also be extended to men (Ueno 1997).

Part of the interest in Japanese women’s position stems from perceptions that Japan is behind other post-industrialized nations in terms of gender equality and, specifically, women’s rights. From the perspective of Japan’s position in the international community, then, the question of women’s position in Japanese society is by no means a trivial one. Yet, even when the Japanese government has given tacit commitment to improving women’s rights, as when it signed the (United Nations) Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), there often has not been any action except under pressure from citizen’s groups. Such was the case with the eventual ratification of the Equal Employment Opportunity Law (EEOC) in 1986, when “...women used international media attention to embarrass the Japanese government into signing, and later on acting on [this treaty].” (Kanazumi 1997)<sup>3</sup> Women’s position in Japanese society has long been a central focus of the Japanese state (Lunsing 2001, Nolte and Hastings 1991, Rodd 1991, Rosenberger 2000, Uno 1991, Yoshizumi 1995), and the definition of women’s roles, and delineation of women’s actions within those roles, has been the object of much overt and covert ideological action.

#### **LANGUAGE AND WOMEN’S PLACE (IN JAPANESE SOCIETY)**

Language is one way in which women and women’s position in society has been shaped and discussed. One of the language forms that gained prominence in the grand sweep of standardization that characterized Japan’s “period of modernization” – the Meiji Period, from 1868-1910 – was what is known today as “Japanese Women’s Language” (hereafter JWL). As Miyako Inoue (1994, 1996) and others have shown, the promulgation of JWL as *the* language for

---

<sup>3</sup> In fact the law carried no sanctions for firms that did not adhere to it, and it was widely criticized as being mere show (see for example Nakano 1996). The law was revised in April of 1999, and the new version does carry sanctions (Bishop 2000).

Japanese women was nothing if not ideological, as JWL forms entailed particular notions of femininity and being a woman in Japanese society.

JWL is one piece of evidence that has been used to support the idea that women are subordinate to men in Japanese society. This notion of JWL as “subordinating” is reflected in comments by such prominent feminist activists and professionals as Aoki Yayoi, who has said that language is central to “the challenge facing Japanese women as they seek to redefine their role and status” (1997). Implicit in such statements is the idea that feminine-marked language does not allow Japanese women to realize particular roles within Japanese society; namely, those of authority and prominence. JWL limits women to particular – subordinate – positions in relation to men in Japanese society. Aoki’s comments also imply that as women seek to move outside of traditional roles (i.e., those that are already defined for them), language becomes problematic. That is, JWL is one piece that “keeps women in their place” (Cherry 1987, Endo 1995). Aoki’s comments are an example of the assumptions that are made about the relationship between JWL and women’s position in society. She is a useful person to cite since she and her body of work are well known in Japan and among non-Japanese scholars working in/on Japan, but it should be noted that she is hardly alone in the connections she makes between language and social position. Her comments are an example of a more widespread belief in the relationship between JWL and the position of women in Japanese society, namely, that the way women speak is part of what defines the position they have in society.

The work presented in this dissertation is part of efforts by many scholars to address the problems inherent in such an oversimplified linkage. The first problem is that there is not a direct link between language and gender. This can be demonstrated by the fact that if Japanese women were to suddenly begin “speaking like men” their language use would not necessarily mean they would attain the same social position as men. Sounding like a man and being a man are two very different things. To take an example from our own society, in English-speaking communities in the U.S. if a woman “speaks like a man” she is often labeled as aggressive and domineering. Similarly, in the same context if a man “speaks like a woman” he is often

considered weak and effeminate. These observations suggest that gender-marked language use is tied to particular stances and characteristics associated with masculinity or femininity, rather than to physically male or female bodies.<sup>4</sup> To return to the case of gender-marked language in Japanese, characterizations of feminine-marked language (JWL) as soft, ineffective, or polite stem from ideas associated with femininity. Thus, gender is related to language through the gender associations made with particular stances; JWL is associated with women – more specifically, “femininity” – who in turn are associated with being soft, weak, and polite. The negative characterizations of men and women who speak like the other gender (i.e., “like a man” or “like a woman”) also stem from ideas about femininity and masculinity. A person who speaks like another gender is thwarting the boundaries between genders, and specifically taking on parts of a differently gendered persona (cf. Butler 1990, see also Bem 1993). To take an example from a very different sphere, men in U.S. society who wear women’s clothing are not seen as “feminine” or “female”, but rather as “not masculine” or “effeminate”, both of which have negative overtones.<sup>5</sup> To be fair, Aoki herself (quoted above) is clear that JWL usage is an obstacle to social advancement for women because of the ideas associated with femininity that JWL invokes. According to her, JWL use is one way of marking the difference between men and women, a difference that is then “...invested with the value of femininity” (Aoki 1997: 4). This linguistic gender-difference marker is problematic, according to Aoki, because “...the difference produced by such tactics is a difference that grows out of a preexisting discrimination and only serves to replicate and reinforce the inferior status of the female speaker.” (ibid). Thus, although Aoki does recognize that linguistic features such as JWL have the effects they do because they are related to ideas about femininity, she also continues to assert that it is through language that the inferior status of women is replicated and reinforced.

---

<sup>4</sup> I will return to this point in Chapter Two, in the section on recent gender and language research in the west.

<sup>5</sup> Certainly in such cases men are sometimes referred to as “girls”, but not in the sense that they have actually become girls. Rather, such comments mean that cross-dressing men are “not men”, and therefore “like girls”, but yet not actually feminine in any positive sense.

This leads us to a second problem: although there has been a great deal of research done on gender-marked language in Japanese (Abe 1995, Endo 1995, Ide 1982, 1983, 1990, 1993; Ide et al 1986, Ide and McGloin 1991, Kobayashi 1993, Shibamoto 1985, Takasaki 1993),<sup>6</sup> there is still much we do not know about how women use feminine-marked language in particular, or gender-marked language more generally<sup>7</sup> in Japanese society. There has been very little research on how gender-marked language is used in actual conversational interactions, or how it is used in a variety of settings and regions (but see Dunn 1996, Okamoto 1995a, and Sunaoshi 1995, for exceptions). Thus, we are in a situation where feminine-marked language (JWL) is equated with “the way Japanese women speak”; an overgeneralization that ignores the variety of resources women may draw on when they speak, as well as the potentially wide range of speaking practices among women in Japan. Again, this is particularly problematic because ideas about language use are then extended to ideas about women in Japanese society. It is worth restating that these linkages between JWL and women’s position in Japanese are made to apply to all Japanese women, even though the actual ways in which women across Japan use JWL – and the way they use language more generally – is far from clear.

A third problem, and one which I have just alluded to, is that we do not know the range of linguistic resources women use in their conversational interactions. JWL has been the focus of most research on women’s language usage in Japanese, with the result that we have very little information on the broader question of how women speak. We have very little information on, for example, potential other ways of marking gender (in the social sense). That is, some scholars have claimed that the prevalence of gender-neutral (i.e., not marked for femininity or masculinity) forms among certain populations in Japan suggests that the language may be becoming more “neutral” (Kobayashi 1993). This assumes that if masculine- or feminine-marked forms are not used, then gender is not an issue. In my own data set, most speakers used

---

<sup>6</sup> Gender-marked language in Japanese includes masculine-marked and feminine-marked (JWL) language, but the majority of the research has focused on JWL.

<sup>7</sup> There are also gender-neutral forms in Japanese.

very few gender-marked forms. To say on that basis that gender does not matter among my speakers, however, would be a leap in logic that might well land one at the bottom of the proverbial well. We simply do not know enough about the ways in which gender is expressed in interactions to be able to say that the lack of gender-marked forms means gender is not something to which participants in interactions are attuned. The focus of most gender and language research that examines gender-marked language in Japanese has been oriented towards differences between men's and women's speech, and this in combination with the dearth of information on actual language usage means that the picture of men's and women's language use in Japan highlights differences rather than similarities. Again, JWL use has been extended to mean "women's language use," although we still know very little about how salient a linguistic resource this particular set of linguistic features is for speakers in a variety of settings.

My attention in this work is focused on contributing to efforts to address some of these problems. I worked with rural women because they are severely underrepresented in the literature; thus, by working with rural women, I hoped to provide information on women's language usage in regions that have as yet received very little attention. I focused on women as they worked in non-traditional roles (i.e., outside the home) in order to investigate how women use language in settings that, again, have been given very little attention in the literature. My interest in "role and status negotiations" stemmed from our lack of knowledge about how women use linguistic resources to create, maintain, and negotiate particular stances in relation to one another. In particular, I was interested in how women would negotiate roles associated with a particular status, such as a high-status teacher or advice-giver role. In conjunction with this, I purposely chose to examine "women's language usage" rather than women's use of Japanese women's language, in order to investigate the range of linguistic resources women draw on in negotiating role and status. As I outline in Chapter Two, my research therefore focuses not just on JWL, as much previous work on women's language usage has, but also gives attention to women's use of speech level (*desu/-masu* and plain) and local language variety forms.



This said, I did limit my investigations to verbal communicative strategies. Although non-verbal strategies (e.g., gesture, eye contact, and body positioning) are an important part of communicative strategies (see for example Kendon 1992), I made the decision to concentrate on verbal strategies in order to do have a limited and intensive focus rather than looking at several features – including non-verbal ones – superficially. In addition, as will become clear when reading about the sites where I conducted my research, many of the interactions I recorded and analyzed took place as women were involved in some other activity, activities which by necessity kept their non-verbal communication to a minimum. For example, in the weaving and story card sites where I worked, women participating in the interactions used their eyes and hands to make things while they talked with others in the setting. For this reason, eye contact, for example, at these sites could hardly be said to be typical of other interactions where participants were focused only on their interlocutor(s). I will return to the question of non-verbal communication and the importance of including such investigations in future work on women’s language use in Japan in Chapter Five.

This dissertation thus considers how speakers in the interactions I collected bend the “rules” of language usage. “Rules” is in quotations because of the point – discussed above – that we are operating under the potentially faulty assumption that the rules which account for linguistic interactions among the very limited group of individuals and settings that is the basis for the bulk of research on women’s language usage in Japan also account for what is found in every other setting and among every other group of participants that has not yet been researched. Given that we can but start with the typologies and models given us by preceding scholars, this limited body of work becomes the basis against which all other data is compared. However, as I have just outlined, this basis, this model, will not necessarily account for the actual variety found

in other data sets. For example, in my own data I found instances of gender-marked language use that cannot be accounted for in the traditional “feminine: weak, masculine: strong” schema.<sup>8</sup>

The lack of applicable models is true not only for gender-marked language but for the other two sets of features on which I focused as well: speech level shifts and local language variety usage. Previous research on speech level shifts cannot account for everything that I found in my data, and local language variety has been all but completely ignored until very recently in most research on language usage in Japan (see Sunaoshi forthcoming, for an exception).

Therefore, my title of “Bending the ‘rules’” points both to the idea that speakers may be breaking or bending rules for particular interactional goals, but also that these very rules may or not be applicable across settings and speakers. Thus, it is both the application of the rules and the rules themselves that need to be investigated.

To return to the specific focus of this dissertation, the analysis presented in Chapters Three and Four concentrates on three sets of features – gender-marked language, speech level shifts, and a regional variety of Japanese – in examining how women in a rural Japanese community use the linguistic resources at their disposal in offering, trying to take, and rejecting or accepting various roles within interactions. In so doing, this work contributes to several fields of scholarship.

## **CONTRIBUTIONS**

In addition to the contributions already discussed in terms of addressing problem inherent in the bulk of gender and language research in Japan, the research presented here also makes contributions to other specific areas.

---

<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, some scholars have argued that the 1980s saw suggestions of a reversal in this dichotomy; the perception shifting to women as strong and men as weak (Lunsing 2001: 167, Nakamura 1991, Watanabe 1989, 1991).

The first of these is our understanding of the connections between hierarchy and status, and role. This dissertation provides an analysis of how hierarchy and status are related to role negotiation, and specifically how participants in interactions use social and linguistic skills to strategically make these negotiations. This is particularly important in hierarchically oriented societies like Japan, where language is one way of marking social relationships that are central to people's functioning in the society.

In relation to my focus on shifts in speech styles, the research presented here also widens our understanding of the problematically vague terms “discourse cohesion” and “rhythm” in Japanese conversational interactions (cf. Ikuta 1983), by showing how participants use particular linguistic forms to mark shifts in conversational topic and focus. As Chapters Three and Four will show, shifts in linguistic features are related to what might be called the “shape” of particular interactions as, for example, when speakers shift to mark the end of a topic of conversation.

Methodologically, my approach follows that of a growing number of scholars in adopting and adapting both micro- and macro-oriented approaches. Because I am interested in the interactional effects of a given utterance, I use a modified version of the micro-oriented methodology conversation analysis (CA) to examine this aspect of my data. However, I am also interested in more macro-oriented questions such as what the details of particular interactions can tell us about broader issues of social organization and even social position. I therefore also use methods such as the ethnography of communication to enable me to include these considerations. The details of my methodological approach are given in Chapter Two below.

The research presented here also adds to our knowledge of rural women in contemporary Japanese society. Rural women are now the focus of competing discourses that ask them to reify “traditional” roles of mother and wife, while at the same time push them to move outside of traditional roles in seeking “gender equality” (*danjo byoudo*) and “empowerment” (*empawaamento*).

## **OUTLINE OF THE DISSERTATION**

I begin this chapter with a brief introduction to anthropological work in Japan, particularly regarding rural areas and rural women. This is followed by a sketch of the community where I did my research, and in particular how it has responded to issues facing rural communities in Japan more generally; again, with an eye to the effects on and place of women. The chapter concludes with an introduction to the community where I conducted my research.

Chapter Two gives details on the three sets of linguistic features that are the focus of the interactional analyses in Chapters Three and Four. This chapter also provides an overview of the methodological framework used in that analysis, and introduces the reader to the four sites from which interactional excerpts are taken in the subsequent two chapters.

Chapter Three focuses on activity-centered (i.e., work related) interactions, whereas Chapter Four looks at non-work-related interactions (such as gossiping and storytelling). In both of these chapters, detailed analyses of how speakers use the three sets of linguistic features on which I focus this dissertation – speech level, gender-marked speech, and local language variety forms – to negotiate role and status are given.

Chapter Five provides a summary of findings, a discussion of the contributions of my research, a reconnection with the questions of women's position in Japanese society and the usefulness of extant gender and language models to my data set posed at the beginning of Chapter One, and future research directions.

## **ANTHROPOLOGICAL WORK ON JAPAN: CENTER AND PERIPHERY, WOMEN AND GENDER**

One of the problems this research addresses is how very little we know about contemporary rural Japanese women. I have already discussed this in terms of the lack of information on rural women's language usage, but it can also be said of our knowledge of rural women more generally. This lack of knowledge is problematic because, just as with language, contemporary models of Japanese society based on center/urban settings and research have come

to represent all of Japanese society. At the same time, the urban/rural distinction – and the parallel center/periphery distinction - is becoming increasingly blurred as people and goods move back and forth between these general regions. We therefore are in need of models that account for both the urban and the rural and the urban/rural hybrid that is developing in contemporary Japanese society. Before turning to the particulars of why such a model is necessary, I will first give a brief overview of how anthropological work has developed in Japan, particularly with regard to topics related to women and rural issues.

Like many areas of the world, the anthropological study of Japan began in rural areas (Dore 1978, Embree 1939, Smith 1991). Early work provided “community studies” that outlined social structures and gave overall descriptions of social events and practices in particular rural communities. Embree’s *Suye Mura* was the first ethnography of Japan published in English, and the only one based on research done prior to WWII.<sup>9</sup> This work marks the start of anthropological work on Japan, and provides glimpses of what life in one village was like before the radical changes that swept Japan after the war. Both Dore and Smith’s works focus on villages in the immediate postwar years, and specifically how Occupation-era<sup>10</sup> reforms were already having an impact on village social structures in the early 1950s.<sup>11</sup> These early works focused on the high degree of cooperation that existed in villages in terms of both work and social activities, as well as the village-level institutions that supported these cooperative structures. For example, Embree’s work explains how villages were divided into a series of increasingly smaller groups (i.e., a neighborhood, then a group of a few household within the

---

<sup>9</sup> Embree conducted research from 1935-36, at which time Japan was already at war in the Pacific. Japan’s entry into WWII is generally marked by the occupation and establishment of a puppet state in Manchuria, in 1931. Thus, Embree’s work might be accurately referred to as a “non-post-WWII” study, rather than one that was conducted prior to WWII. For more on the changes that shaped Japan after WWII, see, for example, Dower 1999.

<sup>10</sup> Japan was the subject of an Allied Occupation – primarily staffed by Americans - from August, 1945 to April, 1952. During this time, the Occupation forces passed a series of far-reaching reforms, characterized by the words “demilitarization and democratization.”

<sup>11</sup> In the early 1970s, Dore did a follow-up study on the community where he had first done research in the early 1950s. The later publication, cited here, includes both references to the original work and details on the follow-up study.

neighborhood, etc.), according by household.<sup>12</sup> Any public work that needed to be done in the village – repairing roads, fixing the roof of the village temple, and so on – was distributed according to one of the groups within the village. The work of Dore and Smith suggest that these methods of cooperative labor distribution were gradually being eroded at the time they did their research, in large part because of the mechanization of agriculture (eliminating the need for cooperation in planting and harvesting) and the concomitant shift from full- to part-time farming.

Besides historical records (see for example Nagatsuka 1993, Walthall 1991) we also have some semi-anthropological research on gender relations in Japan before the end of WWII. Ella Wiswell – then Embree – was married to John Embree at the time he conducted his research in Suye Mura, and accompanied him in the field. She was fluent in Japanese – having lived there for most of her childhood – and quite able to function on her own in the village. She was not professionally trained as an anthropologist, but during her time in the field with her husband she kept extensive field notes, based in part on interviews with women in the village and in part on her own observations. Her non-professional research, eventually published under the title *The Women of Suye Mura* (Smith and Wiswell 1982), provides much more detailed information on the women of the village in particular, and gender relations more generally, than is given in Embree’s work. At that time Japan was primarily agricultural, and most things in people’s lives were centered on the home. As such, even though there was division of labor and to a certain extent separate gender spheres within the household, there was not the strict delineation between women in the domestic sphere and men in the public sphere (i.e., working outside the home) that characterizes contemporary gender-sphere distributions<sup>13</sup>. Indeed, often women were left to manage entire households – including earning a living through farming – for months at a time, as

---

<sup>12</sup> This is part of the *ie* (‘household’) system that formed the basis for many social relationships in pre-WWII Japan. This system was officially abolished under the postwar Occupation reforms, but the practices tied to the *ie* system did not immediately disappear. Indeed, some scholars trace the roots of recent “company-as-family” notions to the *ie* system (see, for example, the discussion of *ie* in Kondo 1990 and Hamabata 1990).

<sup>13</sup> See Ohinata 1995 and Ueno 1997 for the implications of urbanization on the creating of public/private gender role distribution in Japan. Also Tonomura, Walthall and Wakita (1998) for information on women and class in Japanese history.

their husbands did seasonal work in distant cities; a system called *dekasegi*.<sup>14</sup> This historical information is important to bear in mind when looking at contemporary gender relations, and in particular when considering ideologies about gender that claim to be based on “traditional Japan”.

As more and more of the Japanese population shifted from rural to urban areas following World War II, the focus of anthropological work similarly shifted from rural to urban areas (Bestor 1983, Hamabata 1990, Robertson 1991 and 1998, and Vogel 1972). While work in rural Japan has continued, the overwhelming majority of anthropological work on Japan since World War II (in terms of publications, from the early 1970s onward) has and continues to be oriented toward urban areas. Work on rural Japanese women – or gender relations more generally – has become even more scant than ever. One exception is Gail Lee Bernstein’s work (1983) *Haruko’s world*, which focuses on the life of a rural farm wife in the 1970s, and in particular how she (“Haruko”) played an active role in updating mechanization techniques in her community. More recent contributions to the literature on rural women are Mariko Tamanoi’s work on women and nationalism in rural Japan (1998), and Nancy Rosenberger’s work on life cycle choices among contemporary rural women (2000). However, in comparison to the large amount of research on contemporary urban women – particularly housewives – there is still very little work on rural women in today’s Japan.

One may well ask what the difficulty is in focusing attention – including attention to women - on urban/center areas, since that is where the majority of Japanese people live today. As I suggested at the beginning of this section, the problems have to do with questions of the center being taken as representative of the whole, including the periphery. Most broadly, a center-focused body of research potentially misses other, equally salient ways of being a member of Japanese society. Remarks by the Association of Asian Studies president in an address to the 2001 New York Conference on Asian Studies are particularly resonant here, as he remarked that

---

<sup>14</sup> This system is used in contemporary Japan to refer to ethnically Japanese (*nikkei*) people from Latin America who come to Japan as migrant workers (Befu 2000).

research in Asian Studies is gradually shifting from a focus on center/mainstream projects to ones that include what have heretofore been peripheral, marginal, or simply unknown. Such a shift moves us from homogeneous and homogenizing representations of Asia – including Japan – to more complex and broadly inclusive ones.<sup>15</sup> In the case of Japan, the inclusion of non-mainstream social actors, settings, and so on, quickly breaks down ideas about Japan as harmoniously homogeneous. As an example, Dorinne Kondo's seminal work on selves and society in Japan (1990) emphasizes the move from a "conflict-free" model of Japan wherein people work at peak capacity in wondrous harmony with one another for the common good to representations that show the tensions people balance in their lives between competing responsibilities and desires.

However, we still have very few methodological or theoretical tools that enable us to do effective research in peripheral areas. Much as scholarship in the social sciences over the last 15-20 years has sought to move outside of theoretical frameworks that presuppose Western-based versions of central concepts such as "self" and "power", so too must we now search for ways of investigating peripheral areas on their own terms, and not simply on the basis of how they measure up to center-derived models. In other words, we need to pay attention to a potential need to modify or dispense with models developed on the basis of research done in center areas to suit the particular situations of peripheral communities and societies, rather than applying them wholesale to non-urban settings. In relation to the focus on gender and language that is at the heart of this dissertation, this set of conditions leaves us with the problematic situation of having to base our analysis of peripheral language practices on center-based models of gender and language use.

To further complicate matters, we no longer live in a world – if we ever did – in which center and periphery can be neatly and completely separated from one another. The community

---

<sup>15</sup> This trend is not unique to those working in Japan, or those working in Asia more generally. The shift to a focus on process rather than result – that is, from placing people and situations in particular fixed boxes to looking at how people move between and around such boxes – is common to much recent anthropological work.



where I did my fieldwork (Towa), for example, could arguably be classified as part of the periphery. However, the flow of information and influence between this community and the “center” is not unidirectional (cf. Gupta and Ferguson 1997). Although certainly Towa is influenced by the center in terms of such things as fashion trends and family values through the mass media, the community itself also exerts an influence on the center. For example, the local government runs a summer youth camp that brings 80-90 young people from a Tokyo suburb (Kawasaki) to Towa for “rural experiences” (including farming, hiking, etc.) each year. Towa now also has a store and restaurant in Kawasaki that sells local Towa products. The store offers regular workshops on “traditional” arts and crafts from the Towa area for Tokyo-area residents, including occasional cooking classes. As an example of the blurring of not only urban and rural distinctions, but also traditional and contemporary ones, one of the classes that has been offered at least twice in the last 4 years is a “festival-sushi” (*matsuri-zushi*)<sup>16</sup> class. This class is taught by a woman from Towa who learned how to make this special kind of sushi in the Iwate Prefectural capital of Morioka from someone who was from the Tokyo area. She was certified in festival-sushi-making, but this is not a culinary form that has any connections to Towa other than the fact that the woman who teaches the class is from Towa herself. Thus, a “peripheral” woman (i.e., someone who lives in the periphery) learned a non-peripheral cooking method, and now teaches it to people residing in the center under the auspices of a store that promotes peripheral products.

Returning to the focus on gender and language research, this dissertation thus works at two levels in terms of localizing models of gender, language, and society. On one level, I am interested in how models of gender and language developed outside Japan can be applied to the Japanese case. On another level, I am interested in how center-based models of and research on gender and language can be applied to the case of the particular community in which I work.

---

<sup>16</sup> The special feature of this kind of sushi is the designs that are put into it. For example, the woman who teaches the class makes sushi that, when cut, shows the shape of a dragonfly or butterfly.

Although it is becoming increasingly difficult to separate out center and periphery concerns, there have at the same time been a series of domestic programs targeted specifically at rural revitalization. It is to these that we now turn.

### **(GENDERED) DISCOURSES OF REGIONALISM**

In order to understand how discourses of regionalism are gendered, we must begin with an exploration of how “regionalism” (that is, “periphery” or “rural”) has been constructed through recent center-derived discourses.

One of the most difficult and far-reaching problems that rural communities have faced since the end of WWII is depopulation. After the war, the mechanization of agriculture and land reform contributed to conditions in which few people could afford to be full-time farmers (cf. Ohno 1988, Otohiko 1985a and 1985b). More and more people began to work outside of agriculture and, because there often was not enough work to be found in rural communities, many people relocated to urban areas (recall the shift in population from rural to urban areas discussed above).

Starting in the late 1970s, the Japanese government began making concerted efforts to help rural communities remain economically viable, thriving places to live. It did so through a discourse that reified rural communities as sites of traditional Japanese cultural values; a discourse centered on the concept of *furusato* (‘one’s hometown or village,’ ‘one’s native place’) (cf. Kelly 1986, Knight 1993). Since this time, Japanese politicians in central and local governments, as well as mass media advertisers and programmers, have used *furusato* as “the dominant representation of ‘Japaneseness’” (Robertson 1991:104). That is, *furusato* has come to stand for what links Japanese people together, and what makes them Japanese. Some scholars refer to the results of this process as the “sentimentalization of the countryside” (cf. Ivy 1995), wherein rural communities, because they are *furusato*, become the focus of urban-dweller’s nostalgic yearning for a shared national past.

Some communities that participated in this “revitalization” program have become valorized as *furusato* for all Japanese (Tamanoi 1998). Tono, a community that lies roughly 30 miles to the east of Towa, is a prime example of a “national *furusato*.” The native ethnologist Yanagita Kunio collected and published folk tales from this community in the late 1970s and 1980s, and *Tono monogatari* (‘Tales of Tono’) have become a locus around which folk tales associated with the countryside and Japan’s past are centered.<sup>17</sup> The government’s active involvement in the reification of “tradition” through financial subsidies,<sup>18</sup> and the willingness of citizens in communities which received these subsidies to participate in this reification represents “... the investment in the survival of a continuous communality, guaranteed by the thought of tradition as unbroken transmission. (Ivy 1995: 16) This “continuous communality” is encouraged in places such as Tono by performances (in the local language variety<sup>19</sup>) of folk tales passed from generation to generation through “unbroken transmission.”<sup>20</sup>

It is, to say the least, ironic that contemporary discourses coming from the center reify the “national traditions” said to be found in rural communities. For one thing, life in the real history of rural communities was often quite harsh and difficult. Peasants were taxed excessively by local landlords, sometimes to the point of having barely enough to feed themselves. As an example, rice is associated with all that stands for traditional Japan (cf. Ohnuki-Tierney 1993), and contemporary rural communities pride themselves on locally grown rice. However, in “traditional Japan” many peasants could not afford to eat rice, since it had to go as payment to the landlords, so their diet consisted mostly of millet.

---

<sup>17</sup> See Ivy 1995 for a detailed discussion of the collection, publication, and revival of these legends.

<sup>18</sup> The first *furusato*-oriented program included a one-million yen (roughly \$100,000) subsidy for community development to every rural community. This subsidy was called the “*furusato*-development subsidy” (*furusato sousei kikin*), but many people refer to it simply as the “one million yen” (*ichi-oku en*) program.

<sup>19</sup> I refer to regional varieties of Japanese as “local language varieties”, rather than the more familiar term “dialect” (*hougen* in Japanese), because of the derogatory overtones of the latter; i.e., “dialect” as “non-standard.”

<sup>20</sup> The town of Towa, where I conducted my fieldwork, also boasts its own two-volume set of local folktales, called *Folktales of Towa: Legends of the Sarukaishi River*. These tales were collected by an art teacher named Tomio Tada, during his tenure at Towa Junior High School. The women in the Mandagera storycard group, one of my four field sites, use the stories in this set as the basis for their projects.

As I have already suggested, rural communities are also troubled by economic and social difficulties. Rural communities have actively participated in *furusato-zukuri*, and more recent *machi-zukuri* ('town building') programs despite the fact that this participation entails self-objectification. That is, "though they are objects of sentimentalization, the men and women living in [a particular] countryside or region are also eager participants in the business of sentimentalizing themselves" (Tamanoi 1998: 196). There are of course very pragmatic reasons for local citizens' willing participation in such sentimentalizing projects. From the perspective of local government officials, for example, *machi-zukuri* efforts are a means of making local communities economically viable, and thus retaining their populations. Local communities have thus played on the nostalgia for Japan's "rural past" to boost local economies, and provide job opportunities that will encourage people to stay in the area.

The rhetoric of *furusato* construction that underlies *machi-zukuri* discourses is gendered through the strong association of motherhood with this construction. In their role as mothers,<sup>21</sup> women are promoted as bastions of traditional values and transmitters of traditional culture to children through, for example, the collection and oral transmission of local folktales (Robertson 1991). Indeed, one could say that gendered discourses – and particularly discourses that focus on women as mothers – are central to the contemporary situation of rural Japan. For example, although the problem of depopulation is fueled by both young men and women leaving rural communities in large numbers, women are of particular concern because of the emphasis placed on their role as mothers. As Otohiko stated when discussing the decline of agriculture in 1985, "...many households [in rural Japanese communities] have no heirs willing to take over the family farm and many fear that rural society will lose the ability to reproduce itself" (6). Such sentiments speak to the focus on women as reproductive, as bearers of subsequent farming generations, as the vehicles through which agriculture will be sustained. Women-as-mothers is

---

<sup>21</sup> The term used in *furusato* rhetoric is *ofukuro-san* (lit. 'bag lady'), which is different from the more generic term for 'mother', *okaasan*. *Ofukuro-san* is "one of the most affective expressions for 'mother' used by males and evoked in a wide variety of sentimental media (Robertson 1991:22)

not a new focus of national concern, nor is it a new focus of concern for rural women in particular, but the *furusato* rhetoric has re-emphasized this theme. In this rhetoric, women-as-mothers are the transmitters of tradition; traditions that are at the very essence of what it means to be Japanese. In the context of discourses about rural women, women in this idyllic society bear successors to carry forward the essential, agriculture-based traditions that are the basis of Japanese society.

Just as there is a gap between the idealized agrarian lifestyle of *furusato* rhetoric and the sometimes harsh realities of contemporary farming life, so too is there a discrepancy between the roles rural women are being asked to take on, and the goals of large numbers of women. Raised in the affluence of contemporary Japan, many rural women are not attracted to the lifestyle of a farm wife and mother. More and more of these women exit rural communities, leaving behind them growing numbers of single men. This rural trend should be understood, of course, in the context of a broader nationwide tendency for women to marry and have children later in life, or not at all. However, as Mariko Tamanoi has argued, this trend has particular ramifications in rural areas. Because motherhood is so closely linked to the cultural nationalism that underlies *furusato* rhetoric, women who reject their role as local wives and mothers also reject their ties to the national cultural imaginary. That is, they reject their role as a Japanese woman, as defined by the *furusato* rhetoric.

New discourses about gender have arisen since the 1990s, partly in response to the failure of previous policies to cure rural Japan's ills. Discourses regarding gender equality (*danjo byoudo*) and women's empowerment (*josei no empawamento*) have grown particularly popular among rural women's group circles. According to scholars working on women in contemporary rural Japan (Fujitani 2001, Gergely 2001, Hikita 1996, Nakamichi 2000), this group of women is pictured as the vitalizing force of rural Japan, whereas men are the ones who stand in the way of change and modernization. Fujitani writes that policymakers now see the empowerment of rural women as central to the process of rural revitalization.

Rural women are thus placed at the intersection of traditional models of womanhood – focused on being mothers – and models of empowerment that suggest these earlier models are faulty by focusing on the need for innovation and change. Part of the reason I became interested in working with rural women, then, is because of the potential for change that exists for this group in Japanese society at the moment.

### **Gender ideologies in rural Japan**

Given this focus on defining rural women's roles, it is particularly important to take a brief side trip into an investigation of gender ideologies in rural Japan. On the one hand, we can say that programs that reify rural communities' "unbroken [Japanese] traditions" emphasize women's "traditional" roles as wives and mothers. Given this, it seems ironic that *machi-zukuri* programs have led to opportunities for women to work outside of these very traditional roles, as is the case with all of the women in the sites where I did my fieldwork.

From a historical perspective, however, is the shift to work outside the home a big change for rural women? As we have seen, early ethnographic evidence suggests that women were not limited to roles that are now considered "traditional": childcare and household upkeep. Prior to Japan's modernization/urbanization, the home was the site of production in both the labor and biological sense (i.e., this it was a work site and a site for bearing and raising children), and so there was not the clear demarcation of private and public spheres along gender lines that exists today. However, Embree's work and other historical sources also point out that men were considered to be the heads of household – although women or any other family member could represent the household at meetings – a position which carried with it considerable authority and control. In more recent times, women have both continued to be involved in agriculture and at the forefront of promoting technological change in farming practices (cf. Bernstein 1983). Women have been active outside of agricultural work as well, and there are many women who

share the job of maintaining a family business with other family members. Thus, motherhood is not the only – or even primary – salient role in many rural women’s lives.

At the same time, in many ways there are and have been very distinct spheres for men and women. Even though women have long been active in farming, for example, jobs are often divided along gender lines. In Embree’s 1939 study of a Japanese village, for instance, men and women worked in separate groups when planting and harvesting.

Gender relations in contemporary rural societies are no doubt influenced both by local histories as well as the proliferation of center-based discourses of gender through the mass media. For example, in Towa one finds very distinct gender spheres, as in the case of the local fire brigade organization. Members of the brigade are entirely male, and women (mostly spouses of the men in the brigade) have their own “women’s auxiliary”. The women provide food for the men during their drill sessions and biennial performances.<sup>22</sup> In such situations, men are very much on the “public” front, while women are behind them in the “private” sphere. However, both men and women march in the fire brigade parade. Social custom also dictates that spouses not be included in work-related functions, which can often further bifurcate the sexes.

Thus, while it would not be accurate to say that *machi-zukuri* programs have offered women opportunities outside homebound duties for the first time, these programs have resulted in many new commercially oriented activities that were not previously available. For example, Tamanoi (1998) notes that some women in the community where she did her research started a commercial noodle soup business – something that until that time had only been done at home - as part of efforts to draw in tourists to the community.

---

<sup>22</sup> Volunteer fire brigades hold a performance twice a year in which they demonstrate the skills they have developed in managing hoses. The performance often includes a competition between different teams, and town officials preside over it.

## Japanese Women's Language (JWL) and sentimentalization

There is also a contradiction between the reified roles of rural women as custodians of tradition and the way in which they are expected to speak, particularly that they use JWL. This language variety originated among elite samurai (warrior class) women, but was disseminated as “women’s speech” in the language standardization movements that accompanied Japan’s industrial and social modernization in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century (Inoue 1994). However, this standardization took hold to a lesser degree in many rural communities (Okamoto 1995). The fact that JWL was not incorporated as fully as in more urban communities may in part be due to less-strict division of work spheres (historically) discussed in the section above. Evidence from my own fieldwork suggests that this is also true today, as when a group of women jokingly portrayed what it would be like if a woman used JWL when working in the fields. They stated that you would not be able to get any work done if women used JWL in such situations. While it is true that there are situations that socially call for gender separation, as discussed above, it seems that the use of JWL in some instances is quite inappropriate and would even be comical. I will return to this point in Chapter Two, when considering ideologies about JWL.

Sentimentalization of the countryside has not included a move towards learning (for non-residents) or using (for residents) local language varieties. That is, one might expect to find that those involved in *machi-zukuri* activities – especially activities oriented toward outsiders – used local language varieties as part of their selling strategy. However, this is simply not the case. The main reason for this, in the case of my own informants at least, has to do with their level of competency in the local language, where being polite means speaking in standard Japanese<sup>23</sup>.

Thus, sentimentalization does not extend to language use; people in Towa do not use local language varieties as part of performing the “idyllic past” discourses on which sentimentalization is built when interacting with outsiders.

---

<sup>23</sup> The section on “Local language varieties” in Chapter Two deals with this issue more explicitly.



### ***Machi-zukuri* and gender-equality programs**

The ramifications of *machi-zukuri* programs – and the discourses that inform them – for women must also be considered in relation to recent central government legislation aimed at promoting gender equality. The Equal Employment Opportunity Law (EEOL) passed in 1986 and in particular the creation of legislation in 1999 to ‘promote the development of a society where men and women live together equally’ (*danjo kyoudo sanku suishin*, hereafter DJK) have both effected – at least at the level of local government discourse – changes in relations between men and women in communities throughout Japan, including Towa. The revised EEOL does much to help ensure that women have a fair chance at job opportunities, and that their jobs are protected once they have them. This law has made gender inequality in the workplace a major issue in Japan, and has indirectly led to a number of harassment complaints and even court cases.

The DJK was initiated by the central government in 1997, but did not become law until 1999. In terms of what the DJK will do for gender equality in local communities, those I spoke to in Towa (in 2000 and 2001) were skeptical that it was specific enough to have much effect. However, local governments are now required by law to have a DJK section, which works to promote gender equality in some form or another. In Towa this has led to the establishment of a “women’s town council” (*josei gikai*), whose ultimate aim is to help women become members of the local town council (there has never been a woman on the council). The group was formed in 1999, and spent their first year identifying issues of particular concern to women in the community, researching these issues, posing questions related to these issues to the town council in a public forum, observing the running of the council, and holding a symposium at which they presented their experiences and findings to the community.

Despite the lack of hard evidence for significant change as a result of these programs, and the skepticism expressed by local residents that such a vague program as the DJK will have any real effect, it is important to note that the *machi-zukuri* programs in which the women who are the focus of this research are involved take place in a broader context of initiatives aimed at changing current gender relations and ideologies. The question of what effect these programs

may actually have cannot yet be answered, nor can we say whether such top-down programs will be malleable enough to suit the needs of individual communities. Nevertheless, the very fact the gender equality is such a prominent discourse at the moment is significant.

Having drawn the model of *machi-zukuri* and its surrounding discourses in broad strokes, I now turn to an introduction of one particular town and how it has responded to these discourses and initiatives.

## **SETTING**

### **The town of Towa**

The 13-hour trip from Dallas to Narita International Airport puts me within five hour's reach of my final destination: Shin Hanamaki Station on the Japan Railways Tohoku Bullet Train Line. After navigating the catacombs of Tokyo Station and the concrete jungle that literally is Tokyo, it is refreshing to see the rice paddies and mountains on the three-hour bullet train trip north. Having made this trip many times, I am familiar with each stop, and the anticipation builds as Shin Hanamaki Station gets closer. This time I know I will be met by old friends – people I met during my first stay in Towa from 1990-1992 – and though I struggle to keep myself awake in order to avoid suffering from jet lag for the next week, I can almost picture familiar faces as the station gets nearer. Kitakami Station, and the next one is mine so I stir from my seat to get my luggage ready. Shin Hanamaki Station is not a major stop, and the doors will only be open for a few seconds. I make it off the train, down the two flights of stairs (I cheat and use the escalator) and out into the area where you hand over your ticket. Beyond the wicket are tired, but smiling, faces; after all, I have made it in on the last train at 10:19 PM, and they have all been waiting for me at the office. Since I worked for the local government when I was in Towa from 1990-92, I recognize some of the faces of the people who have come to greet me, but others are new (civil servants periodically switch departments within the local government). It is dark, and as we are now in the countryside, once we are away from the sterility and fluorescent lighting at the station, it is pitch black. Though I cannot see it, I know we are driving past the

local railroad line that connects Towa to the eastern coast of Iwate Prefecture, and I know we are passing into the Oyamada area of Towa once we go past the train crossing. It is May, and the rice paddies are brimming with rice seedlings and frogs. They soothe me to sleep on my first night back in this familiar yet new place.

I first went to Towa as a new college graduate, fresh out of the classroom and into my first job. I worked for the local government those two years, as an assistant English teacher in the local junior high schools and as an international liaison: translating letters, acting as interpreter, guide, counselor, and whatever other role was required of me for visitors from other countries, and getting to know the sights, sounds, people, and feel of the community.

This time I was back as a researcher; a graduate student with funding money in hand and a project waiting to be realized. How would people respond to my new position; to the me of 1999 that was similar yet different from the me people had gotten to know in 1990-92? As I listened to the soothing sounds of hundreds of frogs croaking in the rice paddies around me (it is a sign of my initial romanticization of my surroundings that when I waxed rhapsodic about the nightly frog croaking my friends thought I was crazy not to be bothered by the “noise”), I wondered what the town of Towa had in store for me this time.

Towa is in many ways unexceptional but, like any community where you spend a substantial length of time, is at the same time quite exceptional. As the saying goes in Japanese, *sumeba miyako*, or “wherever you live becomes home,” and Towa has certainly come to be a “second home” for me. Home for the people I lived and worked with is a community of farmers, teachers, parents, neighbors, relatives, and friends, as well as people you would just as soon avoid. Like many small towns the world over, news of events travel quickly in Towa, and any time a siren is heard people speculate on who might be in need of emergency assistance. It is a town where knowing a last name is not nearly enough, since there may be 50 people in town who share that name. Knowing whom they are related to and where they live in relation to other people in town, however, can sometimes clarify everything. A typical conversation about a particular person might go something like this:

A: Oh, you know Mrs. Obara's daughter got engaged.

B: Mrs. Obara's daughter? Didn't she already get married?

A: No, you must be thinking of Tetsuo Obara's daughter. She married the Kosuga boy who lives next to the Odashima's store. This is Tatsuo Obara's daughter. You know, the one who competed in the inter-regional high school athletic meet three years ago.

B: Oh, and her mother always wears the aprons with the flowers on them? They live up the road from Tetsuo Obara's wife's parent's house?

A: Yes, that's the one. Well, she...

Towa was selected as my research site not because it is a shining *machi-zukuri* success story, nor because people in this community are particularly aware of language and gender issues. Rather, it was selected because it is rural, because I already had ties to the community, and because it is typical of what one might find in any number of similar small towns in the area. This study is therefore not intended to be a representative sample of what women's language usage is like in Iwate Prefecture, in the Tohoku region,<sup>24</sup> or in Japan more generally. It is intended rather as a case study of how language is used in one particular community, and what light speakers' use of language in this community can shed on our previously held notions.

Towa is sandwiched between Hanamaki to the west and Tono to the east. The local castle, called *Tsuchizawa Date*, served as a territorial outpost during the Tokugawa Period (1600-1867). Kabura Village, known today as the Tsuchizawa district of Towa, was a stopover point between the Sanriku Coast in eastern Iwate Prefecture and inland towns such as Hanamaki and Kitakami. Towa consists of 24 administrative districts and has an area of 157.51km<sup>2</sup>. Tsuchizawa and Ahyo are the central districts of the community, and it is here that one finds the largest concentration of business, as well as the town office, community center and other facilities central to the operation of the city government.

---

<sup>24</sup> Tohoku literally means "northeastern." This region also includes Aomori, Yamagata, Akita and Miyagi Prefectures (as shown on the map of Tohoku).

The town of Towa originated with the Municipality Amalgamation Law of 1955. At that time, the town of Tsuchizawa and the villages of Oyamada, Nakanai, and Taninai (still separate districts within Towa) were merged to form a new town called “Towa”.<sup>25</sup> Although each of the amalgamated municipalities has a history of its own, the town of Towa is thus only close to 50 years old. Despite the amalgamation, there are still distinct districts within the community, and there are still many situations in which one’s district within Towa is very important. Addresses, for example, are based on a location within a series of increasingly smaller areas (as they are throughout Japan). Thus, a given house address will state that it is in the town of Towa, in the Oyamada district, in the fifth sector of that region, and so on. Each district maintains several district-based organizations and activities, including public citizen’s halls (*kouminkan*) where many district-wide events are held. Like many rural communities in Japan, Towa is quite large geographically, though small in terms of population. To get from the central area of Tsuchizawa to Lake Tase, for example, takes 20-30 minutes by car.

Towa is primarily agricultural, and its main products are apples, rice, beef and soy products (miso and soy sauce). There are also about 250 people employed as civil servants by the local government, as well as several more small local industries. Many other people commute to the neighboring cities of Hanamaki or Kitakami.

Towa also shares the problem of population retention with many other towns of its size. It currently (fiscal 2000) has a population of approximately 10,950, but the numbers drop on an average of five people per year. Local citizens bemoan the fact that the list of deaths in the monthly community newsletter put out by the local government always far outweighs the number of births. Many people born and raised in Towa do not remain, but instead relocate to other, usually larger, places. This is particularly true of children other than the eldest, for the tradition of the eldest son or daughter remaining with their parents (or returning after a few years

---

<sup>25</sup> The Chinese characters (kanji) that make up “Towa” are “east” (*higashi*) and “peace” (*wa*).

outside the community) on the family land is still strong in this area. At the same time, there is also a sense of pride in and attachment to the community among those who have remained there.

### **Towa's *machi-zukuri* programs**

The one-million-yen subsidy the Japanese central government passed out to rural communities for *furusato-zukuri* in the early 1980s was used by these communities in a variety of different ways. In Towa was used to build a strong international exchange program and a little-used “information center” (*jouhou sentaa*). Programs that currently fall under the rubric of *machi-zukuri* in Towa include a program that hosts 60-80 schoolchildren from the Tokyo area for a four-day farm experience and home stay, several international exchange programs, and a nursing care and day care facility for the community's elderly.

Towa is also typical of many rural communities in its emphasis on its rich natural surroundings in trying to attract visitors and (ideally) residents. This has given birth in the last 10 years or so ‘green tourism’ (*guriin tsuurizumu*, roughly equivalent to eco-tourism) programs that offer visitors a chance to explore rural areas by engaging with natural surroundings. IN the summer of 2000, for example, the local Agriculture and Government Division of the local government ran a “wild vegetable cooking course”, which involved gathering wild vegetables (*sansai*) from the local mountains and then learning how to use them in various delicacies. Natural surroundings are spoken of in terms of another valuable resource (*shigen*) for the community, and citizens are encouraged to value and protect this resource as part of *machi-zukuri*.

## Field-site selection

The first two months of my research period were spent investigating a variety of possible research sites, of which four were selected. The selection was made on the basis of whether there was a woman (or women) holding a position of authority in the group,<sup>26</sup> as well as whether the group was part of Towa's *machi-zukuri* efforts. Each site is tied to a particular aspect of *machi-zukuri* programs in Towa,<sup>27</sup> as indicated below:

### 1. Preservation of local traditions

- Hataya – a workshop where products using a local weaving technique are made and sold.
- Mandagera – a group that makes picture story cards (*kami shibai*) to go with local folktales.

### 2. Making life long and meaningful

- Horticultural therapy – a local government program that does physical and mental rehabilitation for elderly patients through gardening.

### 3. Agricultural innovation

- Tsutanowa diner – run by women from a local agricultural women's cooperative.

The next chapter outlines the theoretical and methodological framework for the analysis that follows in Chapters 3 and 4, and introduces key concepts and terms that will be relevant to that analysis.

---

<sup>26</sup> In other words, whether there was some hierarchy that would enable me to initially focus on the woman or women ostensibly in charge.

<sup>27</sup> The three areas I list here are a combination of town promotional literature and my own sense of what themes run through *machi-zukuri* in Towa from talking to people and living in the community.

## **CHAPTER TWO: Analytical framework and field sites**

This chapter begins with a brief history of the development of my research project, and returns to some of the problems related to gender and language research that were discussed in Chapter One. I then turn to a consideration of “power”, then to a discussion of key concepts in models of Japanese society. From there, I move to an overview of gender and language research, both in and outside of Japan. Next, I offer a discussion of politeness and honorifics, again including central theoretical models. This is followed by a section on critiques of universal politeness theories from the perspective of scholars who work with Japanese, after which is a section on formal linguistic structures related to politeness in Japanese. I then turn to a consideration of more recent gender and language models, and conclude the “features” discussion with an overview of the local language variety used in Towa. The next large section considers my methodological orientation, and provides a brief overview of the approaches that inform my analytic perspective. Finally, this chapter gives a brief introduction to each of the groups with whom I worked during my fieldwork, as a lead in to the interactional analysis that follows in Chapters Three and Four.

The original focus of this dissertation was on women’s use of Japanese Women’s Language (JWL) in a rural community, and in particular the linguistic resources women in non-traditional roles – specifically, roles in which they oversaw the work of others, and were thus in some kind of authoritative position – used. Did women, for example, eschew the use of JWL in making authoritative decisions, since this set of linguistic features would not seem to lend itself to an authoritative stance of determination and certainty? I was thus interested in two things: 1) whether women used JWL; and 2) if they did, how and to what effect. As outlined in Chapter One, it soon became clear that a strict focus on JWL would not enable me to answer the larger question of women’s language usage in the community where I worked. However, I outline here the move from a JWL focus to one which included other linguistic features in order to reiterate the problems inherent in much research into women’s language use in Japan(ese).



I had two expectations about JWL usage going into this research: 1) that female speakers in the community would use very little JWL, and 2) that there would not necessarily be a straightforward answer to whether JWL usage was “powerful” or “powerless.”<sup>28</sup>

The first expectation was based on personal communication with native Japanese speakers as well as anecdotal information provided by scholars such as Shigeko Okamoto (1995), who stated that women in farming and fishing villages tend to use less JWL. It was also based on the fact that JWL is actually better understood as a particular variety of Japanese, rather than one in which all Japanese speakers are equally invested. The section in this chapter on “JWL as standard” provides more detail on this point, but for now it is important to note that one of the reasons JWL is thought to be less commonly used among rural female populations is that it connotes urbanity, education and sophistication. However, there has been almost no research that investigates JWL usage in non-urban areas, so my expectation was based on compelling anecdotal evidence rather than empirical studies that could form the basis for a comparison. In fact it soon became clear that any claims about frequency would be difficult to make, again because there were no previous studies with which to compare my own findings. Much of the previous research on JWL – in urban or rural settings - has not measured how frequently JWL is used among populations under investigation. This said, there *is* anecdotal evidence of an expectation that JWL is used regularly among female populations as witnessed, for example, by consistent reactions of surprise and sometimes disbelief from non-native Japanese scholars that I found very few instances of JWL (or gender-marked speech in general) in my data.<sup>29</sup> The study presented here does not provide quantitative data to convincingly argue for frequent or infrequent use of JWL for the entire data set. However, one reason I became interested in looking at shifts is because JWL features stood out in primarily gender-neutral conversations.

---

<sup>28</sup> This chapter includes a discussion of “power” terms.

<sup>29</sup> This kind of reaction has come mainly from other Japan scholars who have extensive contact with native Japanese speakers in academia. My suspicion is that the expectation for using JWL among women in this group is higher because, again, of the air of sophistication and education JWL usage brings. In other anecdotal evidence, people in the community where I conducted my research were rarely surprised that I found very little JWL in my data, suggesting that their expectations of usage were quite different.

That is, as I examined my data, instances of JWL were “marked” (Myers-Scotton 1994) in relation to the surrounding utterances<sup>30</sup>. Thus, although this study does not challenge or support the idea that women in rural farming areas use less JWL than women in urban centers (and again, to try and do so would be nearly impossible for the lack of comparable data), it does claim that JWL usage in this data corpus was infrequent enough that it stood out – was marked – against the backdrop of primarily non-JWL utterances.

In considering the second expectation – that it would be difficult to make clear cut statements about how JWL usage is related to “power” – it quickly became clear that part of the difficulty in building a response stemmed from the applicability of the terms “Japanese women’s language” and “power” to my study.

### **From “power” to “interactional efficacy”**

“Power” is a term that has been of interest to many in the social sciences, but because it is used in so many ways – it signifies so many things – it is often difficult to know exactly what is meant when an author uses “power.” In the literature on gender and language generally, and work on gender and language in Japanese more specifically, “power” is an almost inescapable term. For example, JWL is said to be “powerless”, and JWL usage is linked to “powerless” positions for women in Japanese society; but what do such statements really mean?

In Linguistic Anthropology – based on models developed in the social sciences more generally – the most general concept of “power” comes from the notion that language is reality-constituting (Philips 2001). Within this broad framework, there are basically three ways models for discussing how language constitutes reality. The first is a focus on language as reality-constituting through the structure of language itself (grammar). This is what is behind statements like “JWL is ‘powerless’”; that the forms – the grammar – of JWL makes it ineffective in constituting reality. For example, stances of uncertainty associated with JWL mean that these forms do not have as much of an impact on reality-constitution as, for example,

---

<sup>30</sup> Myers-Scotton’s model, and the notion of “shifts” will be discussed in the section on “shifts” below.

masculine-marked forms that are associated with stances of certainty. As Philips says in relation to a general, western context, “[m]en have more power than women in defining social realities by virtue of their attention to the certainty and reliability of their assertions” (ibid: 191). Notice that even in this model of “power-as-reality-constituting-grammar”, however, we are back to the assumption that forms determine efficacy. Under such a model, the perception that JWL is a speech style that confines women to particular roles – namely, roles that keep them in positions of subservience to men – would seem to make sense. However, as I have already discussed, this does not take into account how people use forms in actual interactions.

Closely tied to any model of “power” are questions of agency; for example, how much impact or effect a particular individual has on his/her surroundings (Ahearn 2001). In the model just discussed, where power is located in the language forms themselves, individual speakers have agency according to the linguistic forms that are available to them (Bourdieu 1991). A second model of power moves away from an assumption that there are those who have power and those who do not. Here we find work that claims the constitution of reality (i.e., “power”) is in discourse itself, most notably in the works of Michel Foucault (1979, 1980). In such a model, individual actors have relatively little impact in the face of social discourses, and thus individual human agency is downplayed. Other scholars have focused on just the opposite in highlighting how every participant in an interaction, for example, has the power to shape a continually emerging reality through the process of taking turns at talk in a conversation (Philips: 191). Conversation analysis, for example, emphasizes that every turn of talk transforms the meaning of what has gone before it (Sacks 1974), and this is the case no matter what the relationship between interactants may be (superior/subordinate, social equals, etc.). In the case of my own research, this model enables us to examine what people do with particular linguistic features in interactions. For example, it does not presuppose a particular meaning for JWL forms, but rather provides a framework for investigating how interactants use these forms in particular ways, as part of a range of linguistics resources for collaboratively constructing reality through interaction with others. I will return to this point in my discussion of conversation analysis below.

This model is also quite interesting when applied to societies like Japan, where there is both support and contradiction for such a model. On the one hand, there is a long history of metalinguistic awareness and discussion of the collaborative nature of interaction<sup>31</sup>, which would seem to support this model. On the other hand, there is not the same focus on the individual – or at least on the individual as construed in western philosophy – that is presupposed in this model.

A third model of “power” focuses on large-scale, power-laden sociohistorical processes that shape and are shaped by the power of language (Philips: 192). For example, Inoue’s work explores the development of JWL as a defining category of Japanese women, and part of a sociohistorical process that shaped constructions of “woman” and “femininity” in modern Japan, in part through language. Although not the focus of this dissertation, the “big picture”, as it were, of how JWL – and women’s language use more generally – has been constructed and controlled in modern Japan is of interest because of the discussion of gender ideologies inherent in these processes. As I stated at the beginning of this dissertation, I am ultimately interested in considering women’s positions in Japanese society, and sociohistorical forces that inform contemporary language use are necessarily involved in such a consideration.

In terms of this dissertation, the second model of “power” is the most relevant, focusing as it does on how participants collaboratively shape reality through their interactions. However, I have chosen not to use the word “power” in this work because of the other, confusing ways in which the word is used in the literature on Japanese language and gender. Instead, I speak of the “interactional effects” or “efficacy” of particular utterances when analyzing the interactional excerpts in Chapters Three and Four below.

Another reason I eschew the use of “power” is because of the meaning it carries in the literature on women and language in Japan. When scholars suggest that women’s language is “powerless” they lead us back to one of the problems identified at the beginning of Chapter One:

---

<sup>31</sup> For example, *kyouwa* (lit. ‘cooperative talk’) is a notion that has long been available for talking about conversational interaction.

the underlying assumption that it is the forms that determine the efficacy – i.e., the ability to constitute reality – of a speaker’s utterances; not the speaker, not the setting, not the interaction between a particular speaker and other participants.

A passage from an interview with well-known Japanese women and language scholar Sachiko Ide highlights these problems. During her interview for Sandra Buckley’s 1997 book, Ide recalled the speech of a businesswoman at a recent luncheon she had attended. In commenting on this woman’s speech, Ide said the following:

...[she] establishes a distance between herself and others through the very careful selection of her speech levels. It is this distance, which she is always in control of, that enables her to manage the atmosphere of any situation no matter how tense or difficult. *Her use of women’s language is brilliant. You could never argue that she is in any way lowering her own position in relation to those she is speaking with. She makes the tradition work for her.* Owing to her high professional and intellectual status, *she has access to a whole range of honorific forms are unavailable to anyone else present, especially the men.* This distinguishes her from everyone else, and she is able to manipulate it into a strong mechanism of influence.

(Buckley 1997: 40, emphasis mine)

Ide’s comments show that there is at least one occasion where JWL features are not ineffective or “powerless,” as previous models have suggested. In fact, according to Ide this woman is at an advantage in having access to linguistic resources that others in the room do not. Further, this woman “makes the tradition work for her.”

Following this passage, Ide remarks that there is a need for models of power that account for a variety of social structures, not just structures in which some people have power and others do not. Scholars working in Japan (Watanabe 1993) and other areas of the world (Duranti 1994, Keating 1998) where hierarchy is a salient social structure have also done much to show how hierarchy and collaboration are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Again, a focus on interaction within a model that considers that collaborative construction of reality can leave room for the possibility of a variety of structures. In order to better understand how this can be the case, I will now turn to a consideration of collaboration and hierarchy in the literature on Japan.

## **Hierarchy and collaboration**

Japan can safely be characterized as a society in which hierarchy is an important consideration. Social scientists working in Japan have claimed, for example, that Japan is a “vertical society” (Nakane 1970), wherein people compete with one another within particular “frames” (*ba*) such as a company or a school. According to this model, there is comparatively little horizontal competition or cooperation, and instead societal position is based on one’s relation to one’s company, school and so on. Thus, for example, there are few trade-based unions, and if one company’s steelworkers were to go on strike it is unlikely that there would be a strike by all steelworkers. Nakane argues that this is because people identify with their company before their occupation; that is, one’s employer is more salient than one’s profession. Within this system, there are layers of hierarchy within particular institutions, as well as across society. Ranking based on seniority within schools and companies is omnipresent. In a junior high school, for example, it is not uncommon to see 7<sup>th</sup> grade students bowing to 9<sup>th</sup> grade students as they pass in the halls.

It is important to note that although hierarchical, Japanese society is not strictly divided along hierarchical lines in relation to those who have power (in terms of constituting reality) and those who do not. Rather, there are certain rights (“power”) but also certain responsibilities associated with each person’s place. For example, a company president would not be expected to serve tea to visiting guests himself, but rather the expectation would be that some junior person in the office – often a woman – would do so. It is the right of the company president to have tea served by a junior staff member, and the responsibility of the junior staff member to do so. On the other hand, the company president also carries many more responsibilities than the tea-server. For example, it is not uncommon for company presidents to resign if there is some scandal that involves the company. Ultimately, it is the company president who has responsibility for the well being of the company, and this is hardly an expectation that would be placed on a junior employee. The company president also has responsibility for the well being

of his employees, and this can extend to, for example, arranging marriages (or at least meetings) for employees.

Within this hierarchical framework, there is also a large body of indigenous work that discusses interactions – including linguistic interactions – as collaborative. For example, the notion of “cooperative talking” (*kyouwa*), is part of metalinguistic discourse that considers how speakers work together to create meaning in interactions. Much has been made of the so-called “inscrutability” of the Japanese language, wherein more is left unsaid than said. While I would argue this is more a product of ethnocentric, “Japan-as-unique” discourses,<sup>32</sup> it is at the same time important to note that the idea fuels the concept of collaboration between participants in interactions, given that (according to the “inscrutability” model) one has to actively interpret what one’s interlocutor says in order to make any sense of it. Knowing one’s place, and one’s relationship to others, is an important part of knowing how to function in particular situations.<sup>33</sup>

Entailed in this cooperative model of interaction is the need to “know your interlocutor”. If you know enough about your interlocutor, you know how to speak and behave; by the same token, if you do not know, you are at a loss for an applicable framework. This attention to form has been discussed in relation not only to interpersonal interactions, but a variety of other social phenomena as well (see for example, Ben-Ari et al 1990). Form is not everything, but it is very important, and the form is based on the relationship between people involved in the exchange.

One way of determining one’s relationship to others is through a consideration of an important indigenous dyad: *uchi* and *soto* (‘inside’/‘outside’). This is also related to *ura/omote* (‘front/back’) and *tatemae/honne* (‘superficial/outward’/‘true feeling/inward’) distinctions. All are centered around the distinction between public (front, outside) and private (back/inside) behavior (see Moeran 1984 for a more detailed comparison of these terms). Often *uchi/soto* is

---

<sup>32</sup> This “theory of Japanese-ness” (*nihonjinron*) has received a great deal of attention in scholarly literature over the past few years (see for example Befu 2001). Put simply, there is an indigenous body of literature that proclaims the uniqueness of things Japanese, and the impossibility, therefore, of outsiders (i.e., non-Japanese) understanding them. For a treatment of *nihonjinron* and Japanese language, see Fair 1996.

<sup>33</sup> It is no small irony that despite this long-standing attention to language-in-interaction, most of the research on Japanese women’s language usage has been based on non-interactional models.

used to refer to “in-groups” and “out-groups”, as when talking about language choices. For example, polite forms (*desu/-masu* forms discussed later in this chapter) are used with *soto* or “out-group” members, and plain forms are used with *uchi* or “in-group” members. The more *soto* a person is to you, the more formal and distant the interaction; not just in terms of language, but in terms of behavior more generally. For example, a guest (*soto*) will be shown into a formal sitting room, served tea and snacks in a nice presentation, and be spoken to using polite forms (*desu/-masu*). A family member (*uchi*), on the other hand, will spend most of his time in the interior of the house, drinking tea and perhaps eating leftover cake from a guest’s visit, and being spoken to in informal (plain) forms. Japanese society is by no means unique in the clear distinction made between *uchi* and *soto*, but it is important to note that it is a significant framework for determining one’s own speech and behavior, and for understanding that of other’s. Learning how to negotiate *uchi/soto* boundaries, and how to judge *uchi/soto* relations in particular situations, is part of becoming a socially mature adult in Japanese society.

*Uchi* relationships that are very close can be characterized by *amae*. Developed most notably in work by psychologist Takeo Doi (1973, 1986), *amae* (‘dependency’) has been cited as another key concept in understanding social relationships in Japan. According to the *amae* model, Japanese people seek relationships with others that mirror the one they had with their mothers as infants and young children, one of complete dependence and indulgence. In this model, the person receiving *amae* is completely dependent on the *amae*-giver, and is thus relieved of any responsibilities or worries. In other words, *amae*-relationships are ones in which the person receiving *amae* does not have to attend to social relationships and proper form.

At the same time that there is a great deal of emphasis placed on proper form according to time, place and circumstance, the fluidity of the system is also emphasized. For example, a person who is *soto* to you in one setting may become *uchi* in another. To take an example from Jane Bachnik’s contribution to Bachnik and Quinn’s 1994 collection of essays on *uchi* and *soto*, a sister-in-law visiting her brother’s wife was treated as *soto* when she first arrived (she was served tea, shown into the guest room, etc). However, during the course of her visit a call came



announcing the sudden arrival of her niece's prospective in-laws. At that point, the sister-in-law became *uchi*, and was asked to come into the kitchen and help prepare refreshments for the guests.

### **Relational selves?**

This fluidity within relatively strict forms, and the collaboration within hierarchy that goes along with it, is a theme that runs through much work on and within Japan. In terms of language use, scholars have pointed to the seeming fluidity of self that is evidenced by pronoun usage in Japanese (see for example Kondo 1990, Smith 1983). Although personal pronouns are often elided in conversation, in Japanese there are numerous pronouns for each personal subject category (first person singular, third person singular, etc.) The choice of pronoun depends, again, on the setting and the addressee of a particular utterance. For example, a male speaker might use the informal *boku* when referring to himself with a group of close friends, but *watashi* when speaking to his boss. This is often given as evidence for the notion of “relational selves” in Japan where, rather than a fixed “I” who moves through various situations and encounters various interlocutors, the Japanese self is better understood as a self that changes according to the situation and interlocutors.<sup>34</sup> Some have even argued that “I” is a deictic anchor point – that is, and indexical “zero ground” – around which everything else is organized (Bachnik 1994). In the case of Japan, this deictic anchor point is not “I”, but *ie*; ‘household’ or, more generally, one’s in-group (*uchi*).

In terms of the research presented in this dissertation, and more specifically the analysis in the next two chapters, the brief overview of concepts central to Japanese social organization are important in understanding how speakers in the excerpts I present negotiate status and role in their interactions. This research suggests, for example, that role is more important in societies like Japan, where it is one’s position in particular settings – and in relationship to particular people – that is emphasized over one’s own thoughts or feelings across situations. As Lunsing

---

<sup>34</sup> See Kondo (1990) for a detailed discussion of Japanese and western sense of self, including a review of the relevant philosophical literature.

says, in Japan “...roles particular to contexts may be valued more than intrinsic and independent identities” (2001: 209; see also Bachnik 1992, Hendry 1992).

## **GENDER AND LANGUAGE RESEARCH ORIENTATIONS**

The next section of this chapter returns to the question of women and gender-marked language usage.

### **Gender and language research in Western academia (through the 1980s)**

Gender was introduced as a viable research topic in the mid-1970s through the work of such scholars as Robin Lakoff (1975), and Barrie Thorne and Nancy Henley (1975, see especially Zimmerman and West in this volume). Lakoff’s work outlined differences in women’s language usage from men’s, based on the author’s self-reflection on her own speech and anecdotal evidence of other’s speech patterns. Despite the limitations inherent in using such evidence as the basis for positing systematic differences between men’s and women’s speech patterns, Lakoff’s work was important for two reasons: 1) it helped to make gender part of language researcher’s agendas, and 2) it suggested several lines of inquiry which proved to be fruitful areas of investigation for understanding language practices in relation to gender and gendered positions in (initially English-speaking) societies.

The initial call for research sounded by scholars such as Lakoff was followed by considerable empirical work, both quantitative and ethnographic, on women and language (Coates 1986; Phillips, Steele, and Tanz 1980; Thorne, Henley and Kramarae 1983). This research helped to delineate the borders and open up the parameters of the burgeoning field of gender and language studies. The results of work produced during this period included an expanded notion of the field of gender and language research, from that focused on middle-class, white, heterosexual women to women from a variety of backgrounds in terms of class, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and the like. Scholars also moved from a concentration on English-speaking (Western) societies to investigations in a wide variety of societies and languages. Jennifer

Coates (1993 [1986]), for example, produced one of the first comprehensive sociolinguistic works on gender and language. This work provided an overview of English-language research on gender and language at the time of her writing, and firmly established gender as a viable sociolinguistic variable. The Philips, Steele and Tanz collection of articles (1980) covers a broad range of geographic areas, and thus expanded the scope of gender and language research beyond the borders of English-speaking (Western) societies<sup>35</sup>. For example, Joel Sherzer's contribution to this collection provided an overview of the types of relationships between men and women's speech around the world, while also giving examples from his own research among the Kuna Indians of Panama. Elinor Ochs' article on Western Samoa pointed to the similarities between men's and women's speech in an early effort to suggest that gender is one of several possible factors (e.g., status, age, class, etc.) effecting speech patterns, rather than necessarily the overriding one.<sup>36</sup>

Before turning to a consideration of gender and language work in Japan, as well as more recent work in this area in the West, a brief summary of the prevalent methodologies at work in the body of scholarship just discussed is in order.

### **Methodologies in gender and language research**

As outlined at the beginning of this chapter, I defer from using "power" in my own research because of my interest in looking at the much more specific idea of "interactional efficacy". However, the term "power" is inescapable when considering western research on gender and language, as it is used throughout much of this large body of work. At the same time, one of the critiques of the models discussed below is in their very treatment of "power"; a point that will be addressed in each of the two models below.

---

<sup>35</sup> See also Alice Freed (1994).

<sup>36</sup> This notion was developed more fully in Ochs 1992, and is discussed in the section on recent gender and language models below.

### *Difference/two cultures model*

Research that focuses on sex/gender differences<sup>37</sup> tends to highlight the differences between ways in which men and women speak. Critics of this approach claim that a focus on difference reifies “power” inequities, ignoring the fact that “. . .the meaning of a sex difference is the product of social negotiation; it is culturally produced” (Crawford 1995, Uchida 1992). In Lakoff’s (1975) work, for example, women were called upon to “correct” their language so that they might be able to compete on an equal footing with men in conversational interactions. Such a view suggests that women need to be like men in order to achieve what they want, especially in terms of “power” and respect. This is similar to the linkage made between women’s language use and social position in Japan at the beginning of Chapter One, where the need for women to change the way they speak presumes that it is their language choices that are keeping them from moving out of subservient positions.

A recent version of the difference approach is the “two cultures” perspective, known to the general public through the work of scholars such as Deborah Tannen (1986, 1990),<sup>38</sup> and which has now become a popular belief in much of American society.<sup>39</sup> According to this model, men and women communicate so differently that they in effect speak different languages. A critic of this approach states that such research serves to promote the idea that men and women are “...fated to misunderstand each other unless they recognize their deeply socialized differences” (Crawford: 1). This popular conception can have very serious social consequences; as Crawford (ibid) showed, men discussing date rape justified their actions by stating that they didn’t know what women meant by “no.” Because women “speak a different language” according to this model, the men in Crawford’s study claimed that there should be no

---

<sup>37</sup> My inclusion of both terms is not meant to downplay the discussions about the important distinctions to be made between sex (generally conceived of as biological) and gender (generally discussed as socially constructed). However, both “sex differences” and “gender differences” are used, depending on the researcher. In general, “sex differences” is used when referring to differences between men and women that are assumed to be “natural.” In extending this notion to linguistic differences between men and women, this idea of “naturalness” is also implicit.

<sup>38</sup> Tannen herself argues vehemently against criticisms that her work does not take into consideration “power” inequities (e.g. Tannen 1994). However, particularly in the work which has gained a mainstream, popular audience, she glosses over considerations of “power”/dominance in relation to men’s and women’s linguistic practices.

<sup>39</sup> As witnessed by the phenomenal success of authors such as Joel Gray (1992).

ramifications for their actions. They could not be held accountable if they could not understand what the women said.<sup>40</sup>

What these critiques of the two cultures approach suggest, then, is not just the need to include “power” in the model, but to include a particular understanding of “power”. That is, critics of this model suggest that considerations of “power” should be introduced into the two cultures model in a form that takes into account the social and sociohistorical contexts in which these forms have developed, and in which their use is understood in contemporary societies.

### *Dominance model*

Unlike the difference/two cultures model, the “dominance” approach directly addresses the question of “power”. However, this model is similar to the one just discussed in that it generally finds women in a negative position (i.e., dominated and “powerless”). That is, according to this model men have the power and women do not.

Research according to this model includes work on “man-made” language (Kramarae 1981, Spender 1980), and studies of how verbal and non-verbal communication expresses and maintains male dominance (Cavallaro and Rundquist 1994, Fishman 1983, Thorne et al 1983, Weatherall 1998). Critics of this approach see value in it for raising the question of “power” relations, but warn that “...the conceptualization of how power and status are expressed and reproduced in talk has retained much of the dualistic nature of the sex difference approach; men use talk to dominate, and women are dominated by talk (Crawford 1995: 7). The problem with this is that in much research it is unclear whether women lack control of language because they lack social power, or whether they must gain control of language before they can gain social “power” (Cameron 1985).

Both the difference and dominance approaches, then, place women in a position of inferiority. They also both assume a model of power in which women are kept in positions that

---

<sup>40</sup> Of course it is possible that women could use similar justification in discounting responsibility for “not understanding” something men said. Like “separate but equal” segregation arguments that once held sway in the United States, the differences/two cultures model emphasizes difference without addressing the underlying issues of access and prestige.

are subordinate to men through their use of language forms that do not have the same efficacy (in terms of constructing reality) as men's language forms do.

### **Gender and language research in Japan**

As mentioned at the outset of this chapter, recent research on JWL has shown that women do not always speak in this register, that the category of JWL itself is best conceived of as a language variety spoken by speakers (primarily women) in particular geographic locations and interactional settings, and that the use of JWL carries with it particular gender ideologies. Before addressing these recent developments, however, it is important to provide an overview of what constitutes JWL, and what some of the most influential early studies on the topic have shown.

#### ***“Japanese women's language” (JWL)***

The existence of “men's language” and “women's language” (known in Japanese as *otoko no kotoba/onna no kotoba* or *danseigo/joseigo*, where “men's language” is the first in each pair) is accepted as a well-known focus for sociolinguistic study in the Japanese language. There are particular linguistic features that characterize JWL: avoidance of vulgar expressions, absence of a deprecatory level of first and second pronouns, beautification/hypercorrected honorifics,<sup>41</sup> women's higher frequency of polite forms more generally, and the use of feminine-marked sentence-final particles such as *wa*, *kashira* and *no* (Ide 1990). The two areas that have received the most scholarly attention are politeness (including honorifics) and sentence-final particles (SFPs).

#### **Sentence-final particles (SFPs)**

Japanese is a verb-final language, but generally speakers prefer to end sentences with one or more sentence-final particles. As Senko Maynard has observed, “[c]onversational utterances...rarely end with [plain]<sup>42</sup> forms without a final particle or the like attached” (1993: 156). These particles often indicate a speaker's attitude toward his/her statement, as well as how

---

<sup>41</sup> Beautification/hypercorrected honorifics are forms that are grammatically incorrect but considered by speakers to be a sign of refinement.

<sup>42</sup> Maynard refers to plain forms as “abrupt.”

he/she thinks the comment will be received by other participants in an interaction. Because my focus is on how particular linguistic features function interactionally, I adopt Maynard's modification for SFPs in calling them "interactional particles" (IP), since their effect and meaning should be understood within the context of a particular interaction.

Previous research has suggested that gender-marked IP are used (sometimes in conjunction with other features of gender-marked speech) to express femininity, masculinity, or gender neutrality. The chart in Appendix 1 shows various IP and their corresponding gender-markedness. This chart contains mostly sentence-final particles, but also some other words and/or verb endings that are associated with gender-marked language.

### **Politeness**

A second feature of JWL is "women's higher frequency of honorific forms" (Ide 1990), as well as more frequent use of polite forms generally. I will begin the discussion with an overview of the features associated with politeness in Japanese: speech level (*desu/-masu* and plain, and honorifics). Politeness in Japanese linguistic forms can be broken down into two separate but interrelated features, both of which are realized in the verb morphology: *desu/-masu* versus plain, and honorifics. Before examining each of these in detail, a few words of explanation are in order regarding terminology and the scope of my description. What I call "*desu/-masu*" and "plain" here are labeled differently elsewhere (e.g., "polite" and "plain", "polite" and "non-polite"). I prefer to use *desu/-masu* both because this is how it is discussed in the Japanese literature, and because it does not carry the complicating connotation of being "polite." As the next section makes clear, although *desu/-masu* can indeed function to express politeness, there are two problems that underlie this label: the meaning of "politeness," and the fact that politeness is not the only function that *desu/-masu* forms perform. Thus, I prefer to label this form *desu/-masu* that simply refers to the morpheme used to mark this verb form (e.g., *ikimasu* 'go') or the "polite" form of the copula (*desu*). In terms of honorifics, only the details necessary for understanding the data presented in this work are given here. For more

comprehensive overviews see for example Ide (1982: 360-365) or Roy Andrew Miller (1967: 268-291).

### ***Desu/-masu versus plain forms***

The distinction between *desu/-masu* and plain forms is traditionally talked about in terms of marking degrees of interpersonal distance between speakers motivated by particular social factors, as well as being linked to the degree of formality in a particular setting (see for examples Niyekawa 1991). Others discuss *desu/-masu* versus plain choices as being driven by somewhat different considerations. Miller (1967), for example, describes it as relating to “the speaker’s attitude toward the person s/he is addressing”. However, he also states that this “axis” relates to expressions of politeness and intimacy, i.e., to interpersonal distance. Ide (1982) focuses on four social rules that constrain politeness, specifically in social requirements for the expression of deference on the part of the speaker toward the addressee: social position, “power”, age and formality. *Desu/-masu* versus plain distinctions can thus be understood as a form of social deixis, the “...encoding of social distinctions that are relative to the social relationship between participants in an interaction” (Keating 1998: 9).

The *desu/-masu* form (the name comes from the verb ending) increases interpersonal distance, and is used in more formal settings. In contrast, the plain form decreases interpersonal distance, and is used in more informal settings. *Desu/-masu* and plain can be used reciprocally among social equals, or non-reciprocally among people of different social status. In the following examples, the relevant verb in each sentence is underlined.

1. *Ashita iku.*            ‘(I’ll)<sup>43</sup> go tomorrow.’            [[plain]]
2. *Ashita ikimasu.*    ‘(I’ll) go tomorrow.’            [[*desu/-masu* ]]

The semantic content of 1 and 2 are exactly the same, but the pragmatic content is quite different. If a speaker said 1 to a social superior, for example, it would be considered quite rude, even though the semantic content is perfectly acceptable.

---

<sup>43</sup> Pronouns are commonly elided in Japanese speech. I include them in parentheses in the English glosses to show that they are understood but not actually present in the original Japanese..



The following is an example of how these forms might be used in a conversation between a teacher and a student. In such a situation, social etiquette would lead us to expect that the teacher be in a socially superior position vis-à-vis the student.

Teacher: *Ashita iku?* ‘Will (you) go tomorrow?’ [[plain]]  
Student: *Hai, ikimasu.* ‘Yes, (I) will.’ [[*desu/-masu* ]]

Because the teacher is in a socially superior position, she can assume interpersonal closeness through the use of the plain form (*iku*). For the student who responds to do so, however, would be socially unacceptable, since it would be based on a closeness she cannot (and socially should not) assume. Recall that in this section on “hierarchy and collaboration” in this chapter, I argued that knowing one’s place vis-à-vis others in an interaction is part of becoming socially mature in Japanese society. This is an example of just such a concept, and children, for example, may at first use speech levels incorrectly.

In the examples just given, the subordinate uses the *desu/-masu* form (*ikimasu*) to index interpersonal distance. This also highlights the fact that in Japanese, as in many languages, interpersonal distance – marked in this case by the use of the *desu/-masu* form – makes the utterance more polite.

However, sometimes the setting is more important than the relationship between individual participants in an interaction. The same teacher, for example, might very well use the *desu/-masu* form when addressing the class as a whole, as in:

*Ashita kagakukan ni ikimasu.*  
‘(We’ll) go to the science museum tomorrow.’ [[*desu/-masu* ]]

In such a case, the setting of a public declaration calls for the *desu/-masu* form as the socially appropriate linguistic choice. Formal settings such as making announcements or speaking to groups generally require the use of *desu/-masu* forms such as *ikimasu* in the example above.

### *Politeness: Honorifics*<sup>44</sup>

Japanese is one of several languages that has an honorific register. Honorifics are a particular type of politeness that involve specially conventionalized linguistic forms, such as lexical and/or morphological alternates, which express respect (or disrespect) (Irvine 1998). Scholars have been interested in examining honorific usage in languages like Japanese that have an honorific register because of the role this linguistic category is believed to have in establishing and maintaining social relations and, thus, in maintaining and renewing patterns of culture and society (Agha 1994). There are many language that have forms that relate to the level of politeness (e.g. T/V pronouns in many western European languages), but languages like Japanese differ in that they have "...a rich repertoire to be used concurrently in utterances to mark deference to a variety of individuals" (ibid: 278). Indeed, many have pointed out that in Japanese there are no socially neutral utterances (cf. Matsumoto 1989), because any verb choice a speaker makes constitutes a particular social relationship between the speakers and his interlocutor(s).<sup>45</sup> Further, like the *desu/-masu* and plain forms discussed above, honorifics are also a form of social deixis, wherein social relationships are encoded in particular linguistic features. In this sense honorifics might be viewed as a special type of social deixis in which linguistic features relate to the social evaluation of respect or deference to the speaker or referent.

The honorific system in Japanese can be broken into three categories: *kenjougo* (literally, 'humble language'), *sonkeigo* (literally 'respect language'), and *teineigo* (literally 'polite language'). In using *kenjougo* forms speakers lower ("humble") themselves in relation to their interlocutor(s). Thus, *kenjougo* will be marked as "hon-" (meaning 'humbling honorific') in this work. *Kenjougo* is used, for example, when offering to do something for a social superior, as in 1 below. *Sonkeigo* elevates the addressee (or person being referred to) in relation to the speaker.

---

<sup>44</sup> "Politeness" and "honorifics" are sometimes used interchangeably in the literature on Japanese. For the purposes of this work, "honorifics" refer only to the *kenjougo* and *sonkeigo* forms discussed here.

<sup>45</sup> This assertion is based on an assumption that speakers end all utterances with a verb, that they speak in complete sentences. It is less easy to assert when looking at conversational interaction, since speakers often do not end utterances with a sentence-final verb.

*Sonkeigo* will be marked as “hon+” (meaning “elevating honorific”) in this work. *Sonkeigo* is used, for example, when referring to the actions of a social superior, as in 2 below.

1. *nimotsu o o-mochi-shimashou ka*  
‘Shall (I) carry (your) luggage?’ [hon-]
2. *sensei wa eki made o-aruki-ni-narimashita.*  
‘The teacher walked to the station’ [hon+]

The following examples illustrate how *desu/-masu* and plain forms work in conjunction with honorifics to produce a variety of semantically analogous but socio-pragmatically distinct utterances. All of the following mean ‘(I) will go tomorrow.’ (Niyekawa 1991)

- |   |                          |
|---|--------------------------|
| 1a. <i>Ashita iku</i> [[plain]]                             | informal/minimal respect |
| 1b. <i>Ashita ikimasu</i> [[ <i>desu/-masu</i> ]]           | formal/minimal respect   |
| 1c. <i>Ashita irassharu</i> [[plain/hon+]]                  | informal/respect         |
| 1d. <i>Ashita irasshaimasu</i> [[ <i>desu/-masu</i> /hon+]] | formal/respect           |
| 1e. <i>Ashita mairu</i> [[plain/hon-]]                      | informal/humbling        |
| 1f. <i>Ashita mairimasu</i> [[ <i>desu/-masu</i> /hon-]]    | formal and humbling      |

The difference between 1a and 1b has already been discussed in the previous section. 1c and 1d are both *sonkeigo* (hon+) forms, and differ only in the final verb morphology (plain versus *desu/-masu* ). 1c might be used when referring to a social superior within an informal context. For example, when talking to a friend about her husband’s recent motorcycle accident, one of my informants used the form in 1c. In so doing, she expressed respect for her friend’s husband (by using the hon+ verb *irassharu*) while at the same time maintaining her informal/interpersonally close relationship with her friend (by using the plain form). 1e and 1f contain the *kenjougo* (hon-) form of the verb, and could be used when relating to a social superior one’s intention to go somewhere the next day. The same situational parameters apply to the plain and *desu/-masu* choices made in 1e and 1f as in the discussion of 1c and 1d.

In order to gain a better understanding of how *desu/-masu* and honorific forms in Japanese work in comparison to other systems, it is useful to look at theories that have been developed to account for politeness phenomena across languages.

## POLITENESS: UNIVERSAL THEORIES AND CRITIQUES

Brown and Gilman (1960) and Brown and Levinson (1987) have developed the two most well known theories relating to universal theories of politeness. Brown and Gilman's theory was built around an attempt to account for the distinction between what is called T/V pronoun usage in many western European societies (e.g., *tu/vous* in French). Building on Erving Goffman's notions of "deference" and "demeanor" (Goffman 1969), Brown and Gilman developed the terms "power" and "solidarity" to refer to ideas that influence T/V usage. "Power" in their model is an inherently asymmetrical relationship wherein one individual has the ability to control another. "Solidarity", on the other hand, entails a symmetrical relationship. Although the *desu/-masu*, plain form speech level distinction in Japanese is more elaborate than T/V choices in some European languages, Brown and Gilman's model can and has been applied to this aspect of Japanese as well. According to this model, *desu/-masu* forms are "powerful" because they entail interpersonal distance, whereas plain forms build "solidarity" by marking interpersonal closeness.

This theory has come under criticism in several areas, but for the purposes of this dissertation we need only be concerned with the following: 1) whether social ideologies uniformly influence language usage across society, and 2) whether language changes are independent of changes in social mind.<sup>46</sup> In reference to the first line of criticism, recent work on language and ideology has shown that social ideologies are salient to varying degrees within sections of particular societies (Schieffelin 1998). This suggests a potential explanation for anecdotal information from native Japanese speakers that women in farming and fishing communities use less JWL; less usage would suggest that particular social ideologies – namely gender/social ideologies associated with JWL usage – may be "salient to varying degrees" within Japan as well.

The second critique – that language changes may not be dependent on changes in "the social mind" (and vice versa) – leads back to the question raised at the beginning of this

---

<sup>46</sup> See Agha (1994) for a more detailed discussion of universal politeness theory critiques.

dissertation of the relationship between (gender-marked) language and speaker's social position(s). If, for example, Japanese women stopped using JWL altogether and/or adopted masculine-marked speech, would this necessarily entail a change in social attitudes towards women? My discussion at the beginning of this chapter – informed by previous research – suggests that this would not necessarily be the case, since gender is not ideologically neutral and is bound up in language and other semiotic modes, but Brown and Gilman's theory suggests that it would be.

According to Brown and Gilman's model, politeness in Japanese society could be seen as "power-laden", because polite forms are used in "asymmetrical" relationships and involve a hierarchy of linguistic forms whose use is governed by social relations. This asymmetrical relationship can be seen if we return, for example, to the case of a teacher speaking to an individual student. In that example, the teacher could use the interpersonally close plain form, but the student was socially proscribed from using this form. In Brown and Gilman's model, the teacher in this hypothetical situation would be in a powerful position – by not having to use polite forms – whereas the student would be in a non-powerful position. Similarly, if we follow this model, it is possible to characterize Japanese politeness usage as being disempowering, and women, as more frequent users of these linguistic features, as disempowered.

However, besides the general critiques aimed at this theory discussed above, universal theories of politeness have also come under scrutiny from work done in non-Western societies. Suwako Watanabe (1993), for example, found in her examination of differences in group discussion styles between Japanese and American students that "power" and "solidarity" often function together. As Deborah Tannen noted of Watanabe's work, "...the Japanese saw themselves as members of a group united by hierarchy" (Tannen 1993). Here is an example from discourse of the ideas discussed in the "Hierarchy and collaboration" section of this chapter. Watanabe's findings suggests that honorific usage embedded in hierarchical (i.e., asymmetrical) relations can also function to promote solidarity, rather than working to distance participants in interactions (i.e., promoting power). In other words, "power" and "solidarity" do

not necessarily exclude each other. Elizabeth Keating's work in Pohnpei, Micronesia provides evidence from another part of the world for the possibility of power and solidarity working together, as when she notes that power and solidarity are not fixed, either within a particular interaction or within particular speakers. In citing an interaction where a chief uses expressions of solidarity while organizing an event but shifts to expressions that index power differentials during the actual event, she notes that "...in the same interaction, among the same participants, the polarities of solidarity (intimacy) and power (social distance) are reversed." (1998: 50).

Another area in which work in non-western societies has offered critiques of universal politeness theories relates to a widely-cited theory around the notion of "face" developed by Brown and Levinson (1987). Like Brown and Gilman's theory, Brown and Levinson's theory of face is built around a dichotomy: the distinction between "positive face" (also known as "positive politeness") and "negative face" (also known as "negative politeness"). Positive politeness involves a raising of the addressee/referent in relation to the speaker, and negative politeness the speaker's lowering of her/himself in relation to the addressee/referent. Japanese is a language that contains linguistic features that mark both types of politeness: the *sonkeigo* or "elevating" form is a positive politeness (face) strategy, and the *kenjougo* or "humble" form is a negative politeness (face) strategy.

Brown and Levinson include in their theory a discussion of particular understandings of social configurations drawn from the use of negative and positive politeness strategies. For example, the lowering of oneself in relation to another in "negative politeness" strategies is called "deference," and Brown draws connections between the use of such social strategies and larger social relations in stating that "deference prevails if and where people are in a position of vulnerability or inferiority in a society." (1980: 134). In negative face, a speaker's wants are impeded by others, whereas in positive face the speaker wants his/her utterances to be desirable to others.

However, scholars such as Matsumoto have argued that in societies like Japan "...it is interdependence, not independence, that is socially valued." (Matsumoto 1988) This resonates

with the discussion earlier in this chapter of Takeo Doi's work on *amae* (dependence), who argues that the ideal relationship in Japanese society is one in which a person can be completely dependent on another, and not independent from them. It also brings us back to the discussion in Chapter One of "selves" in Japanese society as relational and dependent on others, rather than individual, discrete and stable. Regarding the specific implications these differences have for language, Matsumoto<sup>47</sup> argues that face is not the issue in making requests,<sup>48</sup> which according to Brown and Levinson are "face-threatening" acts. This helps to explain why, for example, one finds instances of direct, unmitigated requests.

These critiques suggest that there are different ideas about politeness across cultures. Therefore, I now turn to a consideration of work on how politeness is conceived of in Japanese society.

### **Conceptualizations of politeness**

One article on this topic (Ide et al 1992) considered differences in the conceptualization of politeness between native speakers of American English and Japanese<sup>49</sup>. Their research asked participants to answer a series of questions regarding their assessment of the appropriate politeness level for a particular situation by responding to hypothetical utterances. Their results suggest that Japanese speakers assess situations differently than their English-speaking counterparts, and use speech that would be considered inappropriate by most English speakers. Specifically, Japanese respondents favored more polite forms than their American counterparts.

Florian Coulmas, another scholar who has worked specifically on notions of "politeness", supports Ide et al's findings in stating that honorific expressions in Japanese are "essential for proper [linguistic] usage and should not be thought of as a dispensable stylistic refinement"

---

<sup>47</sup> See also Ervin-Tripp et al (1995) for a comparative "East-West" perspective on "face".

<sup>48</sup> See also Shoshana Blum-Kulka (1987) and Cavallaro and Rundquist (1994) for work on politeness and requests.

<sup>49</sup> There has also been a great deal of work done on "politeness" across languages and cultures. See for example the special issue of the journal *Pragmatics* edited by Blum-Kulka and Kasper (1990).

(1992: 320). Taken in combination, this research indicates the need for local understandings of key interactional notions such as “politeness.”

In addition, Ide (1982) specifically investigated Japanese women’s conceptualizations of politeness.<sup>50</sup> As already noted, women are said to speak “more politely” than men (i.e., use more linguistic features denoting politeness more often than men), but like the studies cited above, this study sought to explore how women’s notions of “politeness” itself might influence their language choices. Ide found three factors to be involved in women’s politer speech: 1) women’s lower assessment of the politeness level of linguistic forms, 2) women’s higher assessment of appropriate politeness level due to the type of addressee, and 3) women’s higher frequencies of the kind of interactional patterns which call for higher linguistic forms. The implications of these in terms of linguistic usage are, in the order listed above: 1) women must use higher levels of language in order to achieve the same politeness level effect as men; 2) women will accord higher levels of language than men to the same addressee; and 3) women are more often involved in situations which call for higher levels of politeness due to the type of interactant.

### **Revised gender and language models**

Critiques of models related to theories of politeness lead back to a consideration of models for investigating gender and language, and highlight some of the difficulties and limitations inherent in both of the gender, language and power models discussed above (the dominance and difference models).

Elinor Ochs (1992) has outlined a model that is much more useful, in that it allows for the consideration of factors other than gender and language.<sup>51</sup> Drawing on suggestions from McConnell-Ginet regarding gender deixis, where “...the particular form of some linguistic unit expresses or means something about gendered properties of the circumstances of linguistic

---

<sup>50</sup> See also Suzuki (1993).

<sup>51</sup> See work by Susan Gal (1989 and 1991) for a model of gender and power that takes into account larger sociohistorical forces. See Marjorie H. Goodwin (1990) for an analysis of language and gender from an interactional perspective.



production, the gendered perspective from which an utterance is produced” (1988) and theories of multiple-layered indexicality (Silverstein 1976), Ochs developed a model in which gender is not directly mapped onto language. That gender-marked language does not simply and exclusively index masculinity or femininity is also apparent when we consider some of the feminine and masculine-marked forms in Japanese. As we have seen in the discussion of politeness above, although a characteristic of JWL is that women use polite speech (including honorifics) more often than men, polite speech does not entail feminine speech. There are many situations in which it is the situation or one’s interlocutor that socially dictates the use of polite speech, whether one is female or male. For example, when giving a speech, both men and women would be socially expected to use polite forms.

Ochs’ model thus provides an absolutely necessary means for considering the constellation of features that mediate between linguistic resources and gender (1992: 342). For this dissertation, the most important features in her partial list are lexicon, morphology, and LLV (local language varieties). In this model, gender is related to language through other social meanings that are indexed, and thus, focuses on the “...kinds of meanings men and women are likely to index through language, [and] the relation of these patterns to the position and images of men and women in society.” (ibid).

What this means in terms of the research at hand is that gender-marked language is not the only, or even always primary, linguistic feature that should be considered in addressing the question of “power” (efficacy) in women’s language usage. As suggested in the discussion of politeness (honorifics and *desu/-masu*) above, speech levels are an important feature for marking distance between speakers, and often work in conjunction with other features (including gender-marked speech). Further, in the area where I conducted my dissertation research (and in most parts of Japan), there is a local language variety in use that adds more resources to speakers in the area.

Another important contribution to gender and language research has emerged from scholars working on “performance theory” (Morris 1995). This model, as the name suggests,

look at gender as a performance, and therefore something that is malleable rather than fixed. That is, gender is not something that people are socialized into and that then remains constant, but rather something that people are constantly creating (performing) through various semiotic modes, including their linguistic choices. Judith Butler's seminal work on people who fall between the lines of dichotomous gender/sex labels (1990, 1993) also uses the performance theory model to show the flexibility with which people perform, resist, and subvert gender categories. In relation to Japan, work on a female theater troupe (Robertson 1998) also shows how gender is performed in ways that follow mainstream norms, ways that subvert those norms, ways that support them, and ways that resist them all at the same time.

In terms of gender and language research, this body of work on performance theory is helpful in that it can free up the automatic associations that are made between particular gendered bodies and particular gendered ways of speaking. For instance, Okamoto's work with college-aged Japanese females who use some masculine speech could be understood, in the framework of the gender performance model, as a means for these women to "perform male". The interesting thing about adding the performative aspect is that it can also help to account for the hyper-gender representations one sometimes finds. For example, in talking about cross-dressing, Robertson (1998) notes that if someone looks like the gender they are imitating, they will be said to be passing, not cross-dressing. In cross-dressing, people present an exaggerated version of the gender they are imitating, and the person who is doing the representing is recognizable as not the gender they are imitating. That is, if a woman dresses like a man so well that she looks like a man, she is passing; if she dresses like a caricature of a man and is still recognizable herself as a woman, she is cross-dressing. Thus, gender performance theory provides us with a means of examining the play that can be happening with speakers take on gender-marked speaking styles that are not associated with the gender they usually present.

In order to get a sense of just what is at stake in performing a particular gender through language in Japanese society – particularly what is at stake in performing "female" or "femininity" – I now turn to an examination of JWL and language ideology.

## **JWL and language ideology**

### ***Honorifics***

In contemporary Japanese society, there are both prescriptive norms for honorific usage generally as well as particular expectations and interpretations of women's use of honorifics specifically. The vast number of books that teach people how to use honorifics "properly," and frequent coverage in the popular media about contemporary Japanese people's not knowing how to use honorifics correctly are testament to the ideological significance of honorifics in Japan today. Honorifics are not learned as part of the first-language acquisition process through which people learned Japanese as children, but must be studied and taught in order to be used correctly. Thus, "proper" use of honorifics can be a sign of education and social maturity. At the beginning of this chapter, I stated that knowing how to act appropriately in whatever situation one is in is part of becoming a socially mature adult, and learning honorifics is part of this social development.<sup>52</sup>

One way in which people use honorifics "incorrectly" is through hypercorrection or beautification. Beautification or hypercorrect honorific usage refers to situations in which a speaker uses a higher level of honorifics than is socially necessary in a particular situation. Although in a normative sense this usage is not correct, this kind of use marks the speaker as sophisticated and refined, hence the labels "beautification" and "hypercorrect." At times there may even be a sort of competition to see who can keep up with the level of sophistication and refinement set by a speaker, as when friends use honorific forms with one another.

### ***JWL as standard***

Early in this chapter I noted that much previous research on JWL has focused on middle class women in urban centers (primarily Tokyo). However, the "women's language" of today was actually formerly used exclusively by samurai women, who were members of an elite warrior class (Aoki 1997). The Meiji Restoration (1868) and the creation of a so-called

---

<sup>52</sup> Cyndi Dunn's work, for example, shows how high school students learn proper speaking styles when conducting club business with those outside of the school.

“classless” society<sup>53</sup> led to a gradual spread of the samurai women’s language to women in other social positions.

Women’s language use today (particularly honorifics) has come to reflect urbanity, education, and class (Fair 1996), and those wishing to present themselves as part of this elite group do so in part through language use. As Aoki notes, “all this recent proliferation of women’s language coincides with the rise of a class of people determined to establish their own credential as an elite, sophisticated class.” (1997: 4)

The position that women and men are different, their language use is different, and that maintaining this difference is in the best interests of all concerned can also be considered a type of ideology. Chapter One suggested that there is a powerful sense in Japanese society that separate spheres according to gender is right and natural, though this is by no means what everyone believes. I will return to this notion in my discussion of Japanese feminism in the next section.

In summary, recent research has thus done much to complicate the picture of JWL, and how women in Japan speak more generally. Okamoto summarizes the problems that this body of research seeks to address in stating that “...what has commonly been identified as Japanese women’s language is a constructed category based on SJ, in particular the speech style of traditional women in the upscale Yamanote area of Tokyo. It is what ‘proper’ women are expected to use; it represents a class-based hegemonic linguistic and gender ideology” (1995).

Research that examines women’s non-traditional use of language (e.g., women using masculine-marked speech), therefore, not only works to deconstruct ideologies of homogeneity among Japanese female speakers, but also to highlight what norms are for female speakers by showing markedly different forms.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Part of the reforms in this period involved the abolition of previous distinctions between samurai, peasants, artisans, and merchants. This is not to say that the reforms were completely effective, nor did they effect every group. For example the lowest members of Japanese society, the *Burakumin* (“outcasts/untouchables”) were excluded from the ranking that was abolished, since they had been below this ranking from the outset.

<sup>54</sup> See, for example, work by Shigeko Okamoto on women’s use of masculine-marked forms, and Ogawa and Smith (1997) on language usage among homosexual men in urban Japan.

## JAPANESE FEMINISM

Japanese feminism has until quite recently been relatively unknown outside of Japan, and within Japan has not always had a very high profile. However, there is a long and rich history of feminism in Japan (see for example Fujieda 1995, Mackie 1988, Sievers 198, and Ueno 1994-95), and feminist movements have often been the first place where gender issues have been raised and addressed. One of the central debates within feminist circles has been over the role of mothers and the protection of motherhood.<sup>55</sup> As this debate relates to ideas about defining women, which in turn inform language usage and ideas about language use, I provide a brief overview of its history and contemporary manifestations here.

### *The motherhood debate*

In discussing contemporary gender relations in Japan in Chapter One, I stated that a long-standing debate within feminist circles has been over the rights and protections of women. In the Taisho Era (1910-1926), the “protection of motherhood” put prominent feminists of the time at very different points on the ideological spectrum (Rodd 1991). To boil down the positions, some argued that women-as-mothers should be protected by the state, while others argued that such protections only served to keep women in dependent positions on patriarchal structures within Japanese society. Thus, they argued, women should strive for economic independence.

Indeed, there has been a high level of state interest in the developing and controlling the concept of “motherhood” in Japan, particularly since the Meiji Era (1868-1910), when Japan began intense modernization (see for example Nolte and Hastings 1991, Uno 1991). Not least because of this, “motherhood” is also a concept about which people in Japanese society have strong, and sometimes contradictory, opinions. These different opinions lead us back to the question of whether men and women should occupy separate but equal spheres, or whether both

---

<sup>55</sup> Japanese feminists are concerned with many other issues as well, but I focus my attention on the “motherhood” debate here because it speaks most directly the ideas presented in this dissertation. See Kazuko Tanaka (1995) for more details on recent and current issues.

men and women should have equal access to the opportunities and positions available in all spheres. In terms of language, this debate relates to the discomfort expressed by some in Japanese society when women do not use JWL (cf. Okamoto 1995). If, for example, speakers used less gender-marked language and more neutral forms, would this lead to a breakdown in gender divisions? This is one of the concerns that fuels such discomfort.

Contemporary feminists and scholars such as Ueno Chizuko (1987), for example, argue that “motherhood” is a central and powerful position in Japanese society. According to Ueno, the “power” in this position comes not only from women’s control of the family’s economic resources (husbands often turn over their paychecks to their wives), but more importantly from their psychological role of caretaker and *amae*-giver<sup>56</sup>. In other words, family members are in a dependency relationship with mothers in the household, and it is mothers who are the “psychological bosses” of the household

Sachiko Ide similarly feels that *boseiai* (“maternal love”) is a “fundamental social relationship, which is central to the female identity in Japanese society” (1997: 38) and is not something which is oppressive or should be overcome.<sup>57</sup> She argues that motherhood is a position of prestige in Japanese society, one that is accorded a respect that is not to be found in the West. It is “...preferable that the maternal or nurturing function should be one of the basic structures of social relations rather than the more aggressive – what might be characterized as masculine or patriarchal – form of “power”” (ibid). Proponents of this view see the distinction between men and women (in effect, the different cultures model discussed above) as beneficial to women and, for many of these scholars and feminists, as beneficial to society. For example, some who favor this perspective argue that women do not have to deal with the intense pressure and long hours that many of their husband’s jobs involve. This view can be seen in attitudes towards work among women in Japan, many of whom gladly take lower-paying, short-term jobs in order to avoid the intense demands put on (male) workers who are full-time.

---

<sup>56</sup> Recall the discussion of *amae* (‘dependency’) from Chapter One.

<sup>57</sup> Here Ide is contrasting Japanese views of “motherhood” with those in the west.

Other scholars disagree with what they see as an overly romantic view of women as mothers, and particularly the “power” attributed to women in these positions. Aoki Yayoi, for example, argues that whatever “power” women may have in the private sphere does not carry over into the public sphere. “You can’t discuss the status of women just within the household. It has to be put in the context of the whole society. The ‘power’ relations between men and women in the family are determined by external conditions.” (1997: 6) Even within the private sphere of the household, Aoki argues, women’s husbands control what “power” women have. For example, women often control the finances of the household, but the husband can take away that control by taking away his salary. This is part of the focus on economic independence that has been an integral part of much of Japanese feminism.

This debate has clear parallels with the discussion in Chapter One of women’s use of JWL. On the one hand, Ide’s comments on the businesswoman who used JWL to her advantage suggest that this linguistic resource is valuable precisely because it is only available to women. To connect Ide’s comments to the question of gender distinctions, such comments suggest that the differences between men and women – including the way they speak – should be celebrated and cultivated, not challenged or revoked. Aoki’s comments on JWL as a limiting force for women seeking to change their role and status within Japanese society, however, suggests that the “different-but-equal” idea simply does not work.

Thus, women’s language use takes place in a context where ideas about femininity in particular and gender expression more generally are often focused on women-as-mothers. We will keep this background in mind as we examine language use among the women in my field sites in Chapters Three and Four.

I now move away from a focus on JWL to a consideration of research on speech level shifts in Japanese.

## Research on *desu/-masu* and plain speech level shifts

Much of the most interesting work – in terms of how it informs my own work - on speech level shifts in recent years has been motivated by the observation that traditional understandings of factors that motivate speech level choices cannot explain the shifts that occur in “...sequential discourse where the social conditions remain constant.” (Ikuta 1983, see also Cook 1999). In other words, speakers shift power/solidarity alignments within interactions, even when the external social conditions discussed in the section on *desu/-masu* form usage above (e.g., age) do not shift. If these external social factors were what motivated usage, we should not find the variation that we do. However, there is in fact a great deal more variation than these factors alone can explain when we examine speech level usage in interactions.

Shoko Ikuta (1983) proposed a model that made distance – social, attitudinal or (discourse) cohesional – the central motivating factor in speech level choices, rather than politeness or formality. According to her work, empathy (what she also refers to as “attitudinal distance”) and discourse cohesion are expressed through choices between these two speech levels. In *desu/-masu* mode interactions (i.e., where most forms as *desu/-masu*), speakers convey empathy) by shifting to plain forms when giving a positive evaluation of their interlocutor’s statements. In such situations, Ikuta claims, decreased distance (i.e., the use of plain forms) is preferred. On the other hand, there are also instances where a shift to *desu/-masu* forms is socially expected, even when the conversation is in plain-form mode. This is the case, for example, in prefacing a very personal question. Ikuta’s focus on utterances that precede personal questions (e.g., “have you ever been married?”), however, overshadows the fact that speakers shift back to plain forms when actually asking the questions. That is, although speakers create distance before they ask such questions, the questions themselves are phrased in ways that connote a great deal of interpersonal closeness.

In terms of discourse cohesion, Ikuta shows that speakers shift from *desu/-masu* to plain forms when giving illustrative examples of some particular topic under discussion (e.g.,



experiences at local Chinese restaurants when discussing Chinese food), and from plain to *desu/-masu* forms when shifting topics.<sup>58</sup>

Although “distance” is not as radical a departure from previous frameworks for analyzing speech level shifts as Ikuta suggests (recall the discussions of interpersonal closeness in the previous section on *desu/-masu* versus plain form choices), her work is nevertheless important for several reasons. First, it shows that interpersonal distance is not a fixed relationship based on social factors set at the beginning of the interaction, but rather shifts throughout the interaction. Second, it suggests two important factors that might motivate shifts in interpersonal distance. Finally, it offers a model that is useful in understanding both particular pieces of an interaction (e.g., where speakers shift to plain forms as an expression of empathy in the positive evaluation of another person’s utterances) as well as structure in stretches of discourse (e.g., topics and subtopics).

Haruko Cook (1996, 1999) has also posited a new way of viewing *desu/-masu* versus plain distinctions, by talking about them as a type of social deixis, where shifts between the two forms mark places where speakers foreground particular roles (and thus, highlight particular social relationships). For example, in the previous section on *desu/-masu* and plain distinctions, it was noted that because within families members are in *uchi* (‘inside’/‘private’) relationships with one another, traditional understandings would lead one to expect that caregivers would exclusively use the plain form with their children. However, one actually finds that caregivers use the *desu/-masu* form as well. Cook suggests that caregivers’ shift to *desu/-masu* forms (from a predominantly plain form discourse) when they are instructing or teaching their children as, for example, when they show children how to use chopsticks properly. In such situations, Cook argues, the shift to *desu/-masu* marks from plain marks a role shift, from parent to teacher.

Again, this model is useful for understanding shifts between the two forms in situations where the social factors that are at the basis of traditional understandings do not change. Like

---

<sup>58</sup> Ikuta refers to topics as “space”

Ikuta's work, it also highlights the need for models that examine shifts within interactions, rather than in isolation.

### *Naked plain forms*

Maynard (1993: 150-182) suggests a further complication to the dyad of *desu/-masu* versus plain forms, in her consideration of the “naked plain”<sup>59</sup> form, one that also points to the need for analyzing these forms as they function interactionally. Japanese speakers tend to end their utterances with interactional particles (IP) that express their attitude toward their utterances and/or their conception of how their interlocutors will receive their utterances. Naked plain (NP) forms are utterances that have no final IP, and end with a plain verb or adjective.<sup>60</sup> The following examples illustrate this distinction.<sup>61</sup>

- 1a. *Uchi no chichioya sou da yo.*  
'My dad is like that, you know.' [[plain with IP]]
- 1b. *Uchi no chichioya sou da.*  
'My dad is like that.' [[naked plain]]

Following Maynard's analysis of the IP *yo* (ibid), 1a shows that the speaker is confident of her statement, and does not expect her interlocutor to have anything to contribute to her utterance (i.e., disagreement, commentary, clarification, etc.). 1b, however, does not reflect any kind of orientation toward the speaker's interlocutors, but is rather a statement of “fact.”

Maynard makes a distinction between what might be termed “interactionally-oriented” plain forms (i.e., plain forms that include IP and other linguistic features that orient speakers and their utterances toward their interlocutors in particular ways) and naked plain forms, and suggests that interactionally-oriented plain forms function in discourse in much the same way that *desu/-masu* forms do (ibid: 152). While I feel that it is important to retain the distinction

---

<sup>59</sup> Maynard uses the term “abrupt” for the plain form, and thus calls the form discussed here “naked abrupt.” I have modified it to “naked plain,” however, for consistency with my terminology elsewhere.

<sup>60</sup> Adjectives function much like verbs in Japanese, and can carry speech level markings (*desu/-masu* or plain) and tense.

<sup>61</sup> 1a is from a casual conversation collected by Maynard (1993), and 1b is a modification of that utterance.

between *desu/-masu* and interactionally-oriented plain forms, I also agree with Maynard that naked plain forms differ in important ways from other plain forms.

Maynard lists three main situations in which naked plain forms occur:

1. Where speakers express surprise, an abrupt remembrance or a sudden emotional surge.
2. Where speakers take a point of view internal to the world under discussion
3. In echo responses and questions

In all of these cases, she argues that utterances “...are made without going through the designing process that interactionally accommodates the addressee” (ibid: 159). This will become important when examining interactions in the two chapters that follow this one.

### **Local language variety<sup>62</sup>**

Like many speakers throughout Japan, speakers in Towa make use of a local language variety, in addition to standard Japanese (SJ). Much more can be said about the LLV than will be covered here,<sup>63</sup> but for the purposes of this dissertation we need be concerned with the following two areas:

1. The formal characteristics of the LLV, particularly as they relate to data in my corpus.
2. Attitudes towards LLV use and users.

The following discussion is based on both formal studies done by dialectologists as well as information from native informants.

---

<sup>62</sup> What is referred to as “local language variety” is a politically-informed translation of the Japanese *hougen* (‘LLV’) and the suffix *-ben* (such-and-such ‘LLV’). However, I use “LLV” when quoting from local informants.

<sup>63</sup> The discussion here is limited to language variety features found in the data corpus that informs this dissertation, and is not intended to be an exhaustive overview of the local LLV. For a more comprehensive discussion of language varieties in Japan (with some information on Iwate LLVs), see for example *Nihongo hyakka daijiten* (An encyclopedia of the Japanese Language), pp. 659-664, 696-699, and 913-957. For information on dialect perceptions/attitudes – for the most part limited to the Kanto and Kansai regions of Japan - see work by Daniel Long (1996, 1997, 1998).

### ***Formal characteristics***

Hiroshi Hondoh (1982, 1994 [1975, 1977]) has done extensive work on LLVs in Iwate Prefecture, where Towa is situated.<sup>64</sup> Of particular interest to my own study are Hondoh's findings on politeness systems in local forms of Japanese spoken in this region.

The main points from Hondoh's research are as follows (see Appendix B for details):

1. The local language variety includes morphologically distinct forms that vary according to the social relationship(s) between interlocutors, just as in SJ. That is, there are dialectal forms for respect (*sonkeigo*) and humbling (*kenjougo*) expressions (cf. Appendix A, table 2).
2. The form *su* (and the phonological variant *ssu*) is used as an equivalent for SJ *desu*<sup>65</sup>. However, as respondents stated that *su* is used both to social superiors and social equals, it is quite possible that *su* is equivalent to both *desu* (*desu/-masu* -form) *da* (plain form).

As this summary shows, although there are features that correspond to honorific levels in the local language variety, the question of *desu/-masu* versus plain distinctions is less than clear. We will return to this point below.

In addition to morphological differences that marked speech levels, I was also interested in research on gender-marked language in the local LLV (including research that addressed the question of whether there is gender-marked language). However, none of the available resources addressed this issue. This is particularly interesting in light of the fact that there has been so much attention given to gender-marked differences in SJ.

### ***Folkloric knowledge***

In addition to scholarly research, information gathered from native informants is included in this discussion of local language varieties for two reasons: 1) there were no language attitude

---

<sup>64</sup> Depending on the study, Towa fits into the region labeled by prefectural capital of Morioka or with the city of Tono. There are no studies on the town of Towa itself, so my discussion of LLV usage based on correlations drawn between the findings presented in Hondoh's work and LLV usage as I encountered it during my fieldwork (and specifically, in the data which is the basis of this dissertation). Native informants also claimed that there are differences in the LLV from region to region within Towa (cf. historical information on Towa in chapter 1).

<sup>65</sup> There are other forms in use in Towa, but as *su* was the most common in my data corpus, I limit my discussion to it here.

studies available for this area, but this was an important factor in considering how local language is used in interactions; and 2) it was important to test research results that are both temporally (more than 20 years old) and geographically (the studies included few if any speakers from Towa) distinct from speakers involved in my data corpus with local informants' perceptions of local language use.

In trying to gather information about the LLV, native informants generally presented me with a list of nouns and adverbial expressions (e.g. for feeling very worn out) that were no longer used (or known) by the “younger generations.” I was often directed to people in their 70s or 80s when seeking information about the local LLV since, as I was told, “they speak the LLV.” Older generations bemoan the loss of the LLV in the face of language standardization, particularly as children have more and more exposure to mainstream media (and thus, SJ). However, it would not be accurate to say that people younger than 70 do not use LLV forms. In fact, there seems to be a life cycle pattern of LLV use in which very young children who have not yet spent a great deal of time outside their homes (i.e., have not been in school or day care) use a good deal of LLV. This is probably due to the fact that in many cases grandparents are major childcare givers,<sup>66</sup> and that grandparents tend to use the LLV more frequently. As children go through school, they tend to use less LLV and more SJ. When people leave school and enter the work force, native informants told me that it is often the kind of people with whom you interact with that influences how much LLV is used. For example, local government employees claimed that they tended to use more LLV than people working for a nationwide company would because they spent more time with the local populace (see Sunaoshi forthcoming for a discussion of LLV usage in relation to occupation).

This suggests that LLV usage connotes in-groupness (recall the discussion of *uchi* above) and ties to the community, as indeed my informants stated it does. In the very limited

---

<sup>66</sup> Three and four-generation households are not uncommon in this area. In many cases, the second generation mother and father work outside the home during the week, while the third generation grandparents take care of the family farm and child care.

investigations conducted while in Towa<sup>67</sup>, people reported that they tended to use more LLV with their family members, with older people, and with close friends. . That LLV is a means of establishing solidarity and closeness is also evidenced by reports from native informants who moved to Towa from other areas of Japan, who stated that they strategically use the local LLV to make themselves “fit in” better. One woman, for example, stated that she tries to incorporate the local LLV into her speech when conversing with her neighbors. She has found that using the LLV has made her neighbors much friendlier and welcoming. LLV thus seems to function as a marker of interpersonal closeness, in much the same way as the plain form discussed above (recall the discussion of empathy in relation to Ikuta’s work as well).

As discussed in the previous section, Hondoh’s findings show that there are morphologically distinct speech levels. However, informants stated that although there are honorific and *desu/-masu* equivalents in the local LLV, they are not used anymore. This perception was borne out in ethnographic interviews, as when I commented to the women at one of the sites where I worked that they did not use LLV when interacting with customers. The women told me that they used SJ not because they feared they would not be understood (as I had suggested when I posited the question), but rather because they could not speak in the ways demanded by the situation if they used LLV. They demonstrated the difficulty they would have by spending several minutes trying to produce and agree on ways of saying some common polite expressions they use in speaking with their customers using LLV forms. Although there are polite expressions in the local LLV, therefore, because people are no longer competent in them speaking politely means using SJ. Takashi Kobayashi, a dialectologist who worked for many

---

<sup>67</sup> In addition to informal discussion with local residents, I held three sessions with a total of 25 people to talk about the local LLV. Participants were asked to respond to several questions about LLV usage: 1) with whom and in what situations they use LLV, 2) whether or not there are LLV equivalents to the *kenjougo/sonkeigo* (honorific) and plain/*desu/-masu* forms discussed above (and if so, what they are), 3) and whether there are gender-marked features in the LLV (and if so, what). Participants were encouraged to respond to the questions by discussing them with others in the sessions, and this often led to discussion that yielded more information than otherwise might have been provided on the questionnaires themselves.

years at the National Language Research Institute<sup>68</sup> and now teaches in the Literature Department at Tohoku University, confirmed this scenario through personal correspondence in stating that the SJ politeness system may have overridden that of the LLV. This would lead to a situation such as one finds in Towa, where speakers first call to mind SJ forms when speaking politely, although there are equivalent forms in the local LLV.<sup>69</sup>

The majority of LLV occurrences in my data corpus are in primarily plain-form conversational interaction. Given speakers' statements that LLV usage makes the interaction feel close and friendly (*shitashii*), it is perhaps not surprising that this is the case. However, as I will discuss in more detail in Chapters 3 and 4, plain-form interactions do not preclude the use of LLV.

In addition, the prevalence of LLV forms in plain-form conversations does not exclude the use of LLV in conjunction with *desu/-masu* forms (see also Sunaoshi forthcoming for a discussion of mixed *desu/-masu* -form and LLV interactions). This is true both within a sentence (e.g., a *desu/-masu* verb with local language IP) and within words. An example of the latter is a verb such as *kimashitatta* ('came'), which combines the *desu/-masu* -form of "to come" (*kimasu*) with a LLV morpheme for the past tense (*tatta*). *Kitatta* (where the SJ plain form of "to come" – *kuru* – is combined with the LLV past-tense morpheme) is much more common in my data corpus, but *kimashitatta* is a grammatically (and socially) acceptable form.

Despite the ambiguity about whether LLV forms are equivalent to *desu/-masu* or plain forms, as well as whether or not there is a distinction made in speaker's usage, for the purposes of this dissertation forms from the local language are considered to fall within the plain form register. This decision is based on the fact that native informants overwhelmingly categorized all

---

<sup>68</sup> This is a government-supported institute that has been conducting surveys on language varieties and usage throughout Japan since the 1960s.

<sup>69</sup> It is not clear whether LLV polite forms are considered less polite in relation to SJ forms. Hondoh's findings suggest that this is not the case, however, one interpretation of the tendency to use SJ forms is that they are considered to be more polite than "equivalent" LLV forms.

local language forms as promoting interpersonal closeness, as well as the observation discussed above that SJ is the default mode for speakers when they want to be polite.

As noted earlier, work by dialectologists on the local language varieties in the Towa region has not focused on gender-marked language usage such as that found in SJ. When pressed on this point, native informants stated that there “probably are” (*aru deshou*) gender-marked differences, but further research is needed in order to say more about this. For the purposes of this dissertation, the local language is considered not to have any gender-marked forms.

However, it is important to note that LLV forms also sometimes co-occur with SJ gender-marked interactional particles (e.g., *kashira*). Such instances are interesting counter-examples to discussions of gender-marked (feminine) speech as linked with politeness and formality; i.e., LLV usage promotes intimacy while the gender-marked features promote refinement and politeness (distance).

The chart in appendix 2 gives a list of local language features that appear in the data to be discussed in the following two chapters, and also provides a brief description and SJ equivalent (where possible).

### **Style-shifting**

The analysis which follows in Chapters Three and Four is oriented around shifts in the three areas discussed above: *desu/-masu* or plain forms, LLV, and gender-marked speech. I follow Rusty Barrett’s (1995) modification of Carol Myers-Scotton’s work on code-switching to include “style-shifting,” where shifts in particular linguistic features stand out as different (“marked,” to use Myers-Scotton’s terminology) from surrounding utterances. For example, caregivers’ use of *desu/-masu* forms when speaking to the child(ren) under their care are “marked” and thus “shifts” because the majority of the interaction takes place in the plain form. Similarly, in my data set *desu/-masu* or plain forms, LLV, and gender-marked speech are marked



in relation to the surrounding utterances. What constitutes a shift will depend on the primary linguistic mode (in terms of politeness level, etc.) that is at work in particular interactions. For example, in an interaction where speakers primarily use *desu/-masu* forms, a plain form would be marked (and thus constitute a shift). On the other hand, where an interaction is primarily in the plain form, a *desu/-masu* form would be marked. There can also be shifts within an individual's utterances. Use of the plain form would be marked for speakers who overall use *desu/-masu* forms.

While tracking such shifts would seem at first to be a relatively simple task, since each of the features I examine carries with it particular linguistic forms, in fact things are not that straightforward. For example, as the excerpts in the next two chapters will attest, there are many cases where forms are not marked for either *desu/-masu* or plain speech levels, as when speakers use a connective verb form (“do something and...”). Also, there are many cases where there are no verbs in the utterance at all, or adjectives that function like verbs. Further, there are some cases where using a *desu/-masu* form to match the surrounding utterances would make a particular expression sound much more formal than the rest of the interaction (see the following chapters for examples).

In terms of gender-marked language as well, shifts are not as transparent as they might seem. I have adopted a typology for classifying gender-marked language forms that is widely accepted and used among scholars in the field, but this is not to say that all native Japanese speakers would agree with it completely. For instance, people in their 20s seem to classify gender-marked language differently than people in their 40s or 50s, and some of the items marked as “masculine” in the typology I have adopted might be considered “neutral” by people in their 20s (cf. Okamoto 1995b).<sup>70</sup> This difference in gender-marked language classification suggests the ideological underpinnings of these forms, an area that has yet to be researched very thoroughly.

---

<sup>70</sup> These comments on classifying gender-marked language are also based on personal correspondence with native Japanese scholars who are working on gender and language research.

For the purposes of this dissertation, I have made note of instances where the shift is not straightforward, or where there is consistent disagreement about the classification of a particular form.

## **Summary**

The model that informs the analysis in Chapters Three and Four below, then, considers how speakers use the three sets of linguistic features (gender-marked features, *desu/-masu* and plain forms, and local language forms) that have been outlined in this chapter to negotiate role and status.

The importance of examining these features within their interactional contexts has already been suggested by the research discussed above, e.g., in relation to recent work on speech level shifts. Hereafter, I turn to an outline of a methodological approach that seeks to overcome the limitations inherent in previous research on these focal features, and in work on gender and language more generally: a model that allows for a consideration of multiple, related features rather than singling out one type; a model that takes into account the range of linguistic resources on which speakers draw, one that enables make connections between micro concerns within an interaction and macro-level issues such as social positioning, and a model that provides us with a means for examining the effectiveness of particular utterances within interactions.

## **THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES**

Language has long been of interest to anthropologists, particularly in the United States (for example, Franz Boas' work on American Indian languages 1911), but it was not until the 1960s that scholars began to develop methods of investigating language use in relation to culture. There are many approaches to studying intersections of language and culture (for overviews, see Duranti 1997, Plummer 1995, Schiffrin 1994,), but at the most fundamental level this focus is

distinguishable from other studies of language by a concern with language as it is used in speech as opposed to language in its idealized sense. Thus, those interested in language as it relates to culture are concerned with the *parole* of de Saussure's famous early language typology. This focus is quite distinct from research that is concerned with the *langue* of de Saussure's framework; research that characterizes much of formal, structural linguistics.

Various models have been developed within the general language-in-culture orientation, but at heart many of them are concerned with anthropologically-informed questions of agency (cf. Ahearn 2001). In language and culture approaches, speakers are viewed as social actors, and language as both a resource for and a product of social interaction (Duranti 1997: 6). Further, language is a form of social action, a cultural resource, and a set of sociocultural practices (Schieffelin 1998). The formal properties of languages (often referred to as "grammar") provide speakers with a set of resources that they use in creative ways to create and manage social relations through interactions with other social actors. Language is a particularly useful place to look for information on broader sociocultural (anthropological) questions about agency, power, hierarchy and status, because it is "intrinsically embedded in networks of sociocultural relations" (ibid). Speech level choice in Japanese, for example, is dependent on the social relations between interlocutors in a particular interaction, and at particular moments within interactions.

The focus on language in interaction is informed by an interest in how meanings emerge within particular interactions, rather than being fixed and predictable across situations. Scholars are thus interested in how meaning is "...constantly being built up through interaction with others, and how these meanings are handled, modified, transformed and hence evolve through encounters (Plummer 1995: 224).

Within the context of a focus on language in interaction, there are also good reasons for focusing on everyday language, as opposed to ceremonial or ritual language. As I discuss in more detail in the section on conversation analysis below, an interest in focusing on everyday language developed from both the (cultural) anthropological contention that culture is to be found in everyday activities as well as influences from other branches of the social sciences

(such as sociology) that took “the everyday” as the basis for investigating larger social norms and trends.

The methodological framework of this dissertation is built on two language and culture models, the ethnography of communication and a modified form of conversation analysis (CA). Below, I briefly consider the development of each, and how each contributes to my work.

### **Ethnography of communication**

The ethnography of communication (also known as the “ethnography of speaking”) was codified through a series of works by Dell Hymes and John Gumperz in the 1960s and 1970s (e.g. Gumperz 1982; Hymes 1972, 1974) and continues to have a strong influence on the study of intersections of language and culture, particularly in linguistic anthropology. As the name suggests, this approach seeks to combine ethnographic and linguistic analyses, resulting in studies that consider linguistic practices in relation to their social and cultural contexts. Thus, the ethnography of speaking is “concerned with the totality of [a speech community’s] linguistic repertoire or patterned ways of speaking, and an explication of relationships between speech systems and other aspects of culture.” (Keating 2000: 11, see also Bauman and Sherzer 1989)

This approach, therefore, is interested in understanding the relationship between linguistic and communicative practices within particular communities. As is clear from the list above, there is also an emphasis on naturally occurring data, rather than elicited, data.

I use the ethnography of communication in this dissertation as a means through which to present the close linguistic analyses in Chapters Three and Four within a broader ethnographic context. It is useful, for example, in discussing frameworks for hierarchy within Japanese society that inform particular instantiations of status-marked speech.

### **Conversation analysis (CA)**

Conversation analysis shares a focus on communicative competence, on speaker’s ability to use language in socially effective ways, with the ethnography of communication and other methods for studying language in relation to culture. However, CA also provides a means for

examining the interactional flow of everyday speech, and looks for patterns and rules that govern such speech. It is thus useful for my research because it provides a means for looking at connections between utterances across stretches of talk, as well as the interactional consequences of particular utterances.

CA developed out of the field of sociology in the 1960s, starting with work by Goffman (1969, 1974, 1981; see also Drew and Wootton 1988) and Garfinkel (1967; see also Heritage 1984) and codified primarily through the work of Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson (Jefferson 1981, 1984; Sacks 1972, 1987; Sacks and Schegloff 1979; Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974). Goffman's work was focused on the orderliness of interactions and the conventions that mediated the presentation of selves in interactions, and Garfinkel with the "ethics of everyday life" that focused on the everyday practices of interpretations and the understanding of actions and activities. Both scholars were centrally concerned with the organization of everyday interactions, in part because conversational interactions to this point had been considered chaotic. (Keating and Egbert) Thus, CA "...seeks to describe the underlying social organization...through which orderly and intelligible social interaction is made possible" (Goodwin and Heritage 1990: 283).

CA is focused on activity, and begins from a consideration of "...the interactional accomplishment of particular social activities" (Drew and Heritage 1992: 287). In Chapters Three and Four that follow, I am also interested in how participants in interactions accomplish social activities, and pay particular attention to how they negotiate role and status in doing so (cf. Goodenough 1965).

Of particular interest to this dissertation is the focus on interactional consequences that CA brings to an analysis. CA is centrally concerned with 'interactional sequence', wherein a particular utterance within a stretch of talk evokes a "'here and now' definition of the situation to which subsequent talk will be oriented" (Drew and Heritage 1990: 285, see also Boden and Zimmerman 1991). This perspective has led to the development of such concepts as adjacency pairs, in which one utterance (e.g., a greeting) precludes another (e.g., a response to this

greeting). That such rules exist becomes apparent when people do not follow them, as when someone does not return a greeting. This is important in terms of the focus on interactional efficacy in this interaction, because not acting according to conversational expectations (and rules) is one way in which speakers can "...influence, or even constrain the conduct of their coparticipants" (ibid). For example, it becomes important if no one responds to a question posed by a particular speaker. Because shifts in the linguistic features that are the focus of this dissertation also relate to shifts in the relationships between participants in interactions (e.g., by marking interpersonal closeness or distance), CA is a very useful tool for examining the interactional consequences of such shifts.

It should be noted, however, that I use CA in modified form in this dissertation. The main modification is that I include background information on speakers and settings that are relevant to the interaction. Rather than let the information such as informants' age or relationship to one another come out (or not) of an isolated interaction, I purposefully give ethnographic context to the interactions I examine. I do this because I am interested in how participants use linguistic resources to negotiate role and status, and my understanding of these negotiations is necessarily related to ethnographic background on the speakers and settings. For example, in Chapter Three I focus on work-related interactions, which I argue entail a particular role configuration among interactional participants. In this sense, my work falls into the category of research for which the context of one conversation is not enough, "...but must be supplemented with ethnographic research" (Keating and Egbert forthcoming: 5).

### **Role configurations: "institutional" versus "ordinary" talk**

Because the analysis in Chapters Three and Four focus on shifts in the linguistic features discussed above as speakers negotiate role and status, a word on my assumptions about role configurations in each of the chapters is in order. Chapter Three concentrates on activity-centered interactions, where "activity" is defined as "work-related". It thus considers

interactions that, by Drew and Heritage's definition are "institutional", as in these interactions "participants institutional or professional identities are somehow made relevant to the work activities in which they are engaged" (1992: 4). Thus, in Chapter Three because interactions were related to work, roles were configured on the basis of institutional definitions. In addition, I draw on the work of Erving Goffman mentioned above in assuming particular "participation frameworks", where participants in the interactions I examine have right and obligations associated with particular roles they play in the interactions. As was discussed in Chapter One, Japanese society places a strong emphasis on the importance of knowing one's role in particular settings; and knowing what is expected of one based on that role. Particularly in Chapter Three, these self-understandings are central, as in institutional discourse particularly there is a "direct relationship between status and role, on the one hand, and discursive rights and obligations on the other (ibid: 49).

As will become clear in the description of my field sites below, some of them would not seem to be places where "institutional" talk takes place. The story card group, for example, could arguably be called a social gathering as much as a work site. The diner, though certainly a workplace, is also a site where friends – including the women who work at the diner – chat and gossip. However, the interactions that I focus on at these sites in Chapter Three do fit the definition of "institutional talk" that Drew and Heritage give: 1) orientation by at least one participant to some core goal or identity associated with the institution in question (goal oriented); 2) special and particular constraints on what people will treat as allowable; and 3) association with inferential frameworks and procedures particular to specific institutional contexts. (ibid: 1). This orientation also carries with it particular role configurations for the participants in interactions. Specifically, in institutional talk the women I identify below as "authority figures" are in that role in these interactions. In contrast to this, Chapter Four examines interactions that are not institutionally-oriented. These interactions are not oriented towards a goal associated with the institution and therefore – according to Drew and Heritage – they are not subject of the same constraints on what is allowable. The comparison of

institutional and non-institutional interactions is also intended to consider the question of relational selves raised in Chapter One. In particular, the comparison considers how much people's roles influence their language choices.

## **CONCLUSION**

The data analysis that follows in the next two chapters is therefore based on a theoretical model that considers the effects of particular utterances across stretches of talk, and how speakers negotiate role and status through the use of specific linguistic features within and across interactions. Further, it considers how participants in interactions use language to complete social activities such as making decisions, assessing the work of others, and telling stories.

I will be interested both in the specifics of particular interactions as well as the patterns that evolve out of looking at the interactions collectively. The model I use also includes a central consideration of ethnographic material as it informs the interactions I examine.

The following two chapters focus on short excerpts from longer stretches of talk at all four of my research sites. Though it is not possible to discuss all of the material I collected, the excerpts I discuss are representative of patterns I found both within the same site and, in many cases, across sites. When this is not the case, I have made note of it. In other words, I follow other language-in-interaction researchers in connecting talk to its inter-interactional context by citing extracts of interactions in order to exhibit features or action and social relations that are characteristic of particular settings (*ibid*: 37).

Before moving into an analysis of these interactions, I will now provide some of the very ethnographic background I have claimed is important for each of the four field sites from which I gathered data.



## **RESEARCH DESIGN**

### **Data collection**

I collected video and audio taped data from each of the four sites I describe below over a period of 7-10 months. I approached each of the groups about helping me with my research only after visiting a variety of possible field sites within the community. At each site, I received consent from all participants in the study, according to the guidelines approved for my research project through the University of Texas' Human Subjects Review Board (approval date: 12/14/1998).

The first one or two times I recorded data at each site, participants commented on the presence of the camera. However, as I continued to visit the same site each week, participants became less and less aware of the camera. This was evidenced by comments – to me and/or others in the group – to the effect that they had completely forgotten about the recording equipment. An incident related to my interest in sharing some of the data I had collected and preliminary findings with participants before I left the field in July, 2000 further supports the idea that participants quickly became unaware of the presence of recording equipment. Before sharing my data and findings with others in the group, I checked with those in the group who were participants in the interactional excerpts I planned to show. In one case, two participants wanted to be sure that I did not use an excerpt in which they gossiped about others in the group (which in fact I had not intended to use for that very reason), and I of course respected their wishes. This incident shows how unconscious participants became of my data collection, but also how damaging “ordinary conversation” within close-knit communities can be. For this reason, I only shared data selections that were acceptable to participants in the interactions with others.

I had assistance with transcribing from two diligent women in the community, neither of whom was directly involved with any of the groups in my study.<sup>71</sup> However, because Towa is a small community my two assistants did often know and have contact with one or more of the participants in the study. Therefore, any material that my assistants transcribed was kept strictly confidential, and I kept all records of the transcriptions or original materials.

In two of the four sites where I worked (Hataya and the Tsutanowa Diner), it was not physically possible for me to be present when recording data due to space limitations. I therefore supplemented my recording sessions with regular observational visits to each site.

In the horticultural therapy field site, I initially tried to remain uninvolved in the ongoing activities, since I did not want my own speech to influence in the interactions. However, as there was a chronic shortage of volunteers, I quite often helped with the HT sessions. For my analysis here, I have purposely excluded interactions of which I was a part. In addition, I also made separate observational visits to the site on days when I knew there enough volunteers.

I will now give a brief description and background information for each of my four field sites.

## **Hataya**

The women at the Hataya workshop make and sell saki-ori products. Saki-ori is a form of weaving that developed in Towa and surrounding areas as a means of reusing worn out cloth in the Tokugawa period (1600-1867). Nearly all the people living in the area at the time were farmers, and most were quite poor. In addition, there were restrictions on the kind of clothing they could wear, including a ban on purchasing brand new material, even if the farmers could have afforded it. Saki-ori weaving was thus developed in response to the need for warm, sturdy,

---

<sup>71</sup> These two women did not make the transcripts presented here, but rather transcribed the interactions from my tapes into written form. I consulted work on transcription practices (Edwards and Lampert 1993, Ochs 1992b) in deciding on my own “style,” and discussed this with the women who helped me when necessary.

cheap clothing. Cloth which had become too threadbare to wear or use was torn into strips, and those strips were then woven with thread to make new cloth for making new clothes, etc. The word *saki* comes from the verb for “tearing things into strips,” and *ori* means “weaving”; hence the name “saki-ori.” This type of weaving was practiced primarily by farm women in their homes for many years, and although there were situations where women made saki-ori products for sale in their homes, it was mostly a not-for-profit activity.

Like many things that arise out of necessity, once the need for reusing material was lessened by improved economic circumstances and readily available material, saki-ori style weaving nearly died out. In the 1970’s, however, a woman from Towa named Hideko Odashima<sup>72</sup> studied saki-ori under the tutelage of local women, and eventually opened a facility where anyone could come and try their hand at this kind of weaving for a minimal fee. This facility was built in part with funds and support from the commerce and tourism division of the local government. In addition to the hands-on opportunity offered here, this facility also sold saki-ori products made by several women who worked at the facility.

Mrs. Odashima became a spokesperson of sorts for saki-ori, and traveled widely to talk about and demonstrate this kind of weaving. Now in her 80s, she rarely travels anymore, but still works regularly at the facility. She is cited as the person who reintroduced saki-ori in books that contain information on this kind of weaving.

A visit to the saki-ori facility has become almost mandatory for official visitors to Towa and is always included, for example, as part of the annual program for exchange students from the United States and Great Britain. Mention of saki-ori is made in all community promotional brochures, either as a site of interest and/or one of the “traditional arts and crafts” (*dentou kougei*) of the area. Saki-ori has thus come to be representative of Towa, despite the fact that it

---

<sup>72</sup> Actual names are used for both Hideko Odashima and her daughter, Shuhko with their permission, since their names are already well known and associated with this type of weaving. All other names are pseudonyms, in most cases chosen by the participants themselves.

has never been exclusively practiced in this community. This craft is also linked to other symbols of Towa such as irises in community promotional brochures.

The movement of saki-ori from the domestic to the commercial sphere has brought with it a growing awareness of this kind of weaving, which was once mostly unknown outside of this area. Saki-ori products are now sold in a variety of places nationwide, although the majority of such businesses are in Iwate. Saki-ori is now also part of the curriculum in many schools where weaving is taught. In addition, the move from the domestic to the commercial sphere has opened up opportunities for people such as the women working in the Hataya site to use skills heretofore confined to the domestic sphere in profit-making ventures.

One of the people who worked at the saki-ori facility in Towa for 8 years was Shuhko Odashima, Hideko Odashima's daughter and the current proprietor of the Hataya shop. While Shuhko Odashima appreciated the presence of the saki-ori facility in Towa, because of its location she also felt that it did not reach as many people as one in a more public area would. The facility in Towa is situated in the countryside, far from the center of the town. It is not a place that people will just "happen upon," but rather special transportation arrangements must be made in order to visit there. In addition, Odashima<sup>73</sup> reported to me in explaining how she came to open the facility she currently runs that her taste in colors and color combinations are "oriented towards people from cities" (*tokai no hito ni muku you na karaa*), so she wanted to find a way of reaching those people with her work. Odashima had the idea of building a facility that was in a more central location, in order to share saki-ori with more people from a broader range of geographical backgrounds. She eventually settled on a site near the Miyazawa Kenji Memorial Museum, which is actually outside of Towa and within the limits of the city of Hanamaki. Miyazawa Kenji is a well-known author who lived in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, and many Japanese people from around the country visit the museum and other facilities constructed in memorial to him in this, his birthplace and home. The shop Odashima eventually constructed

---

<sup>73</sup> Shuhko Odashima is referred to simply as "Odashima" hereafter, as that is how her utterances are marked in the transcript excerpts analyzed in Chapters Three and Four.

here, called “Hataya,” is currently part of a row of shops between the museum and a recently built open-air area dedicated to Miyazawa’s children’s stories. There is a bus stop in front of the shop, and as the bus runs only every 40 minutes, some people pass the time by browsing in the stores – including Hataya – near the stop.

Odashima’s interest in acquainting a broader range of people with saki-ori through the Hataya store is reflected in the physical layout of the store itself. The main entry-level floor is the display or “shop” area and the raised area to the right as one enters the door is the workshop area. There are two looms set up in the workshop area, and this is where Odashima and Kabata – the other woman who works at the facility – spent their time unless engaged with customers. There is no wall or partition between the two areas, which means that customers can easily see what Odashima and Kabata are doing from the “shop” area. There are also windows in front of the workshop area, so that visitors can watch the women making saki-ori without entering the store.

Odashima’s aim of reaching a larger audience by opening a workshop in a more public area has for the most part been successful. She and Kabata encounter people from all over Japan in their shop, and through their interactions with these customers promote a product that is associated with the Towa area. In addition, Odashima and Kabata supply other saki-ori dealers with woven products, and thus reach a larger group of people than they would with the workshop alone.

Both Odashima and Kabata are now in their 50s, and both are from the Towa area (Kabata is from a neighboring town). Odashima studied for several years under a saki-ori teacher in a different city, and the shop name “Hataya” is the name given to her by her teacher when she graduated.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> Among artisans in Japan, it is common to receive what might be called an artistic or trade name from one’s teacher upon completion of a course of study. A well-known example of this is kabuki theater actors, who take their names from their teachers. Thus, one finds “Gonzaemon III” and so on.

Odashima is the focus of analysis in work-related interactions; as the person who started the business and the current proprietor, she ostensibly holds a more influential position than Kabata. Odashima and Kabata have worked together almost since the opening of the store, and in speaking about their relationship Odashima stated that although she is technically the boss, she feels her relationship with Kabata is collaborative rather than commanding. According to Odashima, Kabata was a very easy person to work with, since she often did not need explicit instruction or explanation to understand what needed to be done or what Odashima was asking.<sup>75</sup>

I got to know Odashima and Kabata through my connections with the Towa local government board of education offices. When I first approached Odashima about working with me on my research, she initially hesitated because of fears of being listened to and watched. The women work at looms that face windows that look onto a busy road,<sup>76</sup> and Odashima told me that it is not uncommon for passers-by to stop and watch the Hataya women work. As Odashima said at the time, “It’s just like being watched in a zoo.” Given the very limited physical space in the shop, as well as my inability to be of use in the weaving process, I set up the video camera in an unobtrusive spot in the workshop, and had Odashima put the cassette recorder in the pocket of the apron she always wore.<sup>77</sup>

### **Horticultural Therapy (HT)**

The HT program is part of the local government, and is run by Maemi Yaegashi, a female civil servant in her early 50s. She has been a civil servant in the local government for about 25 years and is a native of Towa, where she has lived her entire life. Yaegashi’s training is in care

---

<sup>75</sup> Odashima related her feeling to me during a follow-up visit in May, 2001. At that time Yaegashi was no longer working at Hataya, having had to quit in order to attend to family matters. Odashima expressed a great deal of perplexity at Yaegashi’s being gone; both in terms of her increased workload as well as missing the Yaegashi’s companionship.

<sup>76</sup> During the period I collected data at this site, the road in front of Hataya was a main thoroughfare for trucks related to the construction of a new superhighway (*kousoku douro*) that will connect the area with Akita Prefecture in the west. Towa is one of the towns that will be connected with this highway. During warm weather, the windows in the Hataya were left open, and the almost constant truck noise meant that parts of the tapes I gathered during that period were unintelligible.

<sup>77</sup> I initially encountered some difficulties in determining how to get accurate and complete audio recordings in sites where participants move around quite often. Most women wear aprons with pockets when doing any kind of work, and this proved to be an ideal solution.

for the elderly, and she worked in health-related divisions of the government for several years before starting the HT program. I have been close friends with Yaegashi since I was first in Towa from 1990-92, and in fact my family hosted her when she visited the United States for work-related trip several years ago.

Following brief feasibility studies by then Mayor Hideo Obara and Deputy Mayor Mineo Odashima (the current mayor), Yaegashi went to the United States for five weeks in 1995 to study horticultural therapy at New York City's Goldwater Memorial Hospital. At the time, there were very few HT programs in place in Japan, particularly in Tohoku. Yaegashi explained that this was part of the justification for her trip being funded by the local government. Upon her return, plans for initiating an HT program in Towa were taken under advisement, and the program was started in 1997.

There are currently two main HT programs in Towa. The one Yaegashi oversees is for elderly patients in the local hospital/nursing home, including those in day care. The other program is for mentally debilitated people who may or may not be part of local programs aimed at providing services for this part of the community's population, and is run by a different person.

There are six HT sessions per week at the Towa hospital, one each morning and afternoon on Monday through Wednesday. In addition, the HT staff (Yaegashi and Oikawa) conduct a session every Friday afternoon at a local retirement home. Yaegashi also occasionally does shorter sessions with local senior citizens' groups, and is also involved in HT programs that make up part of the "green tourism" (*guriin tsuurizumu*, 'eco tourism'; tourism through the medium of promoting the beauty of the community's natural resources).<sup>78</sup>

The data for this research is focused on the sessions held in the Towa hospital on Tuesday mornings, although I also observed and gathered some data from the other sites/times just mentioned. The hospital sessions take place in a small greenhouse attached to the recreation

---

<sup>78</sup> See Chapter 1 for more discussion of Towa's green tourism program.

room/dining room of the hospital. Plants take up most of the space in this room, but there is also a small “office” area with desk and telephone, as well as a hot water pot and cups for having tea and snacks after the sessions. In addition, there is a small sink area where participants wash their hands after each session, and from which water is drawn for the sessions. There is an open area just outside the greenhouse where more plants are grown. When the weather is good and the activity permits, sessions are held outside in a small gazebo-like area, in the “alleyway” between the hospital and the nursing home. There are windows between the greenhouse and the recreation/dining room but no curtains, so activities in each area are mutually observable. The door between the two areas is kept open, so that participants in the HT sessions often do their activities against background music being played as part of “recreation time” in the next room.

Generally speaking, 4-5 patients participate in each session, and the same patients attend the same session each week. I limited my data gathering to Monday and Tuesday mornings, in order to limit the number of people participating in the interactions. Patients are brought into the room by the HT staff or by other hospital staff. Patients sit around the round table at the east end of the room, and work one-on-one with volunteers and/or HT staff members. The patients who participate in the HT sessions are physically and/or mentally debilitated to one degree or another, and the first order of business in getting set up for the sessions is to get everyone situated in chairs/wheelchairs and putting on clean aprons. The staff and volunteers usually arrive a few minutes before the session is set to begin, and arrange any necessary materials/equipment that might be needed for that day’s session.

There are a variety of activities done in these sessions, including transplanting flowers that have outgrown their pots, making large planters to go outside the main hospital doors for decoration, and making seasonal crafts such as candleholder centerpieces or cards decorated with dried flowers. The HT staff will have laid out any necessary materials before the session begins, so work begins as soon as everyone is settled. Yaegashi or Oikawa generally gives a brief overview of what people are to do at that day’s sessions, although this often takes place before the patients arrive.



Because Towa's HT program was one of the first in the area, and has become a model for other programs in Tohoku. Yaegashi is often called upon to lead workshops and give lectures about HT in the Tohoku region and throughout Japan, as well as playing host to visitors from a variety of communities interested in setting up or improving their own HT programs. She has given lectures as far away as Kyushu, and is often called upon as a local expert in this area. As a result, Yaegashi was sometimes not present at the HT sessions from which I gathered data for this research. However, she usually checked in for a least a few minutes during each session. Yaegashi's assistant, Oikawa, was present at every session.

Because Oikawa and Yaegashi cannot handle the needs of all the patients on their own, several volunteers come to each session. These volunteers are given minimal training in interacting with patients, through workshops offered once or twice during the year by the HT staff. Volunteers tend to come to the same session(s) every week, and those who were most commonly present during the time my data-gathering sessions were Ms. Yamada and Ms. Oda. Yamada is in her early 60's, and is the wife of a former prominent city councilman. She is also a member of the story card group discussed below, spends a good deal of her time volunteering for various community organizations. Oda is a former schoolteacher in the community, and is still often addressed as *sensei* ("teacher") by the HT staff and other volunteers. She is also in her 60's.

My data analysis originally centered on Yaegashi, as the creator and overseer of the HT programs directed towards senior citizens.

### **3. Tsutanowa Diner**

The Tsutanowa diner was started five years ago by a group of women who are part of a local chapter of the nationwide Quality of Life Improvement group (hereafter QLI. The name comes from the Japanese title, *seikatsu kaizen guruupu*, lit. "lifestyle improvement group"). There are five subgroups in the QLI group, divided by district, and until the creation of the diner

each worked independently of the other. The diner, however, is the first and only QLI activity that draws on members from all regions of Towa.<sup>79</sup>

The idea for the diner came from a desire on the part of several QLI group women to use local agricultural products as the basis for dishes to be sold for a profit. This was the first time the women involved had taken on jobs outside the home.<sup>80</sup> The women approached a civil servant in the Agriculture and Forestry Division (AFD)<sup>81</sup> of the local government who was then in charge of women and agriculture. Although the diner was never directly run by the AFD, according to the then AFD contact person, there was very close collaboration. The AFD helped the women find a location, got them set up in business, offered advice on running a successful business, and helped in creating the menu. Even today, a representative from the AFD attends the monthly meetings between the Diner employees and the rest of the QLI group members. The AFD representative's position was described by diner employees as that of an "observer" rather than an "advisor," but the presence of this representative reflects the continuing support that the diner has from the local government. In addition, the local government has also helped to build business for the diner by, for example, asking the women there to cater events organized by the government.

Of the original six people who started the diner, all but one still work there. In addition, three other new people have joined the staff. The women generally work 20 hours a week, since the diner work is in addition to the often substantial workload they have at home. Women running the diner usually work the same day(s) every week, although the schedule is hard to predict at peak agricultural periods such as planting and harvesting. There is one person in charge of the shop (the *ten-chou*, or "store head"), but there are not any other officers or organizational distinctions between the women involved in running the diner. This is not to say,

---

<sup>79</sup> See Ishiwatari (1996) and Taguchi (1996) for more information on women-run cooperatives and agricultural innovation.

<sup>80</sup> As mentioned earlier in this chapter, these women were like many other rural women in that they were quite active in agricultural activities at home. However, working at the diner was the first time they held paying positions outside of their family's homestead.

<sup>81</sup> Renamed the "Agriculture and local government division" (*nousei-ka*) in fiscal 1999.

however, that there are not salient social distinctions based on age and experience (seniority at the restaurant as well as within the QLI group). The focus in the interactional analysis is on Unagami when she is present, as she is the head of the diner.

The women working at the diner range in age from mid-40s to late 50s, and the majority of them were born and raised in Towa. In addition, there were several customers who came to the diner on a regular basis during the times I was collecting data.

I collected data from this site on the same two days of the week for the first two months of a ten-month collection period, but shifted to a different two days (the same two each week) for the remaining time. Mondays are a “lunch special” day, and I found that going on this day guaranteed more customers than could be assured to come on other days.

Because the diner is funded completely by women in the QLI group, there have been many lessons—sometimes hard ones—in keeping the business financially healthy. Women working at the diner often apologized to me if there were not many customers on a day I was recording, but the real problem was that there was not enough income for the restaurant on those days.

The Tsutanowa Diner is located in a small corner of the “local products center” (*mahoroba bussan sentaa*), which sells food and other goods from the Towa area. The diner has quite a limited space, with a counter that seats up to 8 people and a small kitchen behind the counter.

There are two basic groups of clientele who frequent the diner: regulars who are often friends of the women who work there, and visitors from out of town. Depending on who is in the diner at a given time, conversations can therefore range from very informal and close to quite formal and distant.

Like the Hataya weaving workshop discussed above, women working at the Tsutanowa Diner also promote the Towa community through their interactions with customers, and by the very fact that they run the diner in Towa. Among the many things that the women working at the diner had to adjust to was the fact that many of their customers asked them for tourist advice

while in the restaurant. The Diner women now have promotional brochures in the restaurant, and often act as community liaisons with visitors to the community. In addition, the food itself acts as a promotion of the Towa community, since the Diner women stress the use of local agricultural products. Thus, customers who are not from Towa are often introduced to the community through food. The Tsutanowa diner is also linked to other agricultural activities in the community. These include the Agritopia rose production facility, a restaurant and hands-on food production facility started by the local government in 1999, the Agriculture and Government Division of the local government, and a fruit and vegetable stand supported by the town government.

#### **4. Mandagera making-making group**

Mandagera is a group that meets once a month to make what are called *kami shibai*. These are pictures made to go along with stories, where the picture is on one side and the story is on the other. When telling the stories, the narrator holds up a card so that the audience can see the picture, and reads the part of the story written on the back of the card she holds. The women in this group take stories from a collection of local folktales as material for their work. They make the cards for telling the stories together, although only 2-3 of them will actually present the material at any given event.

The Mandagera group is an outgrowth of a course on making story cards offered through the then Social Education Division (*shakai kyouiku-ka*) of the local Board of Education. Ms. Narisawa, the woman currently in charge of the group, was working in this division at the time, and taught the course. Members of the class wanted to continue their study/work after the class ended, so they continued to meet on a monthly basis. The group has now been in existence for 7 years, of which only the first few months was the government-sponsored class.

The group performs stories they have illustrated at a variety of local and regional events and schools. A central aim of the group, according to their promotional literature, is to pass on local traditions (e.g., folktales) to younger generations. In addition, they also perform at a

various cultural events, and were even showcased on an NHK (Japan's national broadcasting station) as part of a program on local folktale performances in Tohoku.

Because the stories the group performs are from the area (often local versions of more widely known folktales), there is a great deal of LLV in the stories. A recent addition (since January, 2001) to Mandagera performances is a "LLV quiz" (*hougen kuwizu*) where members of the group elicit guesses for standard Japanese equivalents of prominent LLV words in the story to be performed prior to the performance. This has proved to be a popular addition, particularly among schoolchildren, who are less likely to be familiar with many of the LLV terms used in the stories (cf. the discussion of generational differences in local language variety competency in Chapter Two).

The Mandagera group meets once a month (occasionally twice, if more time is needed to prepare for an upcoming performance) in a room that is part of the local Community Center. The tables are usually arranged so that they touch each other, forming a long rectangle around which people work. At times latecomers will set up work at a separate table, if they find there is not enough room for them. Narisawa, the leader of the group and focus of the interactions analyzed in Chapters Three and Four, contributes a good deal of work both during and outside of the sessions. She makes the final decision on what stories they will perform, prepares paper and other necessary materials for the sessions, puts on the finishing touches to pictures when time is limited, makes corrections to others' work when necessary, and in short makes sure that the story cards are all in good order for each presentation.

Unlike the Hataya and Tsutanowa Diner sites, the Mandagera group is not concerned with making a profit, except for the small amount of revenue needed to buy materials and cover and transportation costs incurred in relation to particular performances. Besides their stated interest in "passing on traditions to younger generations," women in the group also made it clear in their comments to me that they thoroughly enjoy meeting with other group members every month, and view the group as a good social activity.

Many of the women know each other outside of the group, and some participate in other activities with other members of the group. Mandagera group meetings ostensibly started at 9:30 AM, but this time usually only marked when the majority of the group members began to assemble, and was not a strict starting time. The women would work from the time they started (usually by 10:00) until noon, when everyone took lunch together. Several women in the group would normally bring something for lunch, and there was always a great deal of discussion about particular dishes that a given person had brought for that day's feast. I was always included in the lunch gatherings, and often brought my own contributions. This tended to lead to my inclusion in the food discussions, since I often brought non-Japanese food that many of the women had not eaten before. The networks outside of the group were sometimes reflected in discussions about a particular dish someone had brought, as women often related that they had had made a dish with ingredients they got from another group member.

After lunch (about 1:00), the group continued to work until 3:00 or 3:30. Quite often there was also a 30 to 40 minute "business meeting" at the beginning or end of the gathering.

I collected data from the Mandagera monthly meetings for 10 months, including the lunchtime sessions. Group participants did not change during this period, except for one person who had to leave for family reasons in February and the occasional absence of one member or another. In addition, one new person (who became the youngest member of the group) joined for my last recording session.

## **CONCLUSION**

The next two chapters focus on interactions from each of these four sites, with particular attention paid to sites where participants use the linguistic features I have discussed to negotiate status and roles. Chapter Three considers work-related activities organized around particular activities, where Chapter Four focuses on non-work-related interactions. I have broken them down this way because of the expectation that these two broad types of interactions entail different role configurations.

## CHAPTER THREE: Activity-centered interactions

### INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter gave an explanation of how a focus on the interactional consequences of particular linguistic features - gender-marked speech, local language varieties, and style differences (*desu/-masu*, plain, and naked abrupt) – is a useful framework for examining how women negotiate role and status, and organize themselves socially through language use. In this chapter and the next, I use this methodological framework to examine excerpts from conversational material, and in so doing show the contributions and shortcomings of this approach.

Within the broad framework of shifts in the three sets of linguistic features delineated in Chapter Two as they relate to role and status negotiations, this chapter and the next will consider the following more targeted questions:

1. How do the three sets of features work independently and/or in combination? What combinations are present, and what do each of those combinations “do” in terms of creating and negotiating particular relational stances?
2. Can the extant literature on speech level shifts and other features account for the patterns found in my data? If not, what can account for these patterns?
3. How is feminine-marked language used; what are the interactional effects? Does it denote “powerlessness” (ineffectiveness) in conversational interaction? If so, how? If not, what does it denote?
4. Are other gender-marked features used, and if so to what effect?

In this chapter, excerpts are taken from activity-centered interactions that relate to the work of the group. Because of this orientation, I expected that the women identified as authority figures<sup>82</sup> would play an important role. I identified four types of interactions – listed below – that were both central to interactions related to work-oriented activities and of interest to this

---

<sup>82</sup> As stated in Chapter Two, “authority figures” are those who hold some office or position where they are in charge of others in the group (e.g., boss, head of the group, etc.).

study because they entail a particular configuration of roles among participants. The four categories are:

1. Evaluation/assessment
2. Manipulating politeness
3. Giving directions/teaching
4. Negotiation/decision-making

The first set of examples is from evaluative interactions between authority figures and others in each of the field sites. Evaluation/assessment is important in investigating how role and status negotiations are instantiated in language for two reasons. First, such speech acts put the speaker under evaluation in a dependent position on the evaluator; putting the evaluator in an authoritative position, but also one laden with responsibility.<sup>83</sup> Second, the way the evaluation is given and received can tell us a great deal about who is in charge and whose words carry interactional weight (i.e., have an effect on the behavior of others in the group).

The second section on “manipulating politeness” focuses on stretches of talk where interactants invert conventional norms for doing evaluation or assessment. Role relations in this type of interaction would seem to be similar to those found in the “evaluation/assessment” section, but the outcomes are quite different. In this section we also see “gender performances,” as participants highlight femininity through the use of a hyper-feminine speaking style.

When giving directions or teaching (the third section in this chapter), the participant(s) in the role of “teacher” assumes a distinct position of authority vis-à-vis other interactants. This type of interaction is particularly interesting with regard to speech level shifts, since some previous research (cf. Cook) has suggested that a shift to the role of “teacher” leads to a shift in speech level.



The section on negotiation/decision making considers longer stretches of talk in examining how participants negotiate their own and others roles in interactions in coming to decisions about work-related topics. In these interactions, the person who introduces the topic, as well as individual participants' knowledge of and background with the topic at hand, leads to the initial role configurations.

### **Transcript notations**

In the following excerpts, an arrow at the beginning of a line indicates a shift in any of the three sets of features, and the specific word or morpheme that marks the shift is underlined in the original Japanese (top line). In addition, the type of shift is labeled in double brackets in the English gloss: e.g., a shift from the plain form to *desu/-masu* would be marked as `[[desu/-masu]]`. For details on transcript conventions, please see Appendix D.

### **EVALUATION/ASSESSMENT**

The first examples in this section come from the Mandagera story card (*kami shibai*) group, where activities are centered around the production of picture cards used in telling local folktales. The women generally all sit around a group of 3-4 tables pushed together to make a common workspace. There tend to be several conversations going on at once during the monthly sessions since, as at a dinner party with many guests, the women often talk with the 2-3 people physically closest to them.

In excerpt 1 below, Ms. Yamanouchi (Y) has just completed a picture card. Ms. Narisawa (N), who is sitting right next to her, comments on Yamanouchi's work.

#### **EXCERPT 1**

- 1 Y *dekimashita*  
(I'm) done. `[[desu/-masu]]`
- 2 N *uwaa hayai hayai subarashii*  
wow fast fast wonderful  
Wow! (You're) fast, (you're) fast. Wonderful. `[[plain]]`

---

<sup>83</sup> Recall the discussion of how authority entails responsibility from Chapter Two. This point will become clearer in examining particular interactions.

- 3 Y *kouyou desu*  
It's fall colors. [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 4 T *seki sugoku kirei*  
stone very pretty  
The stones are really pretty. [[plain]]
- 5 N *kirei desu ne*  
(They're) pretty, aren't they. [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 6 Y *sou iwareru to mou sukoshi teinei ni ne* {laughing}  
like that am told if more little carefully IP  
Hearing you say that (makes we want to do) it a little more carefully/neatly.
- 7 N *juubun desu*  
plenty is  
Its just fine. [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 8 *kirei da wa*  
pretty is IP  
It's pretty. [[plain; strong feminine]]

Yamanouchi begins her utterance by announcing that she has completed her picture card (line 1). She does not explicitly ask for evaluative comments from Narisawa or Takahashi (who joins the conversation in line 4), but her statement elicits just such remarks. Therefore, this is an example of an indirect elicitation of evaluation. Yamanouchi is the speaker in the Mandagera group who most frequently uses *desu/-masu* and feminine-marked forms, and therefore I have categorized her as the most “JWL-like” speaker of the group. For this reason, her use of a *desu/-masu* form here is not unusual. However, it is unusual in comparison to patterns found in indirect elicitations by other speakers in my data set, where most speakers use plain forms.

The lack of arrows marking shifts in the transcript would suggest that there are not shifts in this interaction. In fact, there are so many shifts that each line but the first would have to be marked by an arrow, since speakers shift between plain and *desu/-masu* in every line. For this reason, I chose not to put it in any arrows in this transcript.

Narisawa (N), the leader of the group, is the first to respond to Yamanouchi's (Y) proclamation that she has completed her picture, and she does so using a plain form (*subarashii*). Her response here is an emotional one, as she exclaims that Y has finished very quickly. It is not surprising that Narisawa uses the plain form here, given that she is the position of evaluating group members' work as the leader of Mandagera, and also because of the nature of her

response: an emotive utterance (as marked by the *waa*). It is also important to note that Narisawa responds not to the picture Yamanouchi has just completed itself, but rather to the rate at which Yamanouchi has finished. She thus gives a response to Yamanouchi's efficient work pace, rather than any comment on the work itself.

Yamanouchi continues her use of the *desu/-masu* form in drawing attention to the picture itself (line 3). Here, her comments are more explicitly outwardly-directed.

Takahashi (T) then enters the conversation, shifting back to the plain form in stating that "the stones are really pretty" (line 4). She thus follows Narisawa's lead in using the plain form to respond to Yamanouchi's *desu/-masu* form utterances.

In line 5, however, Narisawa shifts to the *desu/-masu* form in echoing Takahashi's evaluation of the stones. Given conventional understandings of plain versus *desu/-masu* form usage, it is quite striking that Takahashi uses the plain form while Narisawa uses *desu/-masu* here. Narisawa is the leader of the group, and in this interaction it could be argued that she is being called upon to evaluate another member's work, a role that she holds because she is the group leader. While other members of the Mandagera group ask for and give evaluation of other women's work, Narisawa is the person who gives final approval on pieces. For example, she will check to make sure that colors are consistent across cards, so that a character does not have pitch-black hair on one card and brownish-black hair on another. Given all of this, conventional understandings of speech level usage would lead us to expect Narisawa to use plain forms throughout this interaction. However, here she shifts to the *desu/-masu* form. One possible explanation for her shift here is that she does so to highlight Takahashi's comment, which she echoes here. As we shall see in the examples below, it is not uncommon for speakers to shift speech style when reiterating a point they themselves have made previously, and here we see an example of a speaker shifting style when reiterating someone else's point. It is also significant that Narisawa's comment in line 5 is about the quality of Yamanouchi's painting work, and not (as previously) on her efficiency.

In response to Takahashi and Narisawa's positive assessments, Yamanouchi claims that being praised in this way makes her wish she had been more careful in her work (line 6). Self-degradation in the face of a compliment is a conventional response in Japanese society, and here Yamanouchi follows that pattern in stating, in effect, that her work could be better. The verb *iwareru* ('to be told') here is in the plain form, which in the model I have outlined would mark a speech level shift. This would seem to be particularly striking, given that Yamanouchi uses *desu/-masu* forms everywhere else in the interaction, and most importantly that Narisawa – Yamanouchi's superior and evaluator – has just used the *desu/-masu* form herself. Again, conventional understandings would lead us to anticipate that Yamanouchi would therefore at least continue her use of the *desu/-masu* form here to match Narisawa's style, if not use a more polite form than Narisawa. For these reasons, Yamanouchi's shift to the plain form here seems to be an anomaly. However, the syntactic constraints operating in this utterance lead to a different understanding. Across my data, there are places where speakers do not use *desu/-masu* forms, even where all of the rest of their utterances are in that style. In the case of Yamanouchi's utterance here (line 6), the verb *iwareru* ('to be told') is followed by the conditional *to* ('if/when'), and the *desu/-masu* style utterance would read *iwaremasu to*. However, this is an example of a place where speakers almost never shift to the *desu/-masu* form; again, even when their surrounding utterances are all in that form. Conversations with native speakers, and my own sense as an accomplished non-native Japanese speaker combined with my analysis of the data under discussion here suggests that shifting to *desu/-masu* forms at certain junctures such as the one just described above would mark the utterance as too formal for the setting. For example, one might use *iwaremasu to* when writing a formal letter, but in this situation (and in the majority of situations across my data) it is simply too formal. A detailed exploration of this phenomena is beyond the scope of this dissertation (but see Chapter Five for a preliminary analysis), so for the purposes of the analysis in this chapter and the next I will simply make note of places that look like shifts but do not function like shifts. In those few places where speakers across my data do not shift to *desu/-masu* under the conditions I have just described, the plain

form will therefore not be marked as shifts. Therefore, Yamanouchi's utterance in line 6 is not treated as a shift to the plain form.

Narisawa responds to Yamanouchi's self-deprecating remarks with an assurance that her work is just fine (*juubun desu*), in line 7. She maintains her use of the *desu/-masu* form here. In her next utterance, however, she shifts to the plain form, followed by an interactional particle that is strongly marked for femininity (*wa*). Here she is restating the earlier assessment she and Takahashi made of Yamanouchi's work – that it is 'pretty' (*kirei*) – and this is therefore another example of a speaker changing style when reiterating a previous statement or point. Here the use of *wa* also serves to emphasize the point that Yamanouchi's picture is indeed pretty.

In the next excerpt, the interaction is more clearly an instance of evaluation/assessment from the outset. Here, Oikawa (O) asks Narisawa (N) for advice on a story card.

#### EXCERPT 2

- 1 O *kono douro no kugiri o amari hakkiri shinakutemo*  
     this road POSS end DO not very clear don't do
- 2 *ii- n deshou*  
     okay NOM maybe  
     It's okay not make the end of this road very clear, right? [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 3 N *hai*  
     Yes.
- 4 O *futoku kou kaitara ee kashira kono*<sup>84</sup>  
     thick like this if I draw good I wonder this  
     I wonder if it's okay to draw it thick, this... [[strong fem]]
- 5 N *sou desu ne*  
     that is IP  
     Yes, well. [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 6 *mou sukoshi [hakkiri kaite mo ii]*  
     more little clear draw okay  
     It would be okay to make it a little clearer. [[plain]]
- 7 O                   *[hakkiri kaite ii ]*  
                     clear draw okay  
                     It's okay to draw it clearly. [[naked plain]]

---

<sup>84</sup> The verb *kaitara* ('if I draw') in this utterance is in the plain form. However, like the *iwareru to* ('if I'm told') in excerpt 1, speakers rarely use the *desu/-masu* form in this construction (i.e., *kakimashitara*), even where they use the *desu/-masu* form in surrounding utterances. Thus, like *iwareru to* in the previous excerpt, for the purposes of this dissertation I do not consider *kaitara* as marking a shift to the plain form.

- 8 N *ne*  
Right?  
9 O *hai*  
Yes (I see).

Oikawa frames her request for an evaluative comment from Narisawa with the use of *deshou* ('probably/I think'), a *desu/-masu* form. Oikawa's use of the *desu/-masu* form here follows traditional usage rules, both because she addresses a social superior – Narisawa is both the leader of the group and the person who will evaluate Oikawa's work – and "[a] person making any sort of request...is expected to be even more humble and respectful than usual" (Niyekawa 1991:15).<sup>85</sup> Narisawa follows Oikawa's use of the *desu/-masu* form in her response.<sup>86</sup> As with the previous excerpt, conventional understandings of speech level usage would not lead us to expect Narisawa's use of the *desu/-masu* form here, but rather that, as the leader of the group and person in the role of Oikawa's evaluator she would use the plain forms.

Narisawa's response to Oikawa's utterance (line 3) does not actually answer Oikawa's question, but rather indicates that she is engaged with what Oikawa is saying.<sup>87</sup> Oikawa pushes Narisawa for a more explicit response by modifying her original query (line1) in line 4. In doing so, she uses a strong feminine-marked form (*kashira*), in combination with a phonological variant of *ii* ("good/okay") found in the local language variety (LLV). Her style shift here parallels the shift found in the previous excerpt when reiterating something, although the specifics of the shift are different. Oikawa's shift can also be attributed to what she is doing interactionally in this utterance: namely, asking Narisawa to give a response to her question. Given that Oikawa is making the same request of a social superior for the second time, her use of feminine and LLV forms can be understood as a means of making her second question more polite (through the use of a feminine-marked form) while at the same time closer (through the

---

<sup>85</sup> Regarding the latter factor, Oikawa's use of *deshou* is significant, since it is a more indirect (and therefore polite) way of making her request. *Deshou* is used when seeking input from one's interlocutors, and can be roughly translated as "probably/do you think".

<sup>86</sup> Although there are no verbs in Narisawa's response, *hai* is a polite way of saying "yes" or "I hear you".

<sup>87</sup> *Hai* can also mean "yes," but Oikawa's response in line 3 indicates that in this case it is less an affirmative response to Oikawa's question (i.e., "Yes, it's okay not to make the edge of the road clearer.") than acknowledgement of Oikawa's question (i.e., "Yes, I heard what you said").

use of an LLV form). Traditional understandings would characterize *kashira* (a strongly feminine form) as soft and mitigating, and insofar as it makes the utterance more polite, this understanding holds true. However, it is also important to note that the use of *kashira* does not necessarily make Oikawa's utterance ineffective, an interactional notion associated with feminine forms. In fact, Narisawa gives a more explicit response to Oikawa's second query, so Oikawa's utterance in line 4 can be said to be *more* effective than that in line 1. In this sense, the use of a strongly feminine-marked form is actually more effective than the initial gender-neutral form in line 1.

Narisawa initially responds to Oikawa's second request for commentary with a *desu/-masu* form (*sou desu ne* 'yes, well...'), but then shifts to the plain form in answering Oikawa's question. Narisawa's response (an evaluation) is to suggest that Oikawa could draw the road a little more clearly (line 6), which is a negative assessment of the drawing as it stands now and, thus, Oikawa's work. In this sense, Narisawa's use of the *desu/-masu* form in line 5 can be seen as a set-up line for the criticism that follows in line 6. That is, Narisawa maintains the distancing *desu/-masu* form in setting up for a critique of Oikawa's work, which she gives in the interpersonally close plain form. This pattern of preceding a critique with a polite (*desu/-masu* form) would be in line with Ikuta's suggestion that speakers often precede personal questions (done in the plain form) with expressions in the *desu/-masu* form that recognize the intrusive nature of the personal question (e.g., *shitsurei desu kedo* 'this is rude of me to ask, but'). In the case of this interaction, Narisawa's use of the *desu/-masu* form could be seen as a way of drawing back through polite forms before making a personal critique. However, there are some important differences between the interactions that form the basis of Ikuta's model, and the interaction under discussion here. Ikuta discusses the shift from plain to *desu/-masu* forms preceding a personal question in relation to primarily plain-form conversations between two people who do not know each other very well (but are involved in an extended conversation). Furthermore, in the interactions Ikuta considers, the questioner is in a socially inferior position (in Ikuta's data, by dint of being younger) to the addressee. The excerpt under discussion here is

a very different setting, and Narisawa – the social superior – could very well be expected not to use *desu/-masu* forms at all. In fact, this is what traditional models of speech levels usage (*desu/-masu* and plain) would lead us to expect. In addition, the interaction to this point (lines 1-5) has been in a polite form.

Oikawa uses the naked plain form in line 7 when overlapping and echoing Narisawa's assessment, which is in line with Maynard's suggestion that the naked plain is used (though not exclusively) in echo responses (cf. Maynard 1993, also the section on the "Naked plain" form in Chapter Two of this dissertation). Following this, Narisawa takes on Oikawa's previous stance in seeking a more formal commitment to her suggestion, with the use of the IP *ne* ('isn't it/right') in line 8 (see Cook 1990, 1992 for a more detailed discussion of this IP). The *ne* by itself, too, is not marked for plain or *desu/-masu* speech style, but retains the casual and interpersonally close style introduced in line 6 (*desu/-masu* form would be *desu ne*). The form Narisawa uses in seeking explicit confirmation from Oikawa is quite distinct from Oikawa's forms in doing the same thing; whereas Oikawa used more polite forms when asking for an explicit response from Narisawa (line 4), Narisawa uses the plain form in eliciting a definite affirmative response from Oikawa (line 8). The differences can be understood both in terms of what Oikawa and Narisawa are trying to achieve – Oikawa asks a question that entails a request to Narisawa, while Narisawa asks Oikawa to give a response to her assessment of Oikawa's work – and in terms of the speakers respective positions. Whereas Oikawa is asking a person in a socially superior role for evaluation, Narisawa is asking a person in a socially subordinate role for acceptance (of her evaluation).

In response to Narisawa's push for explicit alignment with her evaluation, Oikawa uses a polite form of 'yes' (*hai*). This is in keeping with traditional understandings of speech level usage where, in this case, the person being evaluated (in a socially subordinate position) uses *desu/-masu* forms, while the person doing the evaluation (in a socially superior position) uses plain forms.



Looking at the interaction as a whole, we see that once Narisawa engages in her role of evaluator she consistently uses plain forms, except where she shifts to a plain form when giving a critique. On the other hand, Oikawa uses *desu/-masu* forms except where she echoes Narisawa's evaluative comments (line 7). Thus, Narisawa can be said to follow traditional speech level usage once she formally takes up the role of evaluator that puts her in a socially superior position vis-à-vis Oikawa.

The next excerpt involves another interaction between Narisawa and Yamanouchi. Immediately prior to the excerpt given here Yamanouchi has come to Narisawa for advice on a story card, and Narisawa has already made some changes. In this excerpt, Narisawa both evaluates Yamanouchi's work and gives her specific instructions on how to improve it. At the point where the excerpt begins, Narisawa has brought out another picture from the same story that Yamanouchi has drawn.

### EXCERPT 3

- 1 N (*chotto*) *yasashisugiru toiu kanji datta node*  
 little too pleasant that sense was so  
 It seemed a little too soft (pleasant), so. [[ plain]]
- 2 Y *hai*  
 Yes.
- 3 N (*yasashii*) *desu mon ne*  
 soft is that IP  
 It's soft, you see, right? [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 4 Y *sou desu ne onaji you na hou wakaku shita you desu (yo ne)*  
 that is IP same like part young make like is IP IP  
 I see. It's like the same thing only made younger, isn't it? [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 5 N (*sou*) *desu ne sore imeeji de ne (kou) shite (desu kedomo)*  
 that is IP that image with IP like this do is but  
 Yes, that's right isn't it. With that image in mind you do it like this, but.
- 6 Y (*a sou desu ka*)  
 Oh, really?
- 7 N *hai mou sukoshi (tsuyoku) suru to*<sup>88</sup>  
 yes more little (stronger) make if  
 Yes. If (you) make it a little stronger

---

<sup>88</sup> *Suru to* ('if you make') works just like *iwareru to* in excerpt 1 of this section, and therefore is not considered as a shift to the plain form, even though *suru* is a plain-form verb. See excerpt 1 for a more detailed discussion of this point.

- {N takes picture from Y}
- 8 *ii iro o chotto (tsukete) mimasu ne*  
 okay color DO little add and see IP  
 Okay, (we'll) try adding a little color, okay?
- 9 Y *sou desu ne nn*  
 Yes, mm hmm.
- 10 N (*chairo*): *ni shimasu ka* (unintelligible) *tte*  
 brown make QM  
 Shall we make it brown?
- 11 Y (*minna sou natteru kedo*) *kyouretsus ka na to omotta kedo*  
 all that way are but strong wonder that thought but  
 All the other (pieces) are like that, so I thought it might be too strong, but. [plain]

Narisawa begins her evaluation of Yamanouchi's work with a plain-form verb, *datta* ('was'). Like her critique of Oikawa in the previous excerpt, Narisawa uses interpersonally close forms (i.e., plain forms) to make her critique of Yamanouchi's work, and they may again work here to counteract the negative assessment she gives. However, her utterance also works in conjunction with line 3, where Narisawa shifts to the *desu/-masu* form. In the previous excerpt, Oikawa shifted from polite to feminine-marked forms in stating the same concern, and here Narisawa shifts from plain to *desu/-masu* forms when reiterating her critique of Yamanouchi's work. Therefore, this is another example of speakers shifting style when reiterating something. Unlike the previous excerpt where Narisawa shifted from *desu/-masu* to plain forms in seeking explicit alignment from Oikawa, however, here she shifts to the *desu/-masu* form in doing the same function.

This is primarily a *desu/-masu* style interaction, which is somewhat surprising if we consider what traditional models would predict. According to such understandings, Narisawa (as the social superior) should use the plain form and Yamanouchi (as the social inferior) should use the *desu/-masu* form. However, Yamanouchi uses the *desu/-masu* form throughout, and Narisawa does as well except for her use of the plain form in line 1. Cook's work on speech styles as social deixis is informative here, in that it suggests that speakers use particular forms to highlight particular roles. According to Cook's model Narisawa could use the *desu/-masu* form to highlight her role as teacher/instructor, rather than as an indication of her equal social status

with Yamanouchi. Given Narisawa's successful efforts to have Yamanouchi agree with and accept her critiques, this model provides a much more plausible reason for Narisawa's use of *desu/-masu* than traditional understandings do. In her role as teacher, Narisawa uses the formal *desu/-masu* style to give instruction to her "student," Yamanouchi.

At a more macro level, this excerpt also shows some of the responsibilities involved in having an authoritative position, such as that held by Narisawa. She has already made some modifications to Yamanouchi's picture prior to the excerpt shown here, and at the end of this excerpt (lines 7 and 8), she physically takes the story card from Yamanouchi and shows her how to make the changes by doing them herself. Thus, although Narisawa has more authority than others in the group in that she can often give a good deal of impetus to others to accept her evaluations, that authority also carries with it many responsibilities that others in the group do not have.

The next excerpt is taken from a very different setting, the Hataya weaving workshop where Odashima (O) and Kabata (K) work. The women usually work side by side at separate looms, and often check in with one another about problems they are having with their work. In Chapter Two, I stated that Odashima is the proprietor of Hataya, and thus ostensibly in a position of authority in relation to Kabata. The following excerpt is quite distinct from those discussed up to this point, because Odashima (the person in the authoritative, and therefore socially superior, role) seeks evaluation/assessment from Kabata (the subordinate) on a piece she feels she has not done well. As with all long excerpts presented in this dissertation, the full transcript for this excerpt can be found in Appendix E.

The excerpt starts with Odashima making an indirect elicitation for assessment from Kabata.

**EXCERPT 4: PART 1**

1 O *chotto: komatta ne*  
little bothered IP  
Oh no. [[plain]]

- 2 *Tate saki no ikatta no ka na:*  
 warp POS good NOM I wonder  
 I wonder if I should have made it the warp [[LLV]]
- 3 *ori ga tate saki*  
 weaving SM warp  
 made the weaving on the warp

In the first three lines, Odashima uses an indirect elicitation like that used by Yamanouchi in excerpt 1 above, as she seemingly speaks to herself about the problems she has created in using a particular material for the warp in the piece she is weaving. However, whereas Yamanouchi used a *desu/-masu* form in her utterance (*dekimashita*), here Odashima uses a plain form. Further, Odashima uses a naked plain form, which Maynard has argued is “sociolinguistically insensitive”, i.e., not oriented toward others in the interaction.. Contrary to Maynard’s characterization, however, Odashima’s utterance in fact elicits a response from Kabata in line 4 (below), so in terms of the this interaction can hardly be said not to be outwardly directed. Following her initial “self-directed” utterance in line 1, Odashima shifts to an more intimate and informal style with her use of the LLV form *ikkatta* (SJ: *yokatta* ‘was good’; here ‘should have done’). In line 3, Odashima returns to non-LLV plain form style in providing clarification of the problem she has encountered. This seems to act as a cue for Kabata to respond, as she does in the next part of the excerpt.

EXCERPT 4: PART 2

- 4 K *hmm demo ima hitotsu boya: to (shita) no na ha*  
 but now one blurred that became NOM IP  
 Hmm, but now it’s all blurred together, isn’t it? [[LLV]]
- 5 O *nn nn*  
 Yeah, yeah.
- 6 K (unintelligible) *demo shikata nai- n da yo*  
 but way of doing isn’t NOM COP IP  
 But there’s nothing to be done about it now, I’m telling you. [[mod masc]]
- 7 *orisaite shimatta (kara)*  
 woven in completed so  
 You’ve already put it in (the weaving) so
- 8 *iya iya de wa nai*  
 unpleasant unpleasant is not  
 It’s not, it’s not unpleasant. [[naked plain]]

Kabata responds to Odashima's utterances in line 4 with a local language form of SJ *ne* (*na ha* 'isn't it/right'). Her comment here is an affirmation that something is indeed problematic about the material Odashima is making, but her use of the LLV also conveys her feelings of closeness and empathy towards Odashima. Thus, Kabata critiques Odashima's work (in line with Odashima's own critique) while expressing empathy for Odashima's difficulties. This is very similar to Narisawa's use of interpersonally close forms to critique Yamanouchi in the previous excerpt.

There are important structural differences between this and the previous excerpt, however. Unlike excerpts 1 and 2, where the person in the authoritative role (Narisawa) critiqued a social subordinate (Yamanouchi), in this excerpt Kabata is being asked to evaluate her social superior - her boss. Given this configuration, Kabata's expression of empathy may also be understood as a hesitation device that gives her time before she takes on the role of evaluator that Odashima has "assigned" her by verbalizing her own difficulties.

The idea that Kabata may be hesitating is supported by her utterance in line 6 that "there's nothing to be done about it now." This is a very practical solution to Odashima's dilemma, but does not reveal Kabata's feelings about the material itself. In other words, she does not give an evaluation of Odashima's material. Kabata's style in line 6 contains a moderately masculine form (*da yo* 'I'm telling you'), which traditional understandings would suggest is quite strong and effective. In this utterance, it is a strong statement in that it in essence tells Odashima not to worry about the difficulties she is having with the material. However, it is not effective as an evaluative response that satisfies Odashima's interest in getting feedback from Kabata. In fact, Kabata herself follows up on her masculine-marked utterance in line 8, where she gives an assessment of sorts in stating that "it's not unpleasant." She uses the naked plain form in making this assessment which, given that it is in response to Odashima's indirect request for evaluation, would seem to go against the notion that such forms are inwardly-oriented (i.e. "sociolinguistically insensitive"). However, another understanding of Kabata's use of the naked plain form here is as a means of giving her assessment in the guise of a self-reflective comment.

That is, rather than using linguistic features which explicitly seek input from Odashima – e.g., interactional particles – she uses the naked plain form in order to make her assessment sound as if it were intended only for her. Whatever Kabata’s intent, however, the interactional consequence of her utterances in lines 6~8 is that Odashima responds to her comments directly. as the continuation of the excerpt below shows:

EXCERPT 4: PART 3

- 9 O *nai*  
It’s not [[naked plain]]
- 10 K *nn*  
Yeah (meaning, “it’s not”)
- 11 O *sou*  
Oh?
- 12 K *nn so soiu no ga suki na hito ga iru to omou*  
like that thing SM like people SM are that think  
Mm, I think there are people who like that sort of thing. [[naked plain]]
- 13 O *sou da ne*  
That’s right, isn’t it? [[mod masc]]
- 14 K *nn*  
Yeah.

Odashima begins with an echo response (in the naked plain form) to Kabata’s previous utterance (line 9), to which Kabata reaffirms her position in line 10. Odashima presses Kabata for further assurance in line 11, and in response Kabata provides the further information that ‘there are people who like that sort of thing’ (line 12). Kabata gives her assessment here in the naked plain form, just as she did in line 8 above. However, even though her utterance in line 12 is in the naked plain form, her choice of verb (*omou* ‘I think’) suggests a stance that is more mitigated than her previous naked plain form utterance. Thus, although this utterance is technically in the naked plain form, the verb *omou* works much like an interactional particle and, therefore, this utterance is not strictly in the naked plain form.

Odashima responds to Kabata in line 13 with a moderately masculine form of agreement (*sou da ne*). Again, traditional understandings of masculine-marked form usage would lead one to see this as a strong and effective utterance. In fact, line 13 marks a shift in Odashima’s stance from one seeking evaluation and support from Kabata to one in which she takes charge of the

situation (see also line 15 below). Her use of the moderate masculine form in line 13, then, is part of her shifting stance towards taking control of her situation, and can therefore be understood – in line with traditional understandings of masculine-marked forms – as strong.

In the final section, Odashima settles on an assessment of her work, and a plan for where to take things from here.

EXCERPT 4: PART 4

→15 O *mae mae ni susumu nomi da ne*  
forward forward advance only COP IP  
All you can do is move on, right? [[moderate masculine]]  
16 K *nn*  
Yeah.

In line 15, Odashima again uses a moderately masculine form in retaking charge of the interaction. At the same time, however, the content of her utterance refers to the suggestion that Kabata made in her initial response to Odashima's proclamation of difficulties (line 6). Thus, although Odashima seems to be taking control of the conversation again, and in particular making a decision about what she is going to do with the problematic piece of cloth, she uses Kabata's earlier statement as the means through which she will proceed. In addition, she continues to seek input from Kabata with the inclusion of the IP *ne* ('isn't it/right'). It is not until Kabata has given her final affirmation in line 16 that the matter is dropped and Odashima in fact moves on. Thus, although Odashima's use of the moderately masculine forms in line 13 and 15 follow traditional understandings in that they create a strong and interactionally effective stance, they do not do away with Odashima's reliance on Kabata for confirmation. Even when shifting her stance from someone looking for help and advice from Kabata to someone who takes charge of the direction of her own work, Odashima maintains a certain reliance on Kabata..

The reversal of subordinate seeking advice from her superior to superior seeking advice from her subordinate has already been mentioned, but this interaction is quite different from excerpts 2 and 3 above in one other important way. Unlike previous excerpts, the person seeking evaluation (Odashima) is reluctant to accept the assessment her interlocutor (Kabata) offers, and

the person making the evaluation (Kabata) is reluctant to take on that role. In excerpt 3, Narisawa was very clear about giving advice on how to improve the picture, and Yamanouchi was – if not initially overly eager to accept the advice – open to being done as she was told.

Another distinction between this excerpt and that of Narisawa in the Mandagera group (excerpts 1~3) is that Kabata's speech forms are mitigated in different ways. It is Kabata's statements themselves – and not the style shift that marks Narisawa's – that mitigate her comments. She does not say, for example, that she simply does not like the material Odashima has made or that she thinks Odashima has made a terrible mistake. In fact, she states her own feelings about the piece very indirectly. She does say that the material is “blurred together,” but that is more of a reinforcement and clarification of why Odashima dislikes the material than a clear statement of her own, independent opinion. Her other feelings are conveyed through the statement that there must be people who will like the material (line 12). This is important because it means the material can still be used; if there are people who like it then it will sell, and thus the material has not gone to waste. It also, however, puts the role and responsibility of evaluating the material onto parties who are not involved in the interaction under discussion here. In other words, Kabata projects the role of evaluator that Odashima has indirectly assigned her onto saki-ori customers.

Other than the shift to LLV in line 4, both Kabata and Odashima maintain the plain form throughout. Again, this is quite different from what traditional models of *desu/-masu*, plain form usage would lead us to expect, namely, *desu/-masu* form usage from Kabata (especially because she is critiquing a superior – her boss). Consistent use of the plain form by both parties suggests that Kabata does not need to distance herself from Odashima in order to be able to give an assessment of her work. Given that the two women have worked so closely for nearly ten years, this is perhaps not surprising. There is no one else to turn to for advice on how a particular piece of material is turning (has turned) out, so no doubt exchanges like the one analyzed here have happened countless times. Given the situation, the distinctions between Odashima as employer and Kabata as employee might become more blurred than in other settings.



However, within this plain-form mode, there are significant shifts to naked plain (lines 8, 9 and 12) and moderately masculine forms (lines 13 and 15), in addition to the use of LLV already addressed. Kabata uses naked plain forms in both of her evaluative utterances ('it's not unpleasant' – line 8, and 'there are people...' – line 12). Line 9 can be understood as an echo question to Kabata's utterance in line 8, as discussed above. These variations within and in addition to what on the surface looks like a consistent plain-form interaction attests to the need for considering variation within the plain form (including the use of the naked plain form) and LLV. In addition, the function of masculine-marked forms also indicates the importance of looking at gender-marked linguistic features in combination with other stance and role-related features.

It is also significant that although the plain form is used reciprocally in this interaction, suggesting that Kabata and Odashima are on equal social footing. Kabata does not immediately take on the role of assessor that Odashima assigns her through her utterances in lines 1-3. As mentioned, Kabata first makes an empathetic statement (including the use of LLV) to Odashima, and then states that there are people who will like the kind of material Odashima has produced. Although Kabata's assessment of Odashima's work is less than clear, the fact that she says there may be people who like the cloth suggests that she herself does not. In this case, Kabata's use of LLV forms are parallel to the use of plain forms to make critiques in excerpt 2 above; Kabata highlights interpersonal closeness with Odashima before giving a critique.<sup>89</sup>

Despite the reciprocal use of plain forms in this utterance, however, Kabata's hesitancy to take on the role of advisor, coupled with her lack of direct assessment, suggest that she is not eager to erase all sense of distinction between herself and Odashima. Although she does not maintain or promote interpersonal distance through linguistic forms (such as *desu/-masu*), she does create distance between herself and her role as evaluator by placing the evaluation onto other people. Thus, her critiques are mitigated by subject displacement.

---

<sup>89</sup> For work on critiques and politeness in other languages, see for example Penelope Brown's 1994 (1990) article confrontation and politeness.

Interactions between participants of horticultural therapy sessions (hereafter HT) illustrate another pattern of evaluation/assessment. In this setting, two staff members oversee three to four volunteers per session in working with the participants, who are residents or day care patients at the local hospital/nursing home. Volunteers and staff often evaluate levels of physical comfort for participants at the HT sessions because in many cases the participants themselves are unable to verbalize their own comfort levels due to physical and/or mental debilities. Unlike the previous four excerpts we have examined, in interactions at the HT site volunteers and staff therefore sometimes make assessments without any elicitation from the people who are the subject of the assessment. In such situations, volunteers and staff potentially have a great deal of authority in comparison to the participants about whom assessments are made, in the sense that participants are not always able to verbally respond with their own self-assessment, or question the volunteer or staff's assessment.

In the following excerpt, volunteer Odera (O) prompts participant Miura (M) to assess her energy level. Miura is in a wheelchair, and is quite restricted physically. She does, however, have limited use of her hands and can speak, though in a slurred manner that is difficult to understand. Yaegashi (Y), the head of the HT program, and her assistant Ogawa (OG) also join in the assessment part way through the interaction.

#### EXCERPT 5

- 1 O {speaking to M}  
*tsukareru yo amari isshokenmei yaru (to)*  
 Tired IP too very hard do if  
 (You'll) get tired if you work too hard. [[mod masc]]
- 2 *tsukarenai*  
 not tired  
 (You're) not getting tired?
- 3 Y {to Miura}  
*daijoubu*  
 You're okay?
- 4 O {responding to a nod from Miura}  
*daijoubu da tte yo*  
 alright is says IP  
 She says she's alright.  
 [elipsis]

- 5 O *Miura san wa tsukarenai*  
Miura, you're not getting tired?
- 6 M (unintelligible) *tsukareru* (unintelligible)  
Get tired
- 7 O {laughing}  
*tsukareru you na shigoto ja ne* {everyone laughs}  
Get tired like job not  
It's not a job to make you tired
- 8 OG *dattara ii- n da kedo (sa)*  
If so good NOM is but (well)  
If that's the case it's all right, but.

This conversation takes place entirely in the plain form, and there are no shifts in any of the three sets of linguistic features under discussion except for Odera's use of a moderately masculine form in line 1. Nevertheless, there are important role and status negotiations going on in this interaction.

In the first place, this excerpt is an instance of a speaker pushing another interactant to make an assessment of herself, whereas in previous excerpts those who are (or whose work is) evaluated ask for input from others in the interaction, directly or indirectly. In this excerpt, however, Odera's utterance in line 1 carries an assessment of Miura's physical state, without any elicitation from Miura herself. In this sense, Odera's utterance indicates that she is taking on a role that puts her in a superior position to Miura; one in which she assesses Miura's physical state. Odera's superior role is also indicated by her use of the moderately masculine form *tsukareru yo* (lit: 'you'll get tired, I'm telling you'), which is a statement of 'fact' rather than phrasing that invites input from Miura or others in the interaction.

In line 2, however, Odera offers Miura a chance to assess her own physical state, followed by a similar elicitation from Yaegashi (Y). However, both Odera and Yaegashi's utterances are not mere elicitations of a self-assessment from Miura; rather, each suggests that Miura in fact must/should be tired, Odera by asking if Miura isn't getting tired (*tsukarenai*) and Yaegashi by asking if she is "okay" (*daijoubu*).

Between lines 3 and 4, Miura responds to Odera and Yaegashi's questions about her physical state, by nodding in response to Yaegashi's question in line 3. Even though she has thus responded to Yaegashi and Odera's inquiries, she is still not allowed to communicate for herself. Instead, Odera interprets Miura's nod as meaning she is okay, and relates this to other participants in line 4 ('she says she's okay'). Odera is still not satisfied that Miura is in fact not tired, though, and asks her again in line 5 whether she isn't tired. Thus, even when Miura gives a self-evaluation in response to the elicitations from Odera and Yaegashi in lines 1~3, her opinion is not accepted by Odera. In response to this further questioning, Miura responds that "it's not a job to make you tired" in line 6. However, again Miura's utterance itself is not sufficient; Odera rather repeats it for others in the interaction, in line 7. This time, however, Odera does not use the quoted speech form *tte*, but rather seems to be responding to Miura directly; confirming that she has understood what Miura has said by repeating it. Miura's utterance itself would seem to cut off any further concerns about her level of tiredness, since she is quite direct in stating that the job itself is not one to make her tired and thus, by implication, everyone can stop asking her whether she isn't getting tired. However, Miura's second attempt to alleviate concerns about her physical state by assessing her own level of endurance it still not accepted by everyone in the interaction. Miura's utterance – as relayed by Odera - elicits laughter from the other participants in the interaction, but Ogawa remains unconvinced that Miura is able to assess her own physical state. Ogawa finishes the interaction in line 8 by saying in effect that she hopes Miura truly is not tired.

Many of the interactions between staff/volunteers and participants in the HT sessions model parent/child interactions, where the staff/volunteers are the parents and the participants are the children.<sup>90</sup> So too in this excerpt, where Odera and Yaegashi make assessments of Miura's physical state for her, as well as speak for her. Odera's questioning of Miura about tiredness in line 5 might also be seen childlike treatment, since it minimizes the response that Miura has

---

<sup>90</sup> Many of the participants are like "children" in the sense that their physical/mental debilities make them reliant on others.

already given; namely, that she is not tired. Miura responds to this, however, with her own statement (told through Odera). This would seem to effectively put an end to concerns for her physical well-being. However, Ogawa's final statement that she hopes Miura is right puts Miura's efforts to make her own sense of well-being known into question, since Ogawa leaves room for the possibility that in fact it *may be* a tiring job for Miura.

Although this parent/child relationship is not reflected in particular linguistic shifts in this excerpt, in other cases it is (see below). What is significant here is that in this excerpt such a relationship model privileges the assessment of another made by volunteer and staff over the assessment made by a person about herself. Even when Miura does respond with a self-assessment, it is not accepted by everyone in the interaction, suggesting that Miura is not capable of knowing her own limits. In this sense Miura, and other patients who are involved in similar interactions, can be compared with children whose parents feel the need to place their own assessment of their children's physical state above what the children themselves may say. Thus, for example, a parent may conclude that a child is tired and needs to go to bed, even if the child him/herself does not express this feeling. In fact in many cases it is not clear whether patients are capable of assessing their own physical state, due to physical and/or mental impairments. Rather than make outright determinations of a patient's status, however, volunteers include patients in such determinations, at least on the surface. Whether in fact the patient's self-assessments are taken as accurate, however, remains for the staff to decide. This is not to say that the staff purposely ignore patient's comments, but rather that the staff have responsibility for the well-being of the patients that may at times mean they put their own assessments above those given by the patients themselves, for the health and physical well-being of the patients. In the case of Miura, Ogawa still seems concerned that Miura is in fact not getting tired, even after Miura herself has said that she is not. In this excerpt, therefore, Ogawa's assessment overrules that of the patient herself. Thus, in many of the HT interactions, the implicit role configuration is one in which staff and volunteers are in the role of caretakers, and patients in the role of being cared for by the staff and volunteers.

## SUMMARY

These 5 excerpts illustrate some common points that will be considered in the remainder of this chapter and the next. The most basic point is that the linguistic features under discussion in this dissertation do not always function according to what traditional models would lead us to expect. Feminine-marked particles, for example, have been shown to work in very effective (“powerful”) ways. In addition, an exclusive focus on the gender-marking aspect of particular features obviates other important functions that these features perform in interactions. For example, Odashima’s use of moderately masculine forms in excerpt 4 above reflects a firm stance that does not necessarily have much to do with gender.

In addition, there are several specific points that have come out of this initial group of excerpts. First, repetition often entails a shift in linguistic features. In excerpt 3, for example, speakers changed their speaking style from plain to *desu/-masu* forms when reiterating a point made in a previous utterance. The second point is that speakers often preface critiques with more intimate forms. For example, local language forms are used for empathy (excerpt 4), and when establishing a connection between speakers when one is making a negative evaluation of another (excerpt 2). Thirdly, speakers negotiate status not exclusively through linguistic means, but also through how they assign and reject or accept roles. Such role distribution often occurs in conjunction with shifts in language usage (e.g., the shift to LLV use in excerpt 4). These three points will be considered in the following excerpts.

The next section considers a very different kind of interaction, in which speakers manipulate their knowledge of politeness and gender ideologies for ironic effect.

## 2. MANIPULATING POLITENESS

As mentioned in Chapter Two, politeness in Japanese is often something that is explicitly taught and studied. The following two excerpts demonstrate how speakers use their knowledge of politeness and gender norms in rejecting high status roles assigned to them by others, often to ironic effect. Both excerpts are from the Mandagera story card group. This is the only group

where this kind of interaction occurred, a fact which is no doubt largely influenced by the fact that the Mandagera group members were the only ones who used honorific forms any more than rarely.

In the first excerpt, Gotoh (G) calls upon Fujii (F) as an expert in fixing her problem with the color of her mountains. Narisawa was not present on the day this excerpt was recorded, and throughout the session group members often turned to Fujii (F) for advice and evaluation of their work.

#### EXCERPT 1

- 1 G *yama o aoku shichatta kara*  
mountains DO green made so
- 2 (*sugi*) *nan douiu iro ni shitara ii to omou no*  
cedar what what kind color make good that think QM  
I made the mountains completely green, so what, what sort of color should I make the cedars, do you think?
- 3 F *ara watakushi ni*  
Oh no, you want *me*? [[fem pronoun]]
- 4 G *nn*  
Yeah
- 5 F *chotto watashi hijou ni komarimasu wa*  
little I very much troubled IP  
Oh, that's going to be very difficult for me. [[*desu/-masu*, feminine]]
- 6 G *koko wa amari [kokute ne]*  
here TM very dark IP  
It's very dark here, you know?
- 7 F [*nn nn* ]  
Yeah, yeah
- 8 G *da yo na*  
That's right, isn't it. [[mod masc]]
- 9 F *a (sugi) no iro sugi tte kuroppoi mon ne (igai to) ne*  
oh cedar POS color cedar that blackish that IP somehow IP  
Oh, the cedar color (unintelligible) is blackish, isn't it? Somehow, isn't it?  
[[plain]]
- 10 G *nn*  
Yeah
- 11 F *dakedo amari (chikaku) ja*  
but very close then  
But if it's too close

12 G (*chikai*) *yo* (*unintelligible*) *onaji* [*you ni* (*unintelligible*)]  
close IP same as make  
It's close, though. It has to be the same.

→13 F [*nn* (*sore wa*) *sou da ne*]  
Mm, that's true. [[mod masc]]

Fujii responds to Gotoh's request that she fix the trees by expressing surprise that Gotoh has asked her in particular for help. She uses the first-person singular pronoun *watakushi*, which is part of stereotypical women's speech (JWL) and marked for femininity. She continues this marked femininity in her use of the IP *wa* at the end of line 4. According to traditional understandings, her speech in lines 2 and 4 thus highlights her femininity. In addition, Fujii uses *desu/-masu* forms in both lines, which in combination with the feminine forms makes her speech formal and refined. In other words, Fujii's utterances in lines 2 and 4 closely follow JWL usage, and the underlying ideology that is associated with it of women as polite (formal) and refined.

In contrast, Gotoh does not use formal or feminine forms at all in her utterances. She speaks in the plain form throughout, and uses moderate masculine forms in lines 7 and 11. This is particularly significant given that she is the one seeking advice from Fujii. As discussed above, those making requests generally use more polite forms, but this is not the case with Gotoh.<sup>91</sup>

Fujii's shift to informal, gender-neutral speech beginning in line 9 (and continuing for the rest of the interaction) provides evidence that her speaking style in lines 2 and 4 is a performance of an ideal JWL speaker. Once the conversation turns to a more collaborative discussion of colors, she drops this persona and shifts to a much less marked form.

In trying to understand Fujii's use of this idealized JWL style, it is important to consider what she does with this form. By asking Fujii to help her, Gotoh tries to place Fujii in a superior role to herself, where Fujii would be the instructor/advisor and Gotoh would be the receiver of this instruction or advice. In this sense the interplay between Gotoh and Fujii here is very similar to that discussed in relation to excerpt 4 above, where Odashima tried to place Kabata in an

---

<sup>91</sup> See Kawanari (1993) for more information on women and ways of making requests in Japanese.



advisory role. Fujii's response to this, however, is quite different from Kabata's. She does not take on the role with hesitation, as Kabata did, but rather rejects the role outright. The way Fujii rejects the high status role, however, is to humble herself both in terms of content and form in her utterances. By maintaining *desu/-masu* form usage while Gotoh consistently uses plain forms, Fujii in effect places herself in a socially subordinate position to Gotoh.<sup>92</sup> Fujii uses a humble style for an effective end, as she is successful in rejecting the role Gotoh has tried to assign her.

Further testament to the ironic and performative nature of lines 1-5 comes from the fact that Gotoh does not change her style to match Fujii's (i.e., to the *desu/-masu* form), or even to using humbling honorific forms that would place Fujii in a superior position. Were Gotoh earnest in making Fujii her advisor (and thus, social superior), she would use forms that reflected this relationship, rather than asking Fujii to take on a superior role on the one hand and using forms that undercut this role relationship on the other.

The next excerpt shows a similar pattern of role assignment and rejection, but is also an example of how authoritative roles can be an unwanted burden, in that they carry with them a great deal of responsibility.

#### EXCERPT 2

- 1 Y *sempai kore de iin deshou ka*  
senior this alright I wonder QM  
Sempai, I wonder if this is all right. [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 2 F *do-sempai imasen dokonimo*  
sempai there isn't nowhere  
Wha- there's no *sempai* here anywhere.
- 3 Y *(iru yo) sempai*  
there is IP sempai  
(There is a) *sempai*.
- 4 F *sempai dame desu ne watakushi ja* {laughing}  
bad is IP I  
'Sempai' just won't work, not for me. [[feminine]]

---

<sup>92</sup> Recall from the discussion of plain and *desu/-masu* form usage in Chapter Two that in non-reciprocal usage social superiors use the plain form while social subordinates use the *desu/-masu* form.

The term *sempai* refers to someone who is senior in rank or experience in a given situation. *Sempai/kohai* (the partner to the *sempai*) relationships are prevalent throughout Japanese society, and is most often discussed in terms of a senior/junior pairing. Those who are senior to you in school, for example, are called *sempai*, as well as those who are senior to you in a company or any other kind of organization. The role of *sempai* carries with it both benefits and responsibilities (recall the discussion of responsibilities entailed in authoritative positions from Chapter Two). In school sports clubs, for example, *sempai* are exempt from setting up and taking down any necessary equipment, jobs that fall exclusively to *kohai*. However, *sempai* are also responsible for seeing that *kohai* learn the skills necessary to do well at the sport, and it reflects badly on them if *kohai* do not do so. When people are trying to enter the workforce, they often call upon *sempai* for contacts and even potential positions. It is the responsibility of the *sempai* to offer such guidance to their *kohai*, just as their own *sempai* are expected to do for them.

By addressing Fujii as *sempai* in line 1, therefore, Yamanouchi evokes a whole set of expectations towards her. As *sempai*, Fujii is “the expert” because of her experience and knowledge. This also, of course, entails responsibilities, in that she is expected to be able to resolve the situation in this role. Gotoh further emphasizes her role assignment to Fujii with her use of the *desu/-masu* form, here quite clearly indicating the level of formality and respect that a *sempai* socially demands. Fujii, however, again rejects the role that Gotoh has assigned her, saying that ‘there’s no *sempai* here’. She uses the *desu/-masu* form in doing so, which both de-emphasizes social status distinctions between her and Gotoh as well as maintains the formal register established by Gotoh. Were Fujii truly a *sempai* (i.e., were she to take on that role here) she would more likely use a plain form in response to Gotoh, since in such a situation Gotoh would be her *kohai*. Fujii thus uses an equalizing strategy in rejecting the role Gotoh assigns to her, similar to her rejection strategy in the previous excerpt.

Gotoh, however, persists in calling Fujii *sempai*, to which Fujii makes another rebuttal in line 4. In her second rejection, she emphasizes that being placed in the role of *sempai* will “not

work” (lit. “be bad”) for her. This is similar to her statement in excerpt 1 above that she would be “troubled” by being placed in an authoritative role over Gotoh and Gotoh’s work. Fujii also uses a feminine-marked pronoun in this second rejection, which again is similar to her strategy in the previous excerpt.

In both of these examples, Fujii successfully rejects the high-status roles assigned to her by Gotoh through the use of humbling forms associated with JWL (i.e., polite and feminine-marked). One implication of this is that femininity entails low status, since Fujii uses feminine forms as part of her rejection of high-status roles (and justification for not taking them). At the same time, however, Fujii uses these feminine forms to effective ends. In both instances she is successful in rejecting the role assigned to her, suggesting that feminine/humble forms can be used to very strong effect.

### **3. GIVING DIRECTIONS/TEACHING**

As with evaluative comments discussed in the first section of this chapter, directives entail an unequal relationship between interlocutors, wherein one is in a position to tell the other(s) what to do.<sup>93</sup> In Japanese, work on women’s use of directives has led to the categorizations of distinct female directive styles. Janet Shibamoto Smith (1990) identified two styles: motherese and passive politeness strategies (PPS). In the motherese style, women draw on a traditional and domestically authoritative female role in Japanese society – that of the mother<sup>94</sup> – in forming directives that are similar to the way mothers give directives to their children.

The first excerpt is an indirect directive, in that Yamanouchi’s (Y) utterance is not clearly a directive unless considered in relation to the response that Takahashi (T) makes to it. It is also an example of stereotypical JWL usage in a different kind of interaction than those just discussed.

---

<sup>93</sup> This is, of course, the way that directives work in an ideal world. In fact, people do not always do what they are asked to do, or in the way they are asked to it.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. the discussion of motherhood in Japanese society from Chapter Two.

### EXCERPT 1

- 1 Y *shiroi kami ga mieta kara itadaki ni kimashita*  
white paper SM saw so to get came  
I saw some clean paper [[plain]], so I came to get some. [[hon+, *desu/-masu*]]
- 2 T *hai douzo kocchi ni mo arimasu wa yo*  
yes go ahead here LOC also there is IP IP  
Please go ahead. There's some here, too. [[*desu/-masu*, feminine]]
- 3 Y *a sou*  
Oh yeah? [[plain]]
- 4 T *kore hai*  
Here you are.
- 5 Y *hai hai*  
All right, all right.

Yamanouchi begins her utterance with a plain form (*mieta*)<sup>95</sup>, then shifts to a respect honorific (*itadaki*: marked as hon+) with a *desu/-masu* form at the end (*kimashita*). Consistent with previous utterances by Yamanouchi that have been examined in this work, in this excerpt as well Yamanouchi uses *desu/-masu* forms throughout, thus maintaining a high level of politeness. This is very much in keeping with Yamanouchi's overall style, and in fact for her plain forms are more marked than *desu/-masu* ones.

The second part of Yamanouchi's utterance in line 1 ('so I came to get some'), asks something of Takahashi, namely, that she give Yamanouchi some of the white paper in front of her. The paper belongs to the entire group, and it is not Takahashi's paper nor her responsibility to distribute it. Nevertheless, it is in front of Takahashi, and thus Yamanouchi acknowledges that she is invading Takahashi's space by coming to get some paper. Thus, Yamanouchi's 'I came to get some' means in effect, 'please give me some.' Takahashi's response, 'please go ahead' (line 2), confirms that she understands Yamanouchi's utterance in line 1 to be a directive.

In the second clause of line 1, Yamanouchi uses the stem form of the honorific verb *itadaku*, which means roughly "to receive something from a superior." Thus a more literal translation of the sentence would be "I saw some clean paper, so I came to get some from you, my superior." *Itadaku* is part of a group of verbs generally called "giving and receiving verbs"

---

<sup>95</sup> This is another example of a pattern in which speakers do not shift to *desu/-masu* forms, even if the surrounding utterances are all in this form. As with *itta node*, and *iu to* forms, plain-past verbs plus *kara* ('therefore') seem to work as a special case in which technically plain forms do not count as speech level shifts.

which index social relations in talking about the exchange of goods and services. As stated above, speakers are often quite formal when making requests. Thus, Yamanouchi's use of the *desu/-masu* form is not surprising here. However, the verb *itadaku* here puts an emphasis on Yamanouchi's lower status in relation to Takahashi. Takahashi is in control of the paper – by dint of its being in front of her – and therefore Yamanouchi is reliant on her kindness in getting some paper. Thus, through her use of a form of *itadaku*, Yamanouchi creates a relationship between herself and Takahashi in which Takahashi is in a superior position by virtue of being “in control” of the paper. Therefore, although Yamanouchi is giving Takahashi a directive (‘give me some paper’), she does so in an indirect and polite manner.

In her response, Takahashi matches Yamanouchi's style by using the *desu/-masu* form and the IP *wa*, which is strongly marked for femininity. Much like the excerpts discussed above (in the manipulating politeness section), Takahashi does not engage with the higher status role offered to her through Yamanouchi's language choice. She does not, for example, use plain forms that would signal that she is indeed in a social superior position to Yamanouchi. Like earlier excerpts as well, Takahashi uses a strongly feminine form as part of her strategy to reject this high-status role. Instead, she maintains an equal footing with Yamanouchi by speaking in the same style. She also maintains the formal level that Yamanouchi has established in keeping this style.

Like Yamanouchi's utterance in line 1, however, Takahashi mixes styles somewhat in line 2 by using *kocchi*, an informal form of *koko* (‘here’). This suggests that the level of the conversation is somewhat contrived, at least as far as Takahashi is concerned.

The next three excerpts are examples of directives given by Yaegashi, the head of the horticultural therapy (HT) sessions. In these three excerpts, we see the contrast between how Yaegashi gives directions to patients participating in the HT sessions and volunteers/staff.

In the first of this series of three excerpts, Yaegashi asks Mr. Oikawa to move more to the center of his wheelchair, as he often leans to one side while he is sitting.

## EXCERPT 2

- 1 Y (*sore*) ja Oikawasan motto kocchi ni kite morau kka.  
alright Mr. Oikawa more this way LOC come receive QM  
Okay, Mr. Oikawa, can I have you come this way a little more? [[plain, LLV]]
- 2 (*yosete*) te moraimasu.  
I'll have you move over. [[*desu/-masu*]]

In line 1, Yaegashi uses the plain form (*morau*) in combination with a phonological variant from LLV (*kka*) for the standard Japanese question marker *ka*. The verb *morau* has the same meaning as *itadaku* from the previous excerpt ('to receive/get something from someone else'), but is used among social equals. Thus, Yaegashi's utterance in line 1 is very informal and interpersonally close.

In contrast, in line 2 Yaegashi uses the *desu/-masu* form. As observed in relation to previous excerpts, speakers often shift speech level or style when repeating the same information, and this is a plausible explanation for Yaegashi's shift here as well, since she gives Oikawa the same directive as she has in line 1. However, rather than putting her directive in the form of a request - as she did in line 1 - in line 2 she makes a statement about what she will have Oikawa do. This is a very uncommon form, and more usually people form utterances such as that in line 1 ('could you...?'/'can I have you...'). Yaegashi's shift to the *desu/-masu* form here, therefore, works in combination with her phrasing ('I'll have you move over') to distance herself from Oikawa. As in previous examples, Yaegashi thus makes a strong statement (in terms of content) using a form that places distance between herself and Mr. Oikawa. Directives with HT patients are of particular interest because they are often one-sided. That is, in many cases volunteers or staff ask patients to do certain things (i.e., give directives) that the patients may not be physically able to do. In this sense, sometimes directives in this setting are used more as a means of verifying if it is all right for the volunteer or staff person herself to do something. As in the case with Mr. Oikawa, he was not physically able to move himself even when directed to do so, and so Yaegashi's second utterance is also a means of "asking permission" while doing the work herself; i.e., moving Mr. Oikawa to an upright position.

In the third excerpt, Yaegashi is working with an HT participant who is capable of limited hand movement. In this passage, she asks him for help in getting his wheelchair situated at the table where he will be working.

### EXCERPT 3

{Suzuki has been pushed up to the table in his wheelchair, and Yaegashi is making sure he is in a comfortable position before fixing his wheelchair in that spot.}

- 1 Y *ashi daijoubu Suzuki-san*  
Are your legs okay, Mr. Suzuki?
- 2 S *hai.*  
Yes.
- 3 Y *hai dou:zo. koko tomete mite*  
yes go ahead here stop try  
Okay, go ahead. Try to stop it here.
- 4 *nda kocchi mo*  
yes here also  
Yes. [[LLV]] Here, too.
- 5 *kocchi tomereru kka*  
here can stop QM
- 6 *tomede ya*  
stop IP  
Can you put the stopper on here? Put it on.

In line 3, Yaegashi gives her first directive to Oikawa ('try to stop it here'). When speaking informally speakers often drop the 'please' (*kudasai*) from requests, as Yaegashi does here (i.e., *tomete mite* instead of *tomete mite kudasai*). Thus, her request in line 3 is informal but polite. In line 4, however, she shifts to using the local language (beginning with *nda*), and continues in this style through line 6. Her shift in line 4 again follows the pattern observed in other excerpts, where speakers shift styles when reiterating something. However, unlike the previous excerpt, Yaegashi shifts to a less formal speaking style when reiterating her point than a more formal one.

These two excerpts show that when speaking directly to patients, Yaegashi uses a good deal of the local language variety; a usage that is informed by two factors. First, as mentioned in Chapter Two, older people tend to use more local language forms than those in younger generations, so her use of LLV is one way of connecting with her elderly patients. Second, the

local language variety evokes closeness and familiarity among speakers. This is further support for her use of LLV as a means of connecting with her patients.

However, Yaegashi also sometimes shifts between plain and *desu/-masu* forms in her speech. In excerpt 3, for example, she uses the LLV question marker *kka* with plain forms. Yaegashi's second request to Mr. Oikawa, however, is in the *desu/-masu* form, using the same verb *morau* (as discussed in relation to excerpt 1 of this section).

As with excerpt 5 in the "evaluation/assessment" section of this chapter, Yaegashi's speech style in excerpts 2 and 3 of this section is very much like that used in speaking to a child. This is in sharp contrast to her language usage when speaking to the group as a whole, as in the following excerpt:

#### EXCERPT 4

- 1 Y *kore o saisho kitte kudasai*  
this DO first cut please  
First please cut this.
- 2 O *hai.*  
Alright.
- 3 Y *nto hidari da ne hidari da ne*  
um left is IP left is IP  
Um, it's the left, you see? The left, you see? [[plain]]
- 4 *hai kitte kudasai.*  
Okay, please cut. [[polite]]
- 5 *soshite kittara hana wa desu ne ano mizu ni sashimasu.*  
and if cut flowers TM are IP um water in put  
And then after you've cut (them) put the flowers in water. [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 6 *soshite ato de (minna) anou (teryuu) ni natta no wa*  
and later everyone um leftover became nom TM  
And then after that take the earth left over...
- 7 *tane torimasu node ato de tane torimasu kara*  
seeds take so later seeds take so  
...and take out the seeds. So you take out the seeds after that.
- 8 *hai onegai shimasu.*  
Okay, please do it then.
- 9 *ja Oikawasan mo nja kitte choudai ne.*  
well also well cut please IP  
Okay, Mr. Oikawa, well then (you) cut (them) also, okay?



Yaegashi uses polite forms throughout this excerpt, except in lines 3 and 9. In lines 1 and 4-8, she is giving instruction to the entire group about that day's activity. Such a role socially requires the use of polite forms<sup>96</sup> (including *desu/-masu* forms), so it is not surprising that this is Yaegashi's primary speaking style in this excerpt. Even where there are no verbs that can be classified as plain or *desu/-masu*, Yaegashi maintains a formal speaking style. For example, in lines 1 and 4 she uses a polite directive (*te*-form of the verb + *kudasai* to form *kitte kudasai* 'please cut'), and in line 8 she makes a polite request to the group.

In contrast, when speaking directly to a patient Yaegashi uses plain forms that are moderately marked for masculinity in line 3 (cop+ IP *ne*, 'da ne'), and a directive that replaces *kudasai* in the phrase above (*kitte kudasai*) with the much more informal *choudai* (line 9). Her shift to the plain form is understandable in both lines by the fact that she is addressing a single person, rather than the whole group. This makes the situation more intimate, and socially does not require the use of *desu/-masu* forms. This is especially true because Yaegashi is in charge of the sessions and thus, in charge of the patients who participate in them. However, both of her shifts are more marked than a straightforward shift from *desu/-masu* style into plain would be. In line 3, *hidari ne* (without the copula *da*) would make the utterance gender-neutral, and is what speakers use in other most other excerpts examined. Thus, Yaegashi not only shifts into the plain form here, but also into a masculine-marked form.

The *choudai* at the end of line 9 (*kitte choudai*, 'please cut') is used among close friends and often with children. When shifting to or using informal directives in other excerpts, speakers tend to simply drop the *kudasai* at the end of a polite directive (i.e., *kitte kudasai* becomes *kitte*), rather than replace it with *choudai*. This excerpt too, then, shows evidence for volunteers and staff at the HT sessions speaking as they would to children when interacting with patients at the sessions. In this setting, patients appear to have much less agency within the interactions than in

---

<sup>96</sup> This situation is similar to the hypothetical one given in Chapter Two concerning a teacher's language use in addressing individual students versus the entire class. In the former, the teacher is likely to use plain forms, but in the latter she is likely to use *desu/-masu* forms, because it is a formal situation.

interactions from other field sites. At the same time, volunteers and staff try to keep the patients involved with what they are doing, their own physical state, and so on.

The final excerpt in this section is taken from the Hataya weaving workshop. In this setting, Odashima is in an authoritative position vis-à-vis Kabata because of her place as owner and proprietor of the shop. As in the previously examined excerpt, however, here again Odashima asks Kabata for advice, and puts her in the role of giving directions.

**EXCERPT 5**

- 1 O *mm ah furui no o irereba ii- -n*  
oh old ones DO if put in good NOM  
Hmm, oh (we) should put in the old
- 2 K *(furui no o awaseru)*  
old things do match  
Put (it) together with the old. [[naked plain]]
- 3 O *furui no tte (unintelligible)*  
old things say  
As for the old (unintelligible)
- 4 *dame nan da kouiu no wa kouiu no shika nai kara ne*  
bad is this kind thing TM this kind thing only not so IP  
That won't work. We only have this, this kind.
- 5 K *soiu no o koui no ja nai kara ne*  
that kind thing do this kind thing isn't so IP  
That isn't like this so, right?
- 6 O *nn nn*  
Yeah, yeah
- 7 *(kore) chotto akete miru ka*  
this little open try QM  
Shall we try opening this a little bit?
- 8 K (unintelligible)
- 9 O *nn ja nai no a saki ni ja a saki (tsukatta) kedo na*  
yeah not IP oh before well oh before used but IP  
Hmm, no. Oh, first, well, (we) used this first but, huh?
- 10 K *(unintelligible) sono iro no hou ga*  
That color is (unintelligible)
- 11 O *shizen (touri) deshou mm*  
nature just like probably  
Just as in nature, right? Hmm
- 12 K (unintelligible)
- 13 O *kamo shirenai*  
Could be
- 14 K (unintelligible) *sumimasen ne*  
I'm sorry for (unintelligible)

- 15 O *iro iro (na) iro ga aru \_\_\_\_\_ -n desu yo*  
 various colors SM there are NOM COP IP  
 There are all kinds of colors, you know. *[[desu/-masu]]*
- 16 K (*sou desu ne*)  
 That's right, isn't it.
- 17 O *omoshiroi na*  
 It's fascinating. *[[plain]]*

As with the previous Hataya excerpt, in this example Odashima seeks help from Kabata in deciding what to do about a problem she is having (in line 1, she seeks input from Kabata about whether she is doing things correctly). Unlike the previous excerpt, however, here Kabata does not hesitate or avoid taking on the role of “fixer” that Odashima assigns her. She responds to Odashima’s utterance in line 1 with an utterance in the naked plain form that corrects Odashima’s misunderstanding. As before, this naked plain utterance is not internally-directed, but very explicitly outwardly directed, towards Odashima. Kabata’s utterance in line 2 is striking as a very direct and unmitigated utterance, particularly as it is a directive towards Odashima.

Both speakers continue to use plain forms and speak in a very informal style, as they discuss and evaluate possible solutions to the problem of what to include in a shipment they are preparing to send out.

However, in lines 14-16 both Kabata and Odashima shift to *desu/-masu* and polite forms. Kabata shifts in line 14, where she uses *sumimasen* (I’m sorry/excuse me) in wrapping up the decision about what they will ship. In line 15, Odashima moves beyond the shipment discussion to a more general statement that ‘there are all kinds of colors’. She uses the *desu/-masu* form, coupled with the IP *yo* that makes her utterance definitive (‘you know’). Odashima’s linguistic shift here also reflects a shift in her position within the conversation: up until this point the interaction has been a mutual discussion about materials with Kabata, but in line 15 Odashima highlights her role as an instructor. This position is informed by her position as the proprietor and stylistic director of the workshop, but also by her training and expertise in saki-ori weaving. Kabata also shifts to the *desu/-masu* form in responding to Odashima (*sou desu ne*). This *desu/-*

*masu* form mini-lesson at the end of this stretch of talk is parallel to that observed in excerpt 4 of the “Evaluation/Assessment” section above. Odashima shifts back to the plain form in line 17, in a follow-up comment that is much less definitive or instructive.

## Summary

This examination of directives has given further evidence for the patterns noted in the previous sections. As in previous sections, these directive interactions show how speakers shift levels when reiterating a particular point. In addition, they also provide supportive evidence for humility (speaking humbly) as an effective means for rejecting high-status roles. There is also further evidence that shifts to the *desu/-masu* form are used to mark the end of particular topics. Finally, we have seen how style shifts reflect attitudinal shifts toward interlocutors, as when HT staff shift from a formal style in speaking with the group as a whole or co-workers to an informal and child-directed style when speaking with patients in the sessions.

## DECISION-MAKING/NEGOTIATION

Analysis of the next three longer excerpts focuses on role and status negotiations in decision-making/negotiation interactions.

The first excerpt is from the Tsutanowa Diner, and involves Chiba (C) and Aoki (A). Chiba is a woman in her late 50s who was part of the original diner staff. She now works only occasionally, filling in when the diner is short-staffed. Aoki is in her early 40s, and works regularly at the diner. Though not a founding member, she has been part of the diner for four years. Because Chiba has seniority at the diner (as one of the founding members) as well as being older than Aoki – two significant sociolinguistic factors in speakers' choice of language form – it was expected that Chiba's language use would reflect her more authoritative position in relation to Aoki. However, because Chiba works only occasionally she is not familiar with the daily happenings at the diner, and is thus reliant on Aoki's assistance in this area. Thus, Aoki has more authority in terms of knowledge. Further, in the following excerpt Chiba seeks Aoki's input in putting together a shopping list for the restaurant, i.e., Chiba is doing a favor for Aoki.

This puts Aoki in the position of making requests of Chiba, which would lead us to expect more polite forms from Aoki.

In the first part of the excerpt, Chiba begins the shopping list by noting what they are out of in the diner.

**EXCERPT 1: PART 1**

- 1 C *ninjin nai mon ne*  
carrots aren't IP  
There aren't any carrots, are there? [[plain]]
- 2 A *nn nai desu tsukatte shimatta kara*  
mm aren't cop used up so  
Mm, there aren't any [[*desu/-masu*]] because I used them all. [[plain]]
- 3 C *nda ato wa kaimono nai*  
that's so other TM shopping isn't  
Okay. Is there any other shopping? [[LLV]]

Chiba begins the discussion seeking confirmation from Aoki that there are no more carrots, in line 1. Aoki responds with a *desu/-masu* form in the first part of line 2 (*nai desu*), and then immediately shifts to the plain form in the second part (*shimatta*). Chiba then uses a local language form (*nda*) in line 3, before asking about any for any other contributions to the list. Aoki's use of the *desu/-masu* form in line 2 can be understood as both a formal response to Chiba's inquiry and a topic-end marker. Aoki's shift to the *desu/-masu* here marks an end to the discussion of carrots, and is parallel to examples discussed above where speakers mark the end of a topic in a longer stretch of talk with a shift to the *desu/-masu* form. Her shift back to the plain form at the end of this utterance (the latter half of line 2) is similar to Odashima's shift to the plain form after a *desu/-masu* form wrap-up in excerpt 5 of the previous section.

Chiba's use of a local language form also mirrors a pattern observed in other excerpts. Here, she shifts to LLV in reconfirming that there are no more carrots, a reiteration of her statement in line 3.

The next part of the interaction begins with Aoki's response to Chiba's question in line 3 above.

EXCERPT 1: PART 2

- 4 A *nai no ka na tamago wa aru shi*  
 isn't NOM IP IP eggs TM are and  
 I don't think there's anything else. We have eggs, and
- 5 C *tamago wa ippai aru*  
 eggs TM lots are  
 There are plenty of eggs. [[naked plain]]
- 6 *ashita wa watashi tsukawanai kedo*  
 tomorrow TM I won't use but  
 I won't use (them) tomorrow, but.

Both women maintain the plain form in this part of the excerpt, and the only shift is in Chiba's use of the naked plain for in line 5. As she is echoing the content of Aoki's utterance here, naked plain form usage here fits in Maynard's model as an echo response.

In the next section, both Aoki and Chiba shift into local language form usage in discussing whether the eggs they have on hand will be suitable.

EXCERPT 1: PART 3

- 7 A *demo kore demo igakke o ne emu esu demo*  
 but this even okay IP IP M S even  
 But this is okay anyway, right? Even MS. [[LLV]]
- 8 C *igakke yo*  
 okay IP  
 That's fine.
- 9 A *igakke o ne*  
 okay IP IP  
 That's fine, right?

Aoki initiates the shift to local language forms here, and unlike the shift in line 3 above (where Chiba shifted), in this case both speakers shift. Chiba gives a definitive (with the use of the IP *yo*) though interpersonally close response to Aoki's request for confirmation, but does not respond at all to Aoki's reconfirmation in line 9. Additionally, unlike other examples of reiteration, Aoki does not shift styles when repeating her query in line 9.

EXCERPT 1: PART 4

[elipsis]

- 14 C *aa ja hoippu ikko ne*  
 oh well then whip one IP  
 Oh, okay. One container of whipped cream.

- 15 A *hai*  
Yes.
- 16 C *ikko de ii -n da mon ne*  
one okay NOM is IP  
One is alright, right?
- 17 A *ikko de ii desu*  
one good is  
One is good.

Lines 14 and 16 are another counterexample to the pattern of language shift in reiteration discussed above. However, Aoki's shift to the *desu/-masu* form in line 17 supports other evidence that speakers mark the end of a topic by a shift to formal forms. Further, lines 16 and 17 are exactly the same as the pairing in line 1 and 2 (section 1 of this excerpt). Thus, Aoki's *desu/-masu* shifts mark the boundaries of this part of the interaction (cf. Ikuta).

The next excerpt, which is much longer, is taken from the Mandagera story card group. As mentioned in the ethnographic background on the group in Chapter Two, the Mandagera group gives about two story-telling performances a month, averaged over a year. In the following, Narisawa (N) starts a discussion about an upcoming performance the group has committed themselves to in a nearby town.

**EXCERPT 2: PART 1**

- 1 N *daitou-chou no ni ne ano:*  
Daitou-town POS at IP um
- 2 *ichiou daimei o kaite dasanakya nakatta-n da kedo*  
for now title DO write had to turn in NOM cop but  
(I) had to go ahead and turn in a title for the Daitou thing for now, but.
- 3 F *aa aa*  
Oh, oh
- 4 N *kisetsuteki ni awabuku [nukabuku (ga iin) desu]*  
according to season name of story SM good is  
In terms of the season, "Awabuku Nukabuku" is (good). [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 5 F/T *[nn nn ]*  
mm hmm
- 6 N *soshite kono fukube warashi to*  
and this name of story and  
And also this "Fukube warashi."
- 7 F *aa*  
mm



8 T *nisaku ne*  
 two pieces IP  
 Two pieces, right?

Narisawa introduces a topic of conversation in line 1 through the plain form, which like previous examples goes against previous scholars' suggestions that speakers shift to *desu/-masu* forms at such junctures. This instance particularly stands out because Narisawa addresses the entire group. In discussions of previous examples, it was noted that announcements to a group usually make for formal situations, which in turn socially require the use of *desu/-masu* forms.

Thus, previous explanations of plain and *desu/-masu* form usage cannot account for Narisawa's use of the plain form here. What then underlies her lack of shift? One possibility is that by maintaining interpersonal closeness through the use of the plain form, she mitigates a decision she made without consulting others in the group. The fact that she made such a decision suggests that Narisawa has more authority and influence than other Mandagera members, but by using forms which put her on an equal level with her interlocutors she seeks to diminish this inequity. A second possibility is that her use of the plain form in line 1 is a set-up for her shift to *desu/-masu* in line 5; that the real topic introduction is preceded by a line to mark an upcoming topic shift. Both of these explanations are contingent on viewing line 1 in combination with line 5. This suggests the importance of looking at language use across interactions, and not just within a particular utterance.

In part 2 of this excerpt, Gotoh (G) shifts the conversation from what stories the group will perform to who will do the performance.

EXCERPT 2: PART 2

9 G (*soshitara*) *yomu hito mo kimete kudasai*  
 if that's the case read people also decide please  
 Please also decide who's going to read.

10 N *sou desu ne*  
 right is IP  
 That's right, isn't it. [[*desu/-masu*]]

11 *dakara kyou watashi yametara renshuu chotto*  
 so today I when (we) finish practice little

12 *suru tame ni atsumaru to omou - n desu ne*  
 do in order to gather that think NOM is IP

13 *juukunichi no ne*  
nineteenth for IP

So (I) think today after (we) finish (we'll) get together to practice a little, for the 19<sup>th</sup>.

Gotoh's utterance here is a direct request to Narisawa. The fact that she asks Narisawa to decide who will read rather than doing it herself suggests that she believes Narisawa has the influence to do so.

However, Gotoh's utterance, being in the form of a directive, also tells Narisawa what to do. Thus, although she maintains a polite level of speech, Gotoh's comments are quite strong.

Narisawa continues the use of *desu/-masu* forms in her response to Gotoh, saying, in effect, 'I heard you'. However, she does not actually take steps to address Gotoh's directive. Rather, in lines 11-13 she bypasses Gotoh's request in simply suggesting that people have a practice session after they have completed their work. Who will participate in this session and how they will be chosen is unclear. Thus, Gotoh's directive is not completely effective, since Narisawa does not respond to it.

In the next part of this excerpt, the issue of who will read is taken in another direction, as Gotoh and Yorozu (Y) lobby for being excluded from the pool of potential readers.

EXCERPT 2: PART 3

→14 G *atashi ikkai yatta kara*  
I once did so

I've already done it once, so [[fem pronoun, plain]]

→15 N *nda kke ka*

Is that right? [[LLV]]

16 Y *mou nikai yatta kara*  
already twice did so

(I've) already done it twice, so.

17 YA {raising her hand}

*hippari yaku yaru*  
pull role do

I'll pull the cards out of the way. [[naked plain]]

18 G *ne ikkai [yatta hito ga ii n da]*<sup>97</sup>  
IP once done people SM okay NOM are

People who've done (it) once are okay.

→19 Y *[kondo ii wa ne ] menjo*  
This time okay IP IP exempt

---

<sup>97</sup> Lit., 'It's that people who have done it once are okay.', i.e., the fact the someone has read before is a reason for not having to do it again this time.

This time (we) are okay, right? [[strong fem]] (We're) exempt.  
[[naked plain]]

20 G *menjo*

Exempt [[naked plain]]

In line 14, Gotoh shifts to the plain form in announcing that she has read before. The interaction continues in the plain form for the rest of this excerpt, so Gotoh's plain form usage here marks a return to the speech level that characterizes the interaction overall. Gotoh's utterance is an attempt to exempt herself from a role, namely that of reading at the upcoming performance. Although she does not explicitly state here what "I've read before" means, the *kara* ('therefore') at the end suggests that there is an implication to her statement. Gotoh's utterance here is also tied to her earlier directive to Narisawa to "decide who will read," and the two together lead one to suspect that Gotoh does not want the role of reader this time. Thus, Gotoh's utterance here is a strong, though indirect effort to *disclaim* a role. It is also a second effort to get others in the interaction to engage with the topic of who will read.

It is interesting that Gotoh does so not by maintaining the *desu/-masu* form shift initiated by Narisawa in line 4, but by moving back to the plain form that characterizes the interaction overall. In making this shift, she marks her relationship with others in the interaction as interpersonally close and informal, while at the same time making a suggestion that would mean others in the group would have to take up the role Gotoh is trying to reject.

This time Narisawa directly responds to Gotoh's utterance, when she questions Gotoh's claims in line 15. In doing so, she uses the local language variety form of *sou desu (nda kke)* in combination with the standard Japanese question marker, *ka*. As I have said, Narisawa uses very little of the local language variety, so her use of it here is quite marked in comparison. One way of understanding her shift is as a means of heightening interpersonal closeness as she gives a critique, a role which puts her in an unequal relationship with Gotoh. In this sense, her use of local language variety forms here parallels her continued use of the plain form when introducing

the topic in lines 1-5: in both cases she downplays the inequities inherent in her actions by using interpersonally close forms.

Yorozu joins the conversation in line 16 with her own indirect claim to exemption from reading. Her utterance mirrors Gotoh's in terms of form and content, but does not elicit any response from Narisawa.

Instead, Yamanouchi lays claim to doing the "card-pulling role". Unlike Gotoh and Yorozu, Yamanouchi's utterance is a direct statement of what she will do. Japanese speakers prefer to end utterances with some kind of interactional particle that expresses their attitude or stance towards their utterance and their interlocutors, such as *ne* (right?) or *yo* ('I'm telling you'). In this case, however, Yamanouchi does not use any interactional particles, and thus does not invite commentary from others in the group. In this sense, it is a strong statement. However, no one responds to her claim at all, so it is difficult to say that it is an effective statement.

Gotoh then re-engages Yorozu in their discussion of having read before. Like Yamanouchi in the previous line, she phrases her utterance in a way that invites no input from others in the group. Gotoh's stronger and more direct statement in this line is interesting in part because across my data speakers often shift speech style when restating something, as Gotoh does here. In other cases, these shifts are to less strong and direct forms, but here Gotoh's is to a stronger and more direct one. The shift here may be due to the fact that Gotoh has realized that she has the support of Yorozu, and thus a stronger basis for making her claim.

Yorozu overlaps with Gotoh in line 19, echoing Gotoh's preceding statement. Their styles, however, are quite distinct. Like Gotoh, Yorozu makes her utterance in the plain form, but she also includes the strongly feminine IP *wa ne*. While Gotoh's claim is one of justification ('we should be exempt because we've read before'), Yorozu's is thus more mitigated, and seeks input from others in the group. However, Yorozu ends her utterances with the claim that she and Gotoh are 'exempt' (*menjo*), which Gotoh echoes in line 20. Yorozu does not use any IP with this claim, which again means that she invites no commentary from others. Thus, Yorozu's use

of *wa ne* in line 19 might also be seen as a way of softening her position before making a strong claim.

In this section, then, we see the formation of an alliance between Yorozu and Gotoh, and their joint efforts to lay claim to reading exemption. We also see Narisawa's questioning of this claim, and Yamanouchi's efforts to lay claim to a different role. Yorozu and Gotoh's utterances are more effective than Yamanouchi's, in the sense that they elicit a response from another person in the group, but they are not effective in attaining their goal. Gotoh and Yorozu *are* successful, however, in shifting the focus of the conversation to who will read.

In the next part of this excerpt, Narisawa again questions Gotoh and Yorozu's basis for claiming exemption.

EXCERPT 2: PART 4

- 21 N *nensuu kasanereba yatta na minna yatta*  
years put together did IP everyone does  
If we include all the years we've done it, then everyone has read before.  
[[naked plain]]
- 22 F [*sou da ne* ]  
That's right, isn't it [[mod masc]]
- 23 G [*minna de naku*] *asoko de asoko de*  
everyone not there at there at  
Not everyone, (I did it) there, there
- 24 N *asoko de yatta kke ka*  
there at did IP QM  
Did (you) do it there?
- 25 Y *asoko de yatta*  
there at did  
(She) did it there
- 26 G *nn asoko de*  
Mm hmm (I) did it there

Narisawa's further questioning of Gotoh and Yorozu's claims in line 21 is supported by Fujii in line 22 (*sou da ne*, 'that's so, isn't it?'). Gotoh is quick to point out that she is not talking about having read just anywhere; rather she has read specifically at the place where the upcoming performance is to be held (line 23). Narisawa again questions Gotoh's claims, using the same form as in her first question (line 15), using the plain form mixed with local language

forms). Yorozu answers for herself and Gotoh in stating that they have both in fact read at the upcoming performance before, this time in the naked plain form.

Yamanouchi then makes a second claim to a role, this time building on Gotoh and Yorozu's position that they should be exempt from reading.

EXCERPT 2: PART 5

27 YA *watashi mo yatta*

I also did

I did it, too.

28 G *ussou yaranai yo*

lie don't IP

You're kidding, you didn't. [[strong masc]]

{C laughs, looks across the table at Y}

29 *sonna koto iwanaide*

such things don't say

Don't say such things.

{C laughs, looks down at work}

30 YA *oogata dakara hipparu hito mo nakya nai kara ne*

big size so pull people also have to have so IP

(The cards) are big, so we need people to pull (them out of the way) as well.

This time Yamanouchi's utterance is effective in that it elicits a response from another group member. However, Gotoh's response to Yamanouchi in line 28 is quite different from the way in which Narisawa questioned Gotoh's and Yorozu's claims. Whereas Narisawa used interpersonally close forms that emphasize communal ties between speakers, here Gotoh uses a form that simply and definitively states that Yamanouchi has not done what she claims.

Another difference is that unlike Gotoh and Yorozu, Yamanouchi does not try to defend her position, nor do others in the group support her. Yamanouchi's only response to Gotoh's utterance is to laugh, which given Gotoh's response and Yamanouchi's shift of tactics in line 30 suggest embarrassment.

Gotoh softens her response to Yamanouchi's claim in line 29, using an informal directive form (*iwanaide*). Again, this is a response to Yamanouchi's embarrassed laughter following Gotoh's previous remark. Whereas in other cases Gotoh strengthened her forms when reiterating a point, here she softens her statement in following up on a previous utterance.

Yamanouchi does not make any further attempts to join the ranks of those who are exempt from reading, a response that shows that impact of Gotoh's statements. Unlike Narisawa's questioning of Gotoh's and Yorozu's claims, Gotoh's response to Yamanouchi's claim leads Yamanouchi to completely abandon her attempt.

Instead, Yamanouchi returns to her efforts to claim the card-pulling role (line 30). Her second claim to this role is distinct from her first because she adds interactional particles that seek input from others in the group. Here too there is a shift when reiterating a point, in this case a shift to a more mitigated form. However, as before Yamanouchi's claims elicit no response from others in the group.

In the final section of this excerpt, Gotoh makes one more stake in her claim to being exempt from reading.

EXCERPT 2: PART 6

31 G *kyou kono mae wa watashi yatta-n da wa*  
today this before TM I did NOM COP IP  
Today, I've done it before this. [[strong fem]]

In this final part of the excerpt, Gotoh uses a strongly feminine interactional particle to make her third and final claim to being exempt from reading. After gaining the support of Yorozu Gotoh's claims became stronger in terms of the way she phrased her utterance, but here traditional understandings would lead us to interpret her utterance as weaker – less effective – than her previous ones. In fact this utterance does not elicit any responses from other participants, either challenges from Narisawa or support from Yorozu. Instead, at this point the matter is dropped, and the conversation moves on to other things. Thus, both Yamanouchi and Gotoh's final claims to take on or not take on roles are ineffective, in that they do not garner feedback from others in the interaction.

Unlike the two previous examples in this section, there is no utterance with a marked use of the *desu/-masu* form to signal the end of the topic. Instead, the matter is simply dropped after Gotoh's third claim to being exempt from reading.

Despite Narisawa's role as the leader of the group, as well as her introduction of the topic, Gotoh seems to take control of the conversation starting in line 14, by bringing in claims that will keep her out of the pool of potential readers. However, Narisawa maintains an important role in the interaction, as critic and validator. Neither Gotoh nor Yorozu ignore Narisawa's questions, and in fact these questions elicit further justification of their claims. No one else questions or makes any comment to Gotoh and Yorozu about their claims, except for Fujii's support of Narisawa in line 22. Thus, from the interaction we can say that it is Narisawa whose approval is being sought, and Narisawa who has the right to critique and question Gotoh's and Yorozu's claims.

On the other hand, Yamanouchi's claims do not elicit any response, except when she tries to also claim exemption from reading. At that point Gotoh soundly refuses her claim, and again, no one else in the group becomes involved. Yamanouchi's other attempt to claim the role of pulling cards are ineffective in that they elicit absolutely no response from others in the group.

From looking at this interaction as a whole, then, it would seem that Narisawa and Gotoh are the main players, with Yorozu in a supporting role and Yamanouchi making occasional appearances that for the most part seem to go unnoticed.

Narisawa leads into her initial topic introduction with a continuation of the plain form that characterizes the conversation prior to her utterance here, and in so doing mitigates her authority within the group. Similarly, she uses local language variety forms when directly questioning Gotoh's claims, which heightens interpersonal closeness even in the face of critique.

Gotoh, Yorozu and Yamanouchi also shift speech patterns when reiterating points. When assured of the support of Yorozu, Gotoh strengthens her statements that lay claim to reading exemption, but by the third time she makes this claim she uses a much more mitigated form. Yamanouchi also moves to a more mitigated form between her first and second claims to the card-pulling role, which may be understood partly as a lack of support from others in the group, and partly as an effort to get feedback from others. Similarly, Yorozu reiterates Gotoh's stronger statement in a much more mitigated form.



Gender-marked language is used only three times in this interaction: a strongly feminine form when Yorozu reiterates Gotoh's claim that people who have read before are exempt, a strongly masculine form when Gotoh questions Yamanouchi's statement that she has read before, and a strongly feminine form when Gotoh restates her claim to having read before. These forms function in some of the ways that traditional understanding would lead us to predict: for example, Gotoh's masculine-marked utterance effectively ends Yamanouchi's efforts to be exempt from reading, and Gotoh's feminine-marked reiteration of having read before does not elicit any further responses from participants. In both of these cases, the masculine-marked form is more effective and the feminine-marked form less so. However, there is also the case of Yorozu's use of a strongly feminine-marked form. In this case, Yorozu makes a strong claim through her utterance. At the same time, traditional understandings of feminine-marked language use would lead us to interpret her utterance as ineffective. This does not, however, accurately characterize the effects of Yorozu's utterance here. This example suggests that we need to look more closely at how gender-marked language features are used in actual interactions, and particularly what effects they have within those interactions.

The next excerpt is from the Hataya site. In the following, Odashima and Kabata (K) discuss what materials to include in a shipment they are putting together.

**EXCERPT 3: PART 1**

- 1 O *kore wa dono gurai hoshii-n da kke na kono nagasa wa*  
 this TM how much want NOM COP QM IP this length TM  
 How much do (they) want of this, of this length? [[plain]]
- 2 *Kono hito fushi: ijou ni hoshii-n desu ne*  
 This one joint more than want NOM COP IP  
 (They) want more than this one joint's length, right? [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 3 *Hito fushi han gurai da yo ne*  
 One joint half about COP IP IP  
 About one a half joint length's worth, isn't it? [[mod masc]]

Odashima shifts from the plain form (line 1) to the *desu/-masu* form (line 2), and back to the plain form (this time one that is moderately masculine) in line 3. How can we understand these shifts within one turn? Her use of the plain form in line 1 is in a self-reflective style,

discussed above as an indirect elicitation of advice. In this case, however, Odashima continues speaking, thus suggesting that her utterance in line 1 is in fact more inwardly-oriented than Yorozu's. At the same time, however, Odashima follows her utterance in line 1 with an outwardly-oriented one in line 2, where she shifts to the *desu/-masu* form in addressing Kabata directly. Furthermore, Odashima's use of a plain form in introducing a topic, then immediately following it with a *desu/-masu* form, mirrors Narisawa's topic introduction style in the previous excerpt. In both cases, speakers introduce the topic in the plain form, and then shift to *desu/-masu* forms in their next utterance.

Odashima immediately gives a possible answer to her own question in line 3, using a moderately masculine (plain) form. Lines 2 and 3 follow the pattern discussed elsewhere of speaker's shifting styles when repeating a point, but it is significant that Odashima not only shifts from *desu/-masu* to plain in reiterating her point, but also from a gender-neutral to masculine form.

Her use of *ne* in both lines 2 and 3, as discussed above, indicate her interest in gaining support from Kabata, yet Kabata does not actually respond – and Odashima does not give her a chance to do so – until line 5 (below), in response to Odashima's question about whether this is the way to do it.

EXCERPT 3: PART 2

- 4 O *kou yatte desho*  
 like this do right  
 (You) go like this, right? [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 5 K =*de guruun to mawasu gurai*=  
 and completely turn about  
 And just about turn it completely around
- 6 O =*a cho chotto kore ja nagai ka*  
 oh just a minute this well long QM  
 Oh wa- wait a minute. This is too long, huh?
- 7 K *guruun to mawasereba ii [no ]*  
 completely if can turn good IP  
 If you can turn it all the way around it's fine. [[mod fem]]

- 8 O *[a mawa] seru=*  
Oh can turn  
Oh, (I) can turn (it).
- 9 K *=da yo ne=*  
is IP IP  
See you can, right? [[mod masc]]
- 10 O *=da yo ne*  
COP IP IP  
Yeah right.

In line 4, Odashima shifts back to the *desu/-masu* form in asking Kabata if she is measuring a piece of material correctly. Kabata then joins the conversation for the first time in line 5, with a plain form directive. Kabata follows up on her first directive in line 7, with a moderately feminine form. She is repeating what she said in line 5, so this is another example of a shift when repeating the same point. It is interesting that Kabata uses a feminine form in repeating her directive, especially since it is aimed at Odashima, her boss. Traditional understandings of feminine forms would lead us to interpret her use here as softening a directive she has already given, and this is indeed appears to be what happens here. However, this interpretation becomes more complicated when considered with Kabata's use of a moderately masculine form in her very next utterance (line 9). Here she is not giving a directive, but rather confirming that Odashima can in fact turn the piece of material, but she is still the person overseeing the physical activity that Odashima is doing. Odashima echoes Kabata's words and form exactly in line 10.

In the next part of this excerpt, Odashima resumes control of the direction of the conversation.

EXCERPT 3: PART 3

- 11 *mazu yatte miru ka hito fushi han gurai*  
first do try QM one joint half about  
Shall I just try it? About a joint and a half.
- 12 *chotto {cuts} kore sa nani ire*  
a little this well what put in  
Wait a minute, what shall (we) put in...
- 13 *tottemo kusa no you ni ne shikisai kankaku (ikunai) kara*  
not at all grass POS like IP grass colors doesn't go so  
(It) just doesn't want to take on colors like grass so

→14 K (unintelligible)(*komatta-n da kke na ha*) *someta no*  
troubled NOM COP QM IP IP dyed ones  
(We're) having a lot of difficulties aren't we? [[LLV]]

15 O *a someta no ne*  
oh dyed things IP  
Oh, with the dyed stuff, yeah.

Having solved the problem of size, in line 13 Odashima introduces the second problem in the excerpt, that the colors just do not look right. Kabata responds this time with a commiserating remark (line 14) that is the first instance of local language use in this section. This also parallels Kabata's strategy in the previous Hataya excerpt (excerpt 4 in the evaluation/assessment section), where she used local language forms to both empathize with Odashima and delay her acceptance of the advisory capacity in which Odashima's comments tried to place her.

In part four of this excerpt, Kabata builds toward a possible solution to the dilemma of what to include in the shipment.

EXCERPT 3: PART 4

16 K =*a a kore ni irete ratta ne* {pointing to material on the table}  
Oh oh this in was in IP  
Oh, oh, it was in here wasn't it. [[LLV]]

17 O =*a sou*  
Oh yeah.

18 K *mada wa aru kedomo*  
still there is but  
(We) still have (some) but

19 O *hai hai*  
Yes, yes.

20 K *de sumimasen sou dattaraba ne*  
and I'm sorry that way if it is IP  
I'm sorry, but if that's the case

21 O *mm*  
Yeah

Kabata continues her use of local language forms in line 16, but follows Odashima's lead in shifting back to a straight plain form in line 18. Odashima marks a possible solution by Kabata in line 19, with her use of the polite 'yes' form (*hai*). Kabata again follows Odashima's lead in using a polite form (*sumimasen*) in line 20.

In the next section, Kabata fully takes on the role of advisor in offering some possible solutions.

EXCERPT 3: PART 5

- 22 K {showing other possibilities} *kouiu no mo omoshiroi ka na*  
like this things also interesting I wonder  
(I wonder) whether this might be interesting, too.
- 23 O *aa aa [kurashikku ni ne kurashikku]*  
Oh oh classic make IP classic  
Oh, oh. Making it classic, huh? Classic.
- 24 K *[shizuppoi ka na shizuppoi] ka na*  
understated I wonder understated I wonder  
Is it kind of understated, I wonder? Is it kind of understated, I wonder?
- 25 *Konna fuu na kanji ga ii ka na toka ne*  
Like this feeling SM good I wonder and so on IP  
I wonder if something like this would be good, something like this, you know.

In line 22, Kabata first makes a suggestion of her own. She does not phrase it as a question or suggestion that necessarily requires a response from Odashima, however, but rather in a self-reflective mode that elicits a response from Odashima. Odashima's response classifies Kabata's color scheme into a particular category, "classic," but Kabata at the same time (brackets indicate overlap in speaker utterances) clarifies her suggestion with a different characterization, stating that "it's kind of understated" (line 24). Kabata thus competes with Odashima in characterizing the color scheme she has suggested.

In line 25, Kabata uses the same structure as in line 22 to make another suggestion. Thus, in both cases her suggestions are made in indirect and mitigated ('I wonder') ways. This is parallel to the previous excerpt from this setting that was analyzed (Excerpt 4 in the "Evaluation/Assessment" section of this chapter), in that Kabata does not overtly take on the role of giving directions.

In the next part, Odashima shifts direction in asking about another category of material that may be used in the shipment.

EXCERPT 3: PART 6

- 26 O *kore uru da ne a uru [chigau ne]*  
this sell COP IP oh sell wrong IP



Although Odashima has been pushing Kabata to take on an advisory role throughout this excerpt, she completely relinquishes control of the decision by stating that she “doesn’t know” (line 32), and further that she will leave it up to Kabata (line 34). This is an interesting parallel to the story card group in the previous excerpt, where participants pushed roles onto others by exempting themselves from them (i.e., “I’m exempt, so you’re doing to do it”). Similarly, here Odashima rejects the role of decision-maker, thus leaving Kabata to take on that role. However, whereas in the story card group interaction the women claimed exemption on the basis of past experience, here Odashima does so by claiming that she just does not know what to do. Her stance is completely interesting given that her education and experience with saki-ori would lead one to expect that she is more of an expert on this form of weaving than Kabata. However, when it comes to making decisions about what to include in a shipment, Odashima defers to Kabata’s judgement.

As before, Kabata’s initial response to Odashima’s forfeiture of the decision-making role is to express empathy for Odashima’s position, stating that it “makes your head spin” (line 35). As in other instances where she hesitates in taking a role assigned to her by Odashima, here too she uses local language variety forms to do so.

In part eight, however, Odashima briefly re-engages with the decision-making process.

EXCERPT 3: PART 8

- 38 O =*kore de ne kore wa donna moikkai moikkai*  
 this with IP this TM what kind once more once more  
 With this, right? What kind of is this? Once more, once more.
- 39 K *mm kore ii kka*  
 this good QM  
 Hmm, this is okay, huh? [[LLV]]
- 40 O *ara [nan daro ]*  
 Oh no what is (it I) wonder  
 Oh, what’s this?
- 41 K *[(somete inai)] shi*  
 not dyed and  
 It’s not dyed and
- 42 O *aa wakaranai:::=*  
 Oh, I don’t know. [[naked plain]]

In line 38, Odashima engages with the earlier discussion about possible materials, but quickly reverts to her ‘I don’t know’ stance, starting in line 40 and becoming explicit in line 42. Kabata continues her practice of making suggestions, introducing a new possibility in line 39 and following up on that suggestion with a justification for it in line 41.

In the next part of this excerpt, Odashima herself works with Kabata in working out yet another possible solution.

EXCERPT 3: PART 9

43 K =(unintelligible)

44 O =(shi) *nanka kou naru to are da*  
and somehow like this become then that is

→45 (*igai to chigau*) *fuu ni natte shimaui ka*  
pretty different like become completely QM

Somehow when it’s like this it, is it completely different? [[LLV]]

46 K *nn chotto yari sugi*=  
little do too much

Mm, it’s a little bit much.

47 O =*nn yari sugi*

Mm, too much.

48 K [*unintelligible*] *shimatte*=  
Go ahead and (unintelligible)

Although Odashima has just relinquished her decision-making role for the second time in line 42 above, in line 44 she works with Kabata in coming up with another possible solution. However, Odashima quickly discredits that solution (line 45), using local language forms in seeking input from Kabata about her assessment. In lines 46 and 47, Kabata and Odashima co-construct a reason to reject Odashima’s suggestion.

In part 10, Odashima and Kabata confirm their rejection of the idea just mentioned.

EXCERPT 3: PART 10

49 O [*nn kocchi*] *yappari shizentai kore ga*=  
this of course natural state this SM

Mm, this, of course in the natural state this (is)

50 K =*ka kore da to [konna kanji ka na ] toka*  
or this is if like this I wonder and

Or if it’s like this, it’s a sense like this, isn’t it (I wonder)? And so on



51 O *[nn sou da ne]*  
 mm that way is IP  
 Mm, that's right, isn't it? [[mod masc]]

In line 50, Kabata builds on Odashima's suggestion of one piece to contrast it with another possibility. She uses the same structure as in her previous suggestions (lines 24-25) in doing so. Odashima responds to this choice with a moderately masculine form (line 51).

In the next section of the excerpt, Kabata offers Odashima a concrete choice between two pieces.

EXCERPT 3: PART 11

52 K *kocchi ka kocchi ka*  
 this QM this QM  
 This? This?  
 53 O *wakannai wakannai*  
 I don't know, I don't know. [[naked plain]]  
 54 K {laughing} *wakannai*  
 (You) don't know.  
 55 O *wakannai*  
 I don't know.  
 56 K (unintelligible)  
 →57 O *wakannai yo mm*  
 don't know IP  
 I'm telling you, I don't know. [[mod masc]]

Although Kabata has by this point in the interaction taken on the role of suggesting solutions to the shipment-contents problem, and despite the fact that Odashima has repeatedly stated that she 'doesn't know' what to do, Kabata insists on seeking Odashima's advice in making a final decision (line 52). Odashima, however, rejects even this "final decision" role, by restating that she just 'doesn't know' (line 53). Again, Kabata does not respond to this by immediately making a decision herself, but rather elicits further "I don't know" comments from Odashima (lines 54-57) in confirming Odashima's position.

Having exhausted the possibility of Odashima making the decision for her, or at least conferring with her in the decision-making process, in the next section Kabata suggests that they use both the pieces she has brought forth earlier as possibilities.

EXCERPT 3: PART 12

- 58 K *ato ni shurui yaru ka dousei aru kara*  
 more two kind send QM anyway there are so  
 Shall (we) send two more kinds? I mean we already have them so
- 59 O *mm sou da ne*  
 that way is IP  
 Hmm, that's right, isn't it? [[mod masc]]
- 60 K [(unintelligible)]
- 61 O [*datte kore demo nai*] *n ja ne=*  
 but this even isn't NOM isn't it  
 Yeah but it's not this, right?
- 62 K *=aka ga ne*  
 red TM IP  
 The red, right?
- 63 O *nn*  
 Mm hmm.
- 64 K *chotto iro ga chigau kara*  
 little color SM different so  
 The color's a little different, so

Although she has now made a decision about what pieces can potentially be included in the shipment, Kabata still seeks Odashima's opinion in line 58. Odashima does not reject her part in the decision-making process here, but rather states that what Kabata has said is true ('that's right, isn't it'). Odashima expresses more engagement with Kabata's suggestion in line 61, however, in clarifying how the two pieces are distinct from one another.

Kabata then confirms Odashima's commitment to the pieces she had chosen, in this final part of the excerpt.

EXCERPT 3: PART 13

- 65 K *ja kore [to kore de ii desu ka]*  
 well this and this okay is QM  
 Is this and this okay? [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 66 O [*hai hai hai* ]  
 Yes, yes, yes.
- 67 K *nayamu kara naka naka ne*  
 be troubled so it's hard IP  
 It makes you wonder, so it's really hard (to make a decision) isn't it? [[plain]]
- 68 O *demo ne kodawa:ru toiu koto wa ii koto desu yo*  
 but IP being particular that thing TM good thing is IP  
 But you know, I'm telling you, being particular is a good thing. [[*desu/-masu*]]

69 K *hai*  
Yes.

Kabata shifts to the *desu/-masu* form (line 65) in making a final check with Odashima that sending the two kinds of pieces is agreeable. Odashima follows Kabata's shift in responding with a polite 'yes' form (*hai*). Kabata then shifts back to the plain form in another empathic remark to Odashima about the difficulties of making such decisions. This is in contrast to her expressions of empathy elsewhere, where she shifted to the use of local language forms. However, it is consistent in that she shifts from a formal and interpersonally distant form in line 65 to an informal and interpersonally close form in line 67.

Whereas at other places in the interaction Odashima shunned leadership roles and at times almost seemed at a loss for words due to her professed confusion, in line 68 she takes on the role of mentor/teacher in stating that "being particular is a good thing." She too shifts into the *desu/-masu* form when making this statement. This style shift functions both as a marker that she is speaking as person who knows what she is talking about (in stark contrast to the persona she has presented previous to this in the exchange) as well as an end to the topic of what to include in the shipment, and how it is to be decided. As in previous excerpts (see for example excerpt 1 in "Decision-making") then, Odashima shifts to the *desu/-masu* form in bringing a close to the topic.

## Summary

In the final section of this chapter, the analysis has shown examples of how roles are assigned, accepted or rejected, and claimed by various participants. In the case of the Mandagera story card group excerpt, other participants in the interaction played an important role in regulating attempts to claim particular roles, as evidenced by Narisawa's persistent questioning of Gotoh's and Yorozu's claims. In the Tsutanowa Diner excerpt, participants moved back and forth between working collaboratively to determine shopping needs and negotiating the fact the one person would be doing the shopping for the other (i.e., doing her a favor). The Hataya

weaving workshop excerpt showed how interactional participants can use local language forms as a means of hedging their acceptance of high-status roles.

## CONCLUSION

There are several points to be taken from this chapter in terms of our investigation of role and status in relation to women's language usage. First, in terms of gender-marked language we have seen that feminine language (i.e., feminine-marked language; JWL) can be used in quite effective ways, contrary to what much of the previous research has suggested. Second, humility can be an effective means for speakers to achieve their goals, as evidenced by the humiliating forms used in successfully rejecting a high-status role. Third, speakers often shift to *desu/-masu* form speech when closing a particular topic, even where the rest of the conversation is in the plain form. Although previous research suggested that speakers also use *desu/-masu* forms when introducing a topic (again, even when the interaction is primarily in the plain form mode), the excerpts here show several exceptions to that pattern. Instead, in some cases we found that speakers introduced a topic in the plain form, then shifted to *desu/-masu* in their next utterance. Fourth, speakers often used local language forms when expressing empathy with others in the group, particularly when this was part of efforts to reject a high-status role assigned to them by another participant. Local language forms have thus also been shown to work as hedging devices as speakers decide whether or not to accept a particular role. Finally, shifts in these three sets of features also often reflect a shift in attitude on the part of the speaker toward the hearer. In the HT excerpts, for example, a shift to plain and very informal language also marked volunteers and staff members' different orientation towards patients, namely, as children.

These five features will be considered and developed further in Chapter Four, which moves away from work-centered interactions.

## CHAPTER FOUR: Non-work interactions

An examination of work-related interactions in the previous chapter revealed that the women who are ostensibly in charge – i.e. in positions of authority - in each of the settings in fact are not always the clear and uncontested leaders in interactions. Significantly, the role configurations associated with institutionally-oriented interactions did not necessarily mean that those in the authoritative role (evaluator, direction-giver, etc.) held their positions without consideration or concern for others. Rather, all participants negotiated role and status through strategic use of speech-level shifts, gender-marked speech, and the use of a local language variety, and use these linguistic features in ways not accounted for in previous research.

In a sense I have started my analysis from an unconventional set of examples, as far as research that uses conversation analysis is concerned. CA was developed in no small part to look for the regularities and organizational patterns in so-called everyday interaction. That is, CA specifically focuses on, for example, non-institutional interactions because of the assumption that institutional settings assume a “reduced range of options” in terms of what people talk about and how; specialization and re-specification of activities’ interactional functions (Drew and Heritage). By the same token, non-institutional settings are viewed as less formal, and the rules are less strict. This is true partly because they take place in private contexts, and there is “room within them for considerable negotiation and/or stylistic variation.” (ibid: 28)

My aim in including both non-work-oriented interactions (i.e., non-institutional) is to investigate how relations between participants in each of the four sites are centered around a configuration of role relations that is potentially quite distinct from that found in work-focused interactions. Specifically, I am interested in how shifts in the three sets of linguistic features that are the focus of this dissertation may be informed by different criteria, related to the differences in role configuration. The inclusion of both work- and non-work-oriented interactions also helps to address the position posited by Wetzel (1993) that “power” in Japan is relational – located not in an individual but in a role and position – and that such a view “...places emphasis on role

interaction within the role structure or vertical social structure and far less on the individual” (395).<sup>98</sup> Recalling scholarship on the Japanese sense of self outlined in Chapter Two, much work has been done showing the relational tendencies of Japanese selves. According to the “relational self” model, Japanese are highly attuned to themselves in relation to the people and settings in which they interact. Thus, there is not a constant “I” moving through situations, but rather a flexible “I/us” that changes according to situation and interlocutors.<sup>99</sup>

If what Wetzel argues is indeed the case, then we would expect to find, for example, that the effect of a particular individual’s utterances (i.e. the “power”, in Wetzel’s terms) would vary depending on the setting and role that he/she has in each setting. An example of this would be if utterances by Narisawa – the leader of the Mandagera group – were more effective in institutionally-oriented settings where she is in the role of “leader” in comparison to non-work-oriented interactions in which she does not hold that same role. On the other hand, if role were not a significant factor, then Narisawa’s utterances would be equally effective (or ineffective) no matter what role she played.

Institutionally-oriented interactions arguably have stricter parameters regarding discourse structure and content. However, this is not to say that there are not such constraints or limits on non-institutional interactions. Indeed, much CA work is concerned with the very question of what rules organize so-called everyday talk. However, as the data below attests, it is not just the structure of the interaction but the content itself that is also sometimes sanctioned. How interactants critique one another within casual interactions (i.e., everyday talk) is therefore of interest in who takes on the role of critique and how. By comparing and contrasting work from both institutionally and non-institutionally oriented interactions, I am interested in exploring how

---

<sup>98</sup> Wetzel’s comments are specifically directed toward metalinguistic issues (i.e., how people talk about language and, in this case, “power”), but can and should be extended to actual examples of interaction if we are to assess their applicability. This returns us to the question of “what people say they do” (i.e., what they say is important when talking about “power” relations) versus “what people do” (i.e., if language use actually follows these metalinguistic models).

<sup>99</sup> See Bachnik (1994) for details on “I” as a deictic anchor point around which environs are constructed in the United States and other western countries.

language use changes, particularly in relation to the role and status negotiations I examine through shifts in the three sets of linguistic features that are the focus of this dissertation.

Non-work interactions have been grouped into the following four areas, according to the topic or focus of the interaction. As in Chapter Three, these categories were selected both because they are large categories of conversation that take place across my data, and because they involve particular role configurations that place interactants in potentially unequal relationships:

1. Gossiping about/assessment of others
2. Giving advice/support
3. Critiquing group members
4. Telling stories

#### **GOSSIPING ABOUT/ASSESSMENT OF OTHERS**

People involved in interactions from the sites that form the basis of this dissertation have generally lived in the same area for at least 15 years, if not their entire lives. Because Towa is a small community and many of the participants are of roughly the same age, it is not uncommon for interlocutors to know many of the same people and be familiar with many of the same events. Interactions are often centered around discussion about people known to (or at least known of) all parties involved. However, there is generally at least one person who has more information than the others, or information that is more direct (e.g., from personal experience rather than second or third hand knowledge). In the following excerpts, therefore, knowledge becomes an important source of status for individuals; those who have more personal or direct knowledge have a higher status in the telling of the story. In addition, those without knowledge (or who have a different quality of knowledge – e.g., indirect knowledge) can play several roles - among them providing supportive evidence for the main speaker's claims and evaluating such claims. Thus, whose utterances are given credence through the interaction is important in these excerpts.

The first excerpt is from an interaction between two customers at the Tsutanowa diner, Abe (A) and Bando (B), and Unagami (U), who is the head of the diner. Customers at the diner fall into roughly two categories: visitors from out of town who may eat there once or twice while in town on other business, and friends/acquaintances of one or more of the women who work at the diner. For the latter group, the diner might be seen as a sort of “hang out”, where they can go for a cup of coffee and a good chat with friends. Both Abe and Bando are regular customers at the diner, and know each other and Unagami quite well; therefore they fall into the category of “regular-customers-who-are-friends”. Abe is in her mid 40s and is a native of Towa. Bando is in his mid 40s, and is also a Towa native. Unagami is working behind the counter while A and B talk, but is present through the entire interaction. As in Chapter Three, full transcripts of longer interactions such as this one are given in Appendix E.

In the first part of the exchange, Bando introduces the question of Abe’s husband’s health. Abe naturally has more personal and direct information on this topic than the other two participants in the interaction, but both Bando and Unagami are familiar with Abe’s husband.

**EXCERPT 1: PART 1**

1. B *otousan nani shiteru no (shibaraku uchi ni) iru no*  
 Husband what is doing QM (awhile home at) is QM  
 What’s your husband doing? Is he at home for awhile?
2. A *otousan nn mazu karada o*  
 Husband hmm first body DO  
 My husband, hmm... Well, his body, you know...
3. B (unintelligible)
- 4. A *koshi (ga itakute) souiu koto de (dakedo yasumi wa shite imasu)*  
 Back SM hurts like that thing with but vacation TM is doing  
 (His) back hurts and like that...but he’s taking a vacation. [[*desu/-masu*]]  
 {A and U laugh}

Bando’s use of the informal question marker *no* is another counterexample to suggestions that speakers shift to *desu/-masu* forms when introducing a new topic. Just as Narisawa did in excerpt 2 of the “Decision-making” section in Chapter Three, Bando introduces the topic in a



very informal and colloquial manner. Abe, on the other hand, responds to his inquiries with a distancing *desu/-masu* form in line 4.<sup>100</sup> This is in marked contrast to the rest of the conversation, where plain forms are prevalent (see below). Given that her utterance elicits embarrassed laughter from Unagami, and Abe herself laughs as well, Abe's use of *desu/-masu* in line 4 could be seen as a way of distancing herself from others regarding what is a rather painful and embarrassing issue (i.e., that her husband is not working because of his back problems).<sup>101</sup> However, she then shifts to the plain form and maintains it throughout the conversation, even though she discusses her husband's situation in detail. Thus, her use of *desu/-masu* in line 4 seems to function as a preparatory utterance, one that creates interpersonal distances before shifting into the interpersonally close mode – both in terms of linguistic features and content – that characterizes the rest of her utterances. This parallels Ikuta's (1983) suggestion that participants shift to *desu/-masu* style, even in conversations that are otherwise plain, before asking a personal question. However, in Ikuta's data participants created interpersonal distance between themselves and their interlocutor(s) before asking about something personal, whereas in Abe's case she herself creates interpersonal distance; though perhaps “intra-personal” would be more fitting here, as she creates distance between her own initial response to Bando's introduction of the topic and her own subsequent utterances. It is also Abe herself who brings in more personal information; though Bando introduced the topic, Abe could have chosen not to pursue it in depth. Instead, she makes the topic more personal by introducing more detailed information.

In the second section of this utterance, Abe relates more details about her husband's situation:

EXCERPT 1: PART 2

5. A *shitsugyou hoken moraeru uchi mazu uchi ni ite*  
 unemployment insurance can get home anyway home at is and

---

<sup>100</sup> There are no parts of speech marked for plain or *desu/-masu* forms in line 2.

<sup>101</sup> This is, of course, assuming that the laughter is due to embarrassment rather than humor. Given the content of the discussion, it does not seem likely that the participants would have found it humorous.

6. *jojo ni shigoto sagasu tte mon ne (unintelligible) wa ne*  
 gradually work look for says EMPH IP (unintelligible) TM IP  
 As long as (he) can get unemployment insurance (he's) home, and (he) says he'll  
 gradually look for a job. (unintelligible)
7. B (unintelligible)
- 8. A(unintelligible) *datte zutto tatteru to ne anou dame na no yo*  
 but long time standing if IP um no good NOM IP  
 (unintelligible). But you know, if (he) stands a long time it isn't good. [[strong  
 feminine]]

In lines 5 and 6, Abe clarifies what she meant in line 4 about her husband “taking a vacation.” Her use of *mon*, as discussed in Chapter Three, carries overtones of discontentment, in this case that her husband is at home and not working<sup>102</sup>. In line 8, she uses a form strongly marked for femininity (*na*-adj + *no yo*) in relating the difficulties her husband's health problems cause him. If we follow the traditional association of feminine-marked speech and politeness, and therefore a reflection of formality (and distance), then line 8 forms an interesting parallel to line 4 discussed above, where Abe shifted to a formal style in setting up her personal story.

Indeed, line 8 seems to function in a similar way, as Abe turns to a more detailed explanation in her utterances immediately following.<sup>103</sup>

EXCERPT 1: PART 3

[elipsis]

14. A *zutto nagaku aruitari suru to dame da tte*  
 very long time walk and do if no good is says  
 (He) says (he) runs into trouble if he does things like walk for a very long time.
15. *kanzen ni naoranai (tte sensei ni iwareta) itami ga mazu ne*  
 completely won't heal that doctor was told pain SM anyway IP  
 The doctor told him that it wouldn't completely heal, the pain anyway.
16. U *un nakunareba iin darou kedo*  
 mm hmm if it goes good probably but  
 Mm hmm, if it went away that would be good, I think, but.

<sup>102</sup> *Mon* is an example of the inconsistencies in gender-marked language typologies. While Okamoto, for example, does not include *mon* in her chart, other sources claim that it is “used more by women”. (Niyekawa 1991)

<sup>103</sup> Abe's utterance immediately following line 8 and Unagami's response have been elided because they are not completely intelligible on the tapes. Part 3 is a continuation of the more detailed explanation Abe begins in the elided section.

17. A *minna ni wakai mada wakakute tte iwareru kedo sa*<sup>104</sup>  
 everyone young still young and that am told but well  
 Everyone tells me “He’s young.” “He’s still young,” but, you know.
- 18. B *ndatte koshi yaru no tte wakai toshi yori kankei*  
 but back do NOM that young older relationship
19. *ne be kara*  
 not probably so  
 But you know, back pain has nothing to do with being old or young, right? [[LLV]]
20. A *iwareru kedo yappashi sono itami mo honnin shika*  
 am told but naturally that pain also person himself only
21. *wakanne beshi sa*  
 understand shouldn’t IP  
 That’s what people tell me, but you know, I think only the person himself can understand the pain. [[LLV]]
22. *Dakara kono aida mo sou yuttera kke (zutto tatte ite tsurakatta no)*  
 so recently also that was saying IP long standing difficult QM
23. *tsurakatta tte*  
 difficult said  
 So the other day (he) said the same thing. [[LLV]] (I asked him) “Was it hard standing for such a long time?” And he said, “It was hard.”
24. U *nn*  
 Hmm
25. A *watashi ga nanboka chikara ni (naranakucha)*  
 I SM somewhat strength become  
 I’m going to have to be of some help. [[LLV]]

Abe’s further explanations of her husband’s back problems elicit an expression of empathy from Unagami in line 16 (‘if it went away, it would be good I guess’), an utterance that pits her own hopes for Abe’s husband’s recovery against the doctor’s pessimistic assessment from line 15. She does not, however, shift to LLV in expressing empathy, as was observed in excerpts from Chapter Three (in the evaluation/assessment example from the Hataya weaving site) and as Bando does in line 19.

Abe’s utterance following Bando’s in line 19 parallels his linguistically, as she too shifts to use of the local language. However, she refers back to what she said in line 17, repeating “people tell me,” before making a further statement about how to assess her husband’s back problems. On the one hand her repetition of “people tell me” in lines 20-21 seems to mark

---

<sup>104</sup> Speakers in Towa use LLV *sa* much like SJ *ne*. In SJ *sa* is categorized as masculine, but in local usage it does not carry these overtones.

Bando's utterance in line 19 as an interruption, where Abe's utterance in lines 20-21 might be understood as "As I was saying, people tell me...". On the other hand, her utterance builds on Bando's both linguistically and in terms of content. Her statement that "only the person himself can understand the pain" in lines 20-21 is further support for Bando's claim that outsiders'<sup>105</sup> expectations do not apply in this case. Outsiders cannot understand why Abe's husband should be having back pain at such a young age, or how the pain feels.

Unlike her previous shift to *desu/-masu* forms, Abe continues to speak in the local language variety through lines 22 (*yuttera kke*) and 25 (*nanboka*).<sup>106</sup> Abe's extended shift here can be accounted for in a way similar to Maynard's explanation for the use of naked plain forms. In lines 22 and 25, Abe is relating a story involving her and her husband, and uses the LLV as a means of putting herself inside this story, i.e., her speech here is internally oriented in that it puts her within ("internal to") the story she is relating. Her use of LLV forms here functions in much the same way, in focusing her utterance on her as she exists within the story through her telling of it.

In the next part of the excerpt, Abe builds on her statement that she is going to "have to be of some help" since her husband cannot work.

EXCERPT 1: PART 4

[elipsis]

- 26. A *datte sore shika nai*  
           but that only isn't  
           Yes, but that's all I can do. [[naked plain]]
27. B (*tanoshimi*)  
       I'm looking forward to...
28. A *sore shika ja nai yappa*  
       that only isn't naturally  
       That's all I can do, of course.
- 29. B *nda na ha*  
       That's right, isn't it? [[LLV]]

---

<sup>105</sup> The people telling Abe that her husband is still young, and therefore shouldn't be expected to have these problems.

<sup>106</sup> She shifts out of it again in the middle of that utterance when she quotes her own and her husband's statements.

Abe begins this section with an utterance in the naked plain form, which according to Maynard means the utterance is not oriented toward others in the interaction. However, Abe's use of *datte* ('but') at the beginning of her utterance indicates that she is contradicting something that was said or assumed in a previous utterance. It also carries a note of defense in the face of evidence provided by others in the interaction or herself (i.e., her own doubts about her ability to help). Thus, her use of the naked plain form is very much oriented toward other participants in the interaction. Further, because it is a naked plain form it is a strong statement in that it does not encourage corroboration or comment from other participants (because there are no final IP).

Although not intelligible enough to translate, in the elided section just prior to this part of the interaction Bando made an utterance, so it can be assumed that in line 26 Abe is responding to his comment. Given her reaction (specifically, her use of *datte*), Bando's immediately preceding comment was likely not openly supportive. It is not until Abe reiterates her feeling that "that's all I can do" (line 28) that Bando expresses understanding/empathy for her position. Interestingly, Abe does not change her speaking style when reiterating that this is "all she can do" (lines 26 and 28), unlike evidence found in many previous excerpts. Bando does follow patterns we have seen in other excerpts, however, in shifting to LLV forms to expression empathy for Abe's position in line 29.

In the next section, Abe relates some of the practical changes that her husband's physical limitations are having on their livelihood of farming.

EXCERPT 1: PART 5

30. A *mada kore kara yareru kurai ne*  
still from now on can do about IP

(I'll) still do what I can from here on, you know?

→31. *dakara kotoshi wa taue mo mou tanonda hou*  
so this year TM rice planting also already request part

32. *iin da tte no*  
better is said NOM

So this year's rice planting as well, (he's) said it would be better to ask someone else to do it. [[moderately feminine]]

33. U *un jouyou da be demo*  
 hmm transfer is probably but  
 Yeah, it'll probably (mean) handing it over but. [[LLV]]
33. A *jouyou dakedo sa [(yappari kore kara mo)]*  
 transfer but IP of course from here on also  
 It is handing it over, but you know, of course from here on out also...
34. U *[yappari omoi mono] motte ne*  
 of course heavy things carry IP  
 Of course carrying heavy objects (is difficult), right?
35. A *sou sou sou*  
 Yes, yes, yes.
36. U *ne yappari are suru no mo nottari oritari*  
 IP of course that do NOM also getting on and getting off  
 Right? Naturally doing that also, getting on and getting off
37. B *ano notte ueteru toki ii kedo sa*  
 um ride planting when okay but IP  
 Um, when you plant while you're sitting it's okay, but well...

In line 32, Abe again uses a feminine-marked form, and again it is to frame a difficulty that she and her family are going through as a result of her husband's back problems. In response to this, Unagami expresses her empathy with Abe's situation, following the pattern of using local language forms. Unagami's utterance is not just one of empathy, though, but also clarification about why Abe might be upset over having to hire someone else to do the planting. Thus, Unagami enters a territory that is even more personal than simply responding to Abe's own comments. In her analysis of empathy expressed through distance in the use of *desu/-masu* or plain forms discussed in Chapter Two, Ikuta found that speakers who are not close friends shift to *desu/-masu* forms before posing personal questions. Unagami and Abe are in fact close friends, so we would not expect that their speech choices would follow the same pattern. However, it is interesting to note that rather than shift away (to *desu/-masu* forms), Unagami shifts towards (to local language forms) Abe in making her personal comments, the exact opposite of what Ikuta found in her data. In the case of Unagami and Abe, more interpersonally close language forms frame more personal commentary.

In the next section of the interaction, Bando and Unagami continue, with Abe, their construction of why Abe's husband cannot plant rice with a bad back.

EXCERPT 1: PART 7

[elipsis]

→40. B *ano nae hakobi mo ne tsukareru kke cche ne*  
that seedling transport also IP get tired IP IP IP

41. *[sungoku (aru) shi sa]*  
very much there is and IP

You really get tired moving seedlings don't you, you know? [[LLV]].  
There's so much and you know.

41. A *[ne nanmai mo ]*  
IP several layers even

Right? There are so many layers

42. *ippai ne tsumaneba ne shi ne*  
Lots IP have to layer and IP

You have to stack several together and things, right? [[LLV]]

43. U *chuugoshi ga ichiban taihen da o na*  
crouching down TM most difficult is IP IP

Crouching down is the most difficult, isn't it? [[LLV]]

Bando's shift to LLV in line 40 marks a shift to this form on the part of all speakers through line 45 (below). Although LLV usage is not uncommon in this conversation as a whole (see the appendix for a "picture" of the entire interaction), this is the first place where all speakers shift to LLV-form usage at the same time. Part of this shift no doubt has to do with the content of the interactants utterances at this point: Bando and Unagami work with Abe to create a list of the difficulties inherent in planting rice when one has a bad back. In doing so, they implicitly empathize with Abe – we know it is hard and we are going to help you articulate why – as well as linguistically empathize through their use of LLV forms. Abe herself also uses LLV forms in this section, as she talks about a very personal and difficult topic. The mutual use of LLV here thus ties the interactants into a close bond, united by language and shared difficulties.

In the eighth and final section of this interaction, Abe brings up an issue that would seem to detract from the image of her husband that has been created through the interaction: someone whose pain we cannot understand, but who understandably cannot do his usual job (farming) because of the physical movement it requires.

EXCERPT 1: PART 8

44. A *sore demo pachinkoya sa itteru you da kke yo*  
that even pachinko store to goes seems is IP IP

Even so, it seems he goes to play pachinko, you know. [[LLV]]

{laughter from B and U}

45. B *nde sore shika ne be iku toko*  
and that only not probably go place  
Well, that's probably the only place he can go, isn't it? [[LLV]]
46. A *datte koshi dakara suwatteru no mo tsurai tte ittete sa*  
But back so sitting NOM also painful that says IP  
But it's his back, so (he) says that sitting is also painful.
- 47. *ano hito no baai sou ja nai-n da yo ne*  
that person POS case that way not NOM is IP IP  
That isn't the case with him, is it now? [[moderately masculine]]
48. B *haa kou yatteru hou ii wake da*  
Oh like this doing part good reason is  
Oh, so it's that he's better going like this. [[moderately masculine]]
49. U *ndemo sa chigau koto sa shuuchuu shiteru kara sa*  
but IP different thing IP concentrate doing so IP  
But (he's) concentrating on something different, so, you know.
50. B (unintelligible)
51. U *nn iin ja nai no un kou chigau hou sa<sup>107</sup>*  
Hmm good isn't it mm like this different part LOC
52. *me ga itteru kara*  
eyes SM going  
Uh huh. That's all right, isn't it? [[mod fem]] Umm, his eyes are focused somewhere else, so... [[LLV]]

In line 44, Abe shifts the topic away from why her husband cannot do the rice planting this year to a complaint about what he does manage to still do: play pachinko. Again, this is a marked change from the interaction to this point, which has been focused on garnering sympathy for Abe and her husband's condition. In this final part of the excerpt, Abe instead openly complains about her husband to Bando and Unagami. Bando comes to Abe's husband's defense in line 45, in stating that there must not be any other place he can go. Abe counters by stating that he manages to sit at the pachinko machines, even though sitting is supposed to be painful (lines 46 and 47). Abe's use of a moderately masculine form here marks both a more explicit complaint – it is not just that her husband is going to pachinko parlors, but that he is doing the very thing that supposedly causes him pain in going – and a rebuttal to Bando's justification of Abe's husband's actions.

---

<sup>107</sup> Here, *sa* corresponds to the SJ *ni*, a locative marking the direction or place toward which someone or something moves.



However, both Bando and Unagami continue to offer explanations for Mr. Abe's visits to the pachinko parlor, and suggest that such visits must be helping his spirits, if not his physical health. Bando's immediate response to Abe's utterance in line 47 is to say that the position Mr. Abe's body is in while playing pachinko must somehow be "better" (i.e., more comfortable) for him. That is, Bando does not lend support to Abe's complaint about her husband, but rather gives evidence as to why Mr. Abe might be understandably interested in playing pachinko from a physical point of view. Bando also uses a moderately masculine form in explaining his reasoning (line 48), which further rebut Abe's previous utterance. In line 51, Unagami joins Bando in arguing for Mr. Abe's visits to the pachinko parlor, and she also gives an explanation of why these visits might be physically helpful ("his eyes are focused somewhere else").

Thus, although Abe is the most knowledgeable about her husband's health (the topic under discussion), she is not always the highest status person in the interaction, as judged by whether or not her utterances are supported by others in the interaction. Unagami and Bando express sympathy and understanding for the social pressure Abe is under in justifying why her husband cannot work even though he is so young. They are also supportive of Abe and her husband's decision to hire someone else to do the rice planting this year, providing evidential support for why he would be unable to do so. However, they offer justification for her husband's actions rather than support for Abe's complaints when it comes to Mr. Abe's visit to the pachinko parlor. Thus, when it comes to criticizing her husband, Abe finds that the support she received previously is no longer there.

The second excerpt in the chapter comes from the Mandagera storycard group. In the excerpt below, Narisawa (N) relates information about a person from Towa who recently committed suicide. The woman, Ms. Hakoda<sup>108</sup>, was a nursery school teacher, and Narisawa has second-hand information from own daughter (who is also a nursery school teacher) about Ms. Hakoda. Gotoh (G), Fujii (F), Yamanouchi (Y), and S (Suzuki) all contribute to Narisawa's

---

<sup>108</sup> Names that appear in conversations have also been changed.

narration. In this excerpt Narisawa is the only person who has direct (albeit second-hand) information about the woman and the circumstances leading up to the incident. This excerpt is also from the Mandagera session where Suzuki<sup>109</sup> first joined the group. She is the youngest member of the group, and her mother is friends with Gotoh. It was through Gotoh that Suzuki learned of the Mandagera group, and through Gotoh's introduction that she attended on the day this interaction was recorded.

In the first part of the excerpt, Narisawa introduces the topic by relating some background information about the mental state of the Ms. Hakoda, the woman who committed suicide.

**EXCERPT 2: PART 1**

1. N *Hakoda-san wa nanka okosan dekinakatta koto ga genin de*  
Hakoda TM like child couldn't have thing SM cause and
2. *chotto noirouze mitai na (kanji datta ne)*  
little neurosis like sense was IP  
Because she couldn't have children, Ms. Hakoda had something like a slight neurosis, you know?
3. G *aa (noirouze)*  
Oh, a neurosis.
4. F *Hakoda-san kodomosan nakatta -n da*  
Hakoda children weren't NOM COP  
Oh, Ms. Hakoda didn't have any children.<sup>110</sup>
5. G *(unintelligible)*
6. S *(ryouzan de) dekinaku natte*  
miscarriage with unable became  
She became unable (to have children) because of a miscarriage.
7. Y *nanka ii oyomesan moratta tte ne yorokondeta tte*  
like good wife got said IP was happy that
- 8. *kikimashita kedo ne*  
heard but IP  
You know, (they) said he'd gotten a good wife. I'd heard (he) was really happy but, you know? [[*desu/-masu*]]
9. F *zannen datta ne*  
unfortunate was IP  
It was unfortunate, wasn't it?

<sup>109</sup> Suzuki participated in the group only on the last day I collected data with the Mandagera women. She has remained an active member since that time.

<sup>110</sup> Fujii's use of the nominalizer *n* (a reduced form of *no*) with the copula *da* indicates the not being able to have children is an explanation for Ms. Hakoda's neurosis. Literally, "It's that she didn't have any children."

10. G *hontou ne*  
 really IP  
 It really was, wasn't it?

As in previous excerpts, Narisawa introduces the topic with a plain form in line 2, which goes against other scholars' suggestions (Maynard 1993, Ikuta 1983) that speakers prefer to use *desu/-masu* forms – even if the conversation is in the plain mode – at such junctures. In lines 3-6 Gotoh (G), Fujii (F), and Suzuki (S) all provide commentary on Narisawa's remarks. In line 7, Yamanouchi (Y) adds her own information, based on what she has heard about Mr. Hakoda's feelings towards his wife. She shifts to the *desu/-masu* form in the latter half of her utterance (*kikimashita*). Her use of the *desu/-masu* form is informed in part by her position as the youngest and newest member of the group (she used *desu/-masu* forms with everyone throughout the entire session). However, it is also important to note that in line 7 Suzuki is also potentially taking over the role of main storyteller from Narisawa, in presenting new information about the case rather than commentary on Narisawa's telling of it.

In this vein, it is significant that no one responds in particular to Suzuki's utterance. Rather, in lines 8 and 9 Fujii and Gotoh continue to respond to Narisawa's original statement – and the topic of Ms. Hakoda's suicide more generally. Indeed, Gotoh and Fujii in these two lines have a sub-conversation, as Gotoh responds to Fujii's response to Narisawa's earlier utterances.

In the next section of the excerpt, Narisawa gives more information about how a woman in Ms. Hakoda's mental state came to be working for a nursery school.

EXCERPT 2: PART 2

11. N *hoikusho de shiranaide hoikuen de shiranaide*  
 nursery school at don't know nursery school don't know
12. *yatotta rashii -n dakedo*  
 hired seems NOM but  
 It seems to be that they didn't know at the nursing school, at the nursery school  
 when they hired her, but.
13. S *(unintelligible) hanamaki hoikuen de ne*  
 Hanamaki nursery school at IP  
 (unintelligible) at the Hanamaki<sup>111</sup> Nursery School, you know?

---

<sup>111</sup> A city next to Towa.

14. F *a hontou ni*

Oh really?

→15. N *asoko ni ita sou desu (yo ne)*

there LOC was heard is IP IP

I've heard that she was there, you know, wasn't she? [[*desu/-masu*]]

16. *saisho kara haruyama iin no ne*

beginning from Haruyama clinic POS IP

From the beginning at the Haruyama<sup>112</sup> clinic, you know?

17. S *aa nn nn*

Oh, mm hmm.

Suzuki again introduces new information in line 12, in response to Narisawa's statement in lines 10-11 that the people at the nursery school didn't know Hakoda was mentally disturbed when they hired her. Unlike her previous effort to gain a story-telling role, in this case Suzuki's utterance is met with a response from Fujii; an expression of surprise. Narisawa picks up on the thread of the story Suzuki has introduced in her own utterance in line 14 ("I've heard she was there"). Here, Narisawa also uses a *desu/-masu* form, which is in marked contrast to her surrounding utterances. Her shift here can be understood as an effort to match Suzuki's speaking style (recall that Suzuki uses *desu/-masu* forms throughout), and also out of politeness and distance to Suzuki since this was her first day with the group. However, Narisawa's shift might also be related to the fact that she uses her connection to Suzuki's previous utterance as a means of continuing in her own role as primary storyteller. Narisawa does in fact follow the line of conversation introduced by Suzuki, in shifting from a concentration on Ms. Hakoda's state of mind and how she managed to be hired to more practical matters of where she had been getting medical treatment.

However, Following this part of this excerpt, Narisawa returns to her earlier line of conversation (line 11) regarding the nursery school's lack of knowledge about Ms. Hakoda's mental state. Suzuki's topic is thus not carried very far in the interaction, and Narisawa retains her role as main storyteller overall. After this section, Narisawa responds to an assessment

---

<sup>112</sup> A region within Towa.

Suzuki has made just prior about why Ms. Hakoda committed suicide (i.e., because she wanted children so much but could not have them herself).

EXCERRPT 2: PART 3

[elipsis]

→28. N *tabun ne souiu no wa hontou da to omou no*  
maybe IP like that NOM TM really is that think IP

Maybe, you know? I think that kind of thing was true, you know. [[mod fem]]

29. *ano kodomo ni taishite no are ga chotto ijou de*  
that child for thing that SM little irregular and

30. *chotto nn abunai tte iu no de*  
little mm dangerous that said so

They said that thing for that child<sup>113</sup> was a little irregular and, um, dangerous, so...

→31. *en no hou kara yamete moratta mitai desu kke nn*  
school part from quit get seems COP IP mm

...the school - it seems that the school had her quit, you know?

[[*desu/-masu*, LLV]]

31. F *aa sou datta no nn*

Oh is that how it was? Hmm

In this section, Narisawa makes shifts in all three sets of linguistic features under discussion: gender-marked (line 28), style shift (plain to *desu/-masu* in line 30), and LLV (line 30). Her use of a moderately feminine form in line 28 marks a shift from reporting what she has heard from others to an expression of her own feelings; it is at this point that she joins others in the group in assessing Ms. Hakoda's state of mind. Given this, her use of a feminine-marked form here could be understood as an expression of empathy, much like the use of LLV forms in other excerpts.

Line 30 at first seems to be another example of distance-building *desu/-masu* form usage in conjunction with closeness-building forms from the local language variety. Here, Narisawa retakes her role of information-giver/storyteller, as she relates more information about the circumstances leading up the Hakoda's suicide. In this sense, her use of the *desu/-masu* form can be understood as a reflection of her role as teacher. In addition, this utterance also marks the end of her main contribution to the conversation. Although there is reflective commentary on

---

<sup>113</sup> Prior to this section, Narisawa has explained how Ms. Hakoda developed a strong attachment for one of the children in her class, and would say to him "please, let me hug you." (*dakko sasete ne*).

Hakoda's death following Narisawa's utterance here, no new information is offered. Her use of the *desu/-masu* form here can thus also be seen as a way of marking the end of the story-telling portion of the conversation, and the eventual end of the conversation. As evidenced by previous excerpts, speakers often shift to *desu/-masu* forms to mark the end of a topic, but there is also sometimes a brief continuation of the topic in the form of commentary (e.g., 'it's terrible, isn't it?'). Narisawa's utterance in line 31 is also an example of a place where speakers use LLV forms in conjunction with *desu/-masu* forms. Again, the two forms would seem to be working at cross purposes, since LLV promotes interpersonal closeness while *desu/-masu* forms promote distance and formality. If we understand Narisawa's shift to *desu/-masu* as a means of marking the end of her major contributions to the conversation, and thus marking formality rather than distance, her use of the local language form *kke* is also easier to understand. That is, Narisawa uses *desu/-masu* in line 30 as a way of marking formality, which is not unusual at transitional points in conversations. Narisawa's use of LLV forms may be understood as a means of expressing both empathy for Hakoda and a connection with her interlocutors in this local tragedy. In this latter sense LLV is particularly effective, in that it denotes not only interpersonal closeness but also a shared connection to a particular geographic area. At the same time, however, she uses a LLV form to maintain interpersonal closeness with her interlocutors.

The last section of this excerpt involves participants verifying information and making further comment on what has already been revealed in the conversation.

EXCERPT 2: PART 4

[elipsis]

50. F *okosan nakatta no*

child wasn't QM

She didn't have children?

51. N *nn*

Yeah. (meaning "No, she didn't.")

→52. F *a sou datta*

Oh, that's how it was. [[naked plain]]

53. G *(unintelligible) no ka na*

I wonder if (unintelligible)

- 54. N *nn rashii toiu hanashi da kke*  
 mm hm seems that talk is IP  
 Uh huh, it seems so, that's the talk, you know? [[LLV]]
55. G *nn hontou ni kodomosan hoshikatta-n da ne*  
 hmm really children wanted NOM COP IP  
 Hmm, she really wanted kids (that's the reason), huh?

Fujii's use of the naked plain form in line 52 can be understood as an instance of what Maynard (1993) has called an "echo response," wherein a speaker repeats the exact words or sentiment of a previous speaker's utterance. It can also be seen as a self-reflective comment ("Oh, I see"), which thus does not contain IP that are directed towards eliciting responses from others in the conversation. In line 54, Narisawa repeats her use of the local language form *kke*, but this time in conjunction with a plain-form verb (*da*). Having relinquished her central position in the conversation, she now shifts to a form that marks her closeness and familiarity with other participants. Gotoh's utterance in line 55 marks the end of this topic of conversation, but unlike Narisawa she does not shift to the *desu/-masu* form.

## Summary

As in previous sections, the excerpts here show a pattern of shifting to *desu/-masu* forms when wrapping up a topic of conversation, although speakers do not necessarily shift to this form when introducing a topic. The excerpts also show the use of local language forms in expressing empathy. In addition, we also find evidence for speakers shifting to *desu/-masu* form when taking the floor to introduce new information, particularly when someone else has been the center of the conversation.

## 2. GIVING ADVICE

One function that much of the non-work interactions serves is to test out ideas and seek advice from other members of the group or workplace. In the first excerpt below, Odashima seeks Kabata's input on why she does not receive invitations to participate in exhibitions where people display their artwork.

EXCERPT 1

1. O *sappari watashi ni daremo sasowanai ne*  
not at all I to no one invites IP  
I don't get invited by anyone at all, you know?
2. *isshoni {laughing voice} sakuhinten shimasho nante*  
together exhibition let's do like that  
“Let's do an exhibition together” or anything like that.
3. *Ikkai mo sasowarenai:*  
Once even not invite  
I haven't been invited to even one. [[naked plain]]
4. K *ano hito ga hitori de yaru-n da tte omotte*  
that person SM herself does NOM COP that think  
They think, “That person does it (works) by herself” and...
5. O *nnh sou da ne*  
mm that is IP  
Hmm, that's right, isn't it?
6. *mou sakuhinten yatteru kara ne koko de ne {laughing}*  
already exhibition doing so IP here LOC IP  
(We) already have a product exhibition so, don't we? Here, don't (we)?
7. K *koe o kaketeru shi ne*  
letting know also IP  
(You) invite (other people) as well, don't you?
8. O *sou ka sou ka*  
I see, I see [[plain]]
- 9. *sou desu ka*  
Is that right? [[*desu/-masu*]]

Like the indirect elicitation techniques discussed in Chapter Three (in the section on evaluation/assessment), Odashima seeks Kabata's advice through the indirect means of stating her confusion and dissatisfaction over not being invited to exhibits. Unlike the excerpt discussed in Chapter Three in which Kabata avoids taking on the role of giving advice or support at first, in this case she responds immediately with a clear and supportive explanation. As before, Odashima seeks reassurance of Kabata's remarks by adding her own suggestion as to why people might think she does not need or want to participate in product exhibits (line 6). Kabata responds to this by adding another reason for Odashima's lack of invitations, to which Odashima responds first in the plain form (which she has used throughout) and then with a shift to the *desu/-masu* form. Again, Odashima's use of the *desu/-masu* form in line 9 marks the end of this



topic of conversation. Unlike the excerpt just discussed above, there are no “follow-up” comments to Odashima’s utterance in line 9.

In Excerpt 2 of this section, members from the Mandagera story card group discuss issues of privacy and what rights they have to withhold personal information. Although all the women present may have had personal experiences related to this topic, Fujii is the main conversationalist in this interaction overall, and comments and further stories are build around Fujii’s utterances.

Prior to this interaction the women had been discussing a woman Fujii knew when she lived in the prefectural capital of Morioka. This woman is from Towa and known to many of the women present at the story card group. This discussion reminds Fujii of another topic, which she introduces below.

**EXCERPT 2: PART 1**

1. F *shakyou de ano hora shinobu kawamura shinobu-san*  
social education that you know Shinobu Kawamura Shinobu
2. *kita deshou*  
came right  
In the Social Education (office), you know, that Shinobu, Shinobu Kawamura came, right<sup>114</sup>? [[*desu/-masu*]]
3. *De nan da ka iro iro kaite shirabetete sorede watashi ni*  
And something various write investigating and then me to
4. *denwa ga kite*  
phone call SM came and
- 5. *saishuu gakureki oshiete kudasai tte denwa ga kita no*  
last education level tell please that phone call SM came NOM  
And he was writing and investigating various things, and so then I got a phone call, a phone call asking me to tell him my highest level of education, you know.  
[[moderate feminine, plain]]
- 6. *aa mou jikou desu tte itta*  
oh already personal is that said  
(I said,) “Oh, that’s personal.” {laughs} [[naked plain]]
7. *sore de jikou de omoidashita aa mou jikou desu tte itta*  
and then personal with remembered oh already personal is that said  
And that’s why I remembered (when we were talking about) personal. “Oh, that’s personal,” I said (to him).

---

<sup>114</sup> Shinobu Kawamura had visited the group earlier on the day this interaction was recorded.

Fujii begins her utterance with a *desu/-masu* form in line 1, and then shifts to the plain form in line 3. Her use of the *desu/-masu* form to introduce a topic follows the model suggested by Ikuta, and the “conventional” model that speakers in previous excerpts have not followed. In line 5, Fujii uses a moderately feminine form in explaining what kind of phone call she had from the Social Education office worker known to most members of the group. Overall, then, Fujii’s speaking style is much more polite and distant than Narisawa’s in introducing a topic or, in this case, story.

In line 6, she tells the group her response to Mr. Kawamura’s request, using the *desu/-masu* form to quote herself (*jikou desu*) but the plain form to complete her utterance here. She uses the naked plain form, which here follows Maynard’s model in that she places herself in the narrative situation (i.e., takes an internal perspective). However, her utterance does not seem to support Maynard’s notion that naked plain forms are used without a strong awareness of other participants in an interaction. In this case, Fujii is telling a story that is very much directed towards others in the group, so it might be better to say that she brings the others in the interaction into her very personal point of view in the narrative, by using naked plain forms that promote interpersonal closeness. Fujii follows her utterance in line 6 with laughter and body movements that involve the rest of the group in her humorous/embarrassed stance toward what she told Mr. Kawamura. The reason for her laughter becomes clearer as the interaction unfolds; namely, that she had the nerve to say such a thing to a local government official.

In the next part of the excerpt, Gotoh joins the conversation with her own personal experiences, building on the theme of “infractions on one’s personal business” established by Fujii.

EXCERPT 2: PART 2

6 G *datte sa mou sou saishuu gakureki*  
 but IP already that way last education level  
 →7 [*kakanene tte nande soitsu hitsuyou*] *nan da e ne*  
 have to write say why that necessary NOM is IP IP  
 But you know, that’s right, (they) say “You have to write your highest level of  
 education.” Why is that kind of thing necessary, you know? [[LLV]]

8 F [*un dakara jikou desu tte itta mon shou ga naku*]  
 hmm so personal is that said couldn't be helped  
 Mm hmm, so that's why I said "That's personal," because there was nothing else I  
 could do.

As we have seen in other excerpts, Gotoh uses the local language variety in line 7 to both empathize with Fujii and express her own sentiments about whether or not such information should be required. Fujii responds to Gotoh's statements with an utterance that uses the word *mon* discussed above in implying dissatisfaction with the situation. Fujii's use of *mon* in line 8 builds on the empathy expressed by Gotoh in line 7, as well as restates her position (for the third time) that she should not be asked for such personal information in a less direct and forceful manner than the previous two times.

Yamanouchi then joins the conversation in giving some background that justifies Fujii's refusal to give out personal information, namely that there have been people who have taken advantage of personal information they got from others in the course of their job. Following this, Narisawa joins the conversation in introducing a new but related topic regarding private information that then becomes publicly available. Narisawa then moves the conversation back to the original topic introduced by Fujii in complaining that such private information need not be included in public documents.

In the next part of the excerpt, Gotoh rejoins the conversation in stating her position that she does not think it necessary to provide information on level of education.

EXCERPT 2: PART 3

[elipsis]

→22 G *kore watashi itsumo sou omotteratta*  
 this I always like that thought  
 I always thought like that (on) this (issue). [[LLV]]

23 *nande kore kakanakya nannai-n darou tte*  
 why this have to write NOM wonder said  
 "Why (should we) have to write this, I wonder?"

24 F *jikou desu tte nani ni tsukau-n da ka shiranai kedo*  
 personal is said what for use NOM is QM don't know but  
 (You) say "it's personal." (I) don't know what it's going to be used for, but...

25 *jikou desu tte ichatta* {laughs}  
personal is that said

...I just said, "It's personal."

→26 N *saikin yutta zo tto omotta-n da*  
recently said IP that thought NOM COP

(You must) have thought recently, "I said it." [[strong masculine]]

27 F *nn*  
Yeah

In line 22, Gotoh uses the local language variety, which adds emotional emphasis to a sentiment she has already expressed in the conversation: that she has long wondered why it is necessary for people to provide such information. Fujii follows Gotoh's utterance with a reiteration of her own actions in response to what she perceived as an invasion of privacy, in lines 24 and 25. Narisawa then summarizes how Fujii must feel, having stood up against the request of a local civil servant, using strong masculine form, *zo*. This is quite marked language, both for Narisawa and for speakers across my data more generally, and adds further support to the idea that participants in the interaction are quite emotionally involved in the issue under discussion at this point. It is strong support for Fujii's response to the civil servant, and therefore a positive assessment of how Fujii handled the situation.

Following on this, in the final part of this excerpt Narisawa tells the others that in fact they can refuse to give out personal information.

EXCERPT 2: PART 4

→28 N *demo kyohi suru koto dekiru-n da yo ne*  
but refuse do thing able NOM COP IP IP

But you can refuse, you know, right? [[masculine]]

29 F *nn*  
Yeah

30 G *aa hontou*  
Oh really?

31 N *nosetakunai kara toka shirare [taku nai ]*  
don't want to include so like that don't want to be known

"Because (I) don't want it to be included, or something like that, (I) don't want it to be known."

32 G *[sore shiranai kara]*  
that don't know so

33. *hitori de nande konna no o kakanakya naranai na to ka omotte*  
alone why this thing DO have to write wonder like that think  
See I don't know that, so I always think to myself, "Why do (I) have to write this?"

In line 29, Narisawa takes on what could arguably be called an "educator" role in informing other interactants that they can refuse to give out personal information. Again, the fact that she does not shift to *desu/-masu* forms in giving out this information suggests both that her role of educator is downplayed here and that she is emotionally involved with the issue. Narisawa's role in this interaction is not that of leader, as it was in excerpts in Chapter Three, but rather as friend and information-giver. In this sense, her use of plain forms is quite significant in comparison to her speech patterns elsewhere.

In this excerpt, although Fujii introduces the topic of not wanting to divulge private information to public officials, Narisawa, Yamanouchi and Gotoh all make significant contributions to this topic as well. Thus, it is quite different from the previous excerpt, in which Narisawa was the main source of information on the topic.

The fourth excerpt in this section is from the Tsutanowa Diner, where Hirose (H) talks with Aoyagi (A) about going to the monthly meetings for the diner. Although both women work at the diner, Aoyagi is in having lunch on her day off during this interaction, while Hirose is working. Both Aoyagi and Hirose are Towa natives in their mid-40s, and have worked at the diner since its inception. Prior to the first part of this excerpt, Hirose has asked Aoyagi whether she regularly attends the Tsutanowa meetings, to which Aoyagi has replied "no". In the following, Hirose speculates on what makes it difficult for Aoyagi to attend.

#### EXCERPT 4

1. H *kawari nakatta Aoyagi-san*  
change none Aoyagi  
How are things,<sup>115</sup> Ms. Aoyagi?
2. A *hai*  
Fine
3. H *genki de*  
You've been well?

---

<sup>115</sup> *Kawari nakatta* literally means "has nothing changed," but is used to mean "How are things?"

4. A *genki de*  
I've been well
5. H *hnn Aoyagi-san miitingu ni deteru no*  
hmm Aoyagi meeting at going QM  
Hmm, Ms. Aoyagi, have you been going to the meetings?
6. A *detenai*  
I haven't. [[naked plain]]
- 7. H *zen zen fuun nda mon ne yoru da mon ne*  
not at all hmm that's right IP night is NOM IP  
Not at all, hmm. But that's right, isn't it [[LLV]], it's that it's at night, isn't it?
8. A *un {laughs} mada ne [chicchai kara derarenai ]*  
yeah still IP small so can't go  
Yeah {laughs} (they're) still small, so (I) can't go. [[naked plain]]
9. H *[nda muri shinakute ii mon ne]*  
that's right overextend don't do okay IP  
That's right [[LLV]], you don't need to overextend yourself, do you?
10. A *dera dera detara tte iwaretatta kedo mazu {laughs}*  
go go if go that was told but anyway  
(Someone) told (me) [[LLV]] "How about if you went?" but you know {laughs}
11. H *kodomosan oitemo ne (unintelligible)*  
children even if leave IP  
Even if you leave your kids behind, right? (unintelligible)
12. A *un kyuryou wa mazu moratteru kara {laughs}*  
Hmm salary TM anyway getting so  
Uh huh. Anyway (I'm) getting a salary, so {laughs}
13. H *nn nn*  
Mm hmm
14. A *kyuryou mazu okuretemo mazu moratteru kara {laughs}*  
salary anyway even if late anyway getting so  
(And as for) salary, anyway even if it's late (I'm) getting it at any rate so {laughs}
15. H *okureru no okureru no*  
Be late QM be late QM  
It's late? It's late?
16. A *un doushitemo are miitingu ni denai kara*  
Mm hmm at all that meeting to don't go so  
Yeah. I just don't make it to those meetings, so.

As in previous excerpts, Hirose uses local language forms in making empathetic commentary about Aoyagi's difficulties in getting to the meetings (lines 7 and 9). Aoyagi responds to Hirose's first comment with a naked plain form (line 8), although she does include a preposed IP *ne* in her utterance (*mada ne*). Aoyagi also shifts to the use of local language forms

in line 10. Hirose again expresses her empathetic understanding of Aoyagi's difficulties in line 11, though this time through her content and not her form choice.

Hirose and Aoyagi have worked together for many years, but Hirose still broaches a potentially touchy subject when asking Aoyagi if she has been attending meetings. Hirose herself has five children, the youngest of which was just one year old at the time this interaction took place, and she herself was often unable to attend diner meetings as well. Thus, she can both sympathize with Aoyagi and use her as support for her own inability to attend the meetings at times. The excuses she provides for Aoyagi in lines 8 and 10 are thus also justifications for her own inability to attend. In this excerpt then, Hirose assesses Aoyagi in light of her own situation.

### **Summary**

These excerpts have shown several patterns in assessing others. In the first example, Abe constructed an image of her husband as someone who cannot work due to health problems, despite what others might expect. Abe distanced herself from the others in the interaction when first addressing the issue of her husband's health, but the conversation gradually became more and more interpersonally close after that, including a stretch of talk in which all participants used local language forms. Bando and Unagami supported Abe's claims that her husband faces work-impeding physical difficulties with empathetic commentary and further evidence of the difficulties Abe and her husband must be facing. As in previous excerpts, empathetic expressions often included the use of local language forms. When Abe complained that her husband was visiting pachinko parlors despite his physical complaints, however, both Bando and Unagami came to Mr. Abe's defense in justifying his actions. In the first excerpt, then, although Abe was the main source of information on her husband's health, Unagami and Bando also played important roles in supporting or undercutting Abe's statements and complaints.

In the second excerpt, Narisawa was the person in the group with the most direct knowledge of the woman who committed suicide, and others in the group both supported her role as the main speaker in this interaction. Although both Yamanouchi and Suzuki made attempts at contributing to the conversation as well, these were not very successful (in that they were not taken up by others in the conversation). For the most part, the role of other participants was to comment on what Narisawa related to them, and on the woman's suicide more generally.

The final excerpt showed another configuration of roles, in which Hirose asked Aoyagi about her situation in order to justify her own. This was the most collaboratively constructed interaction, as Hirose questioned Aoyagi, Aoyagi gave responses, Hirose offered other plausible reasons, and Aoyagi accepted and incorporated them.

The next section examines instances where participants in interactions disagree with and/or critique one another.

## **2. CRITIQUING GROUP MEMBERS**

As with the evaluation/assessment section of the previous chapter, critiquing others in an interaction entails a particular set of relations among participants. The language in which critiques are made, and the response such critiques evoke can shed light on status relations among participants in interactions, and (role) alignments among these participants. I begin with an excerpt from a horticultural therapy (HT) session.

Most of the interactions during HT sessions were centered on the patients themselves, and there was very little interaction between volunteers and staff that was not work and patient-focused. However, after the session participants had left, the volunteers and staff always sat down for about one half hour to discuss how the session had gone, fill out reports, and generally just chat over tea. This was an important time for Yaegashi and Oikawa to make note of the various session participant's physical and mental status, and to confer with others about a particular person. It was also a time for volunteers and the two staff members to catch up on



each other's lives, and to share stories about mutual acquaintances. In this post-session setting, Yaegashi was still in the role of director when the interaction focused on work-related topics, such as how a particular patient did in a just-completed session. However, when discussing matters unrelated to work, neither Yaegashi or Oikawa (the other staff member) took on a role that placed them in a higher position – that is, gave them greater status – than any of the volunteers. The following excerpt is an example of how Yaegashi – the leader during the HT sessions – is critiqued by her workplace subordinate (Oikawa).

In the following excerpt, Yaegashi prepares to make some tea, using a packet she had received as a gift a few weeks earlier. Oikawa (O) and the researcher (HK) also participate in the interaction.

#### EXCERPT 1

1. Y *Chieko-san kore hitotsu de ooi ka na (unintelligible) mottai nai ne*  
Chieko this one too much I wonder waste IP  
Chieko, is one (packet) too much I wonder? (unintelligible) it's a waste, isn't it?
  - 2. O *ee sore tte ofuro da yo*  
What that as for bath is IP  
What?! That's for the bath, you know. [[mod masc]]
  3. Y *a sou kka*  
Oh is it?
- {everyone laughing}
- 4. Y {laughing} *ofuro datta no*  
Bath was NOM  
It's really for the bath? [[mod fem]]
  5. H *hitotsu de ooi toiu yori mo*  
One packet too much that more than  
More than (being concerned if) one packet is too much...
  6. Y *a chanto pakku (basu) tte kaite aru hontou da*  
Oh really packet bath that written really is  
Oh, it says "bath" right on the packet. It's true. [[mod masc]]

As can be seen from Oikawa's response (line 2), Yaegashi mistakes a packet of bath salt for herbal tea. Oikawa's utterance is moderately marked for masculinity, a form she does not often use. Carried in this masculine form is the IP *yo*, which means roughly "I'm telling you", which marks Oikawa's stance as one of firm conviction. Unlike the use of a similar masculine-marked form (excerpt 2, "Decision-making" section of Chapter Three) where Gotoh in essence

silenced Yamanouchi's participation with the use of a plain form + *yo* utterance, in this case Oikawa's utterance is taken to be humorous. She herself and everyone else present during the interaction laughs immediately after Oikawa says, "That's for the bath" (line 2). One thing that can help to explain the different effects of similar forms in the two examples is that unlike the "who's going to read?" excerpt above, in this case Yaegashi is not trying to take on a role already claimed by others in the interaction. Rather, in this excerpt Yaegashi is doing a favor for others in the group by making tea.

Oikawa's use of a moderately-marked form is difficult to account for under conventional models for gender-marked language choices. That is, because Oikawa works under Yaegashi, her formation of this utterance is unexpected in terms of traditional models for constructing hierarchy through language in Japanese. As I have said, however, this part of the interaction is not directly related to work, and thus the relationship between Oikawa and Yaegashi – where Yaegashi is Oikawa's superior – does not necessarily hold. One way of accounting for Oikawa's use of a masculine-marked form here, then, is to say that she does not need to be respectful towards Yaegashi in this "post-session" interaction by mitigating her critiques.

However, the reaction from all participants suggests Oikawa's statement is understood to be humorous. In this sense line 2 functions much like the two examples on "manipulating politeness" in Chapter Three, in that overstating a particular stance or identity is humorous. In stating that the packet is "for the bath," Oikawa makes Yaegashi look ridiculous for wanting to serve the volunteers and staff herbal bath salts as tea. This is a potentially delicate situation, since Yaegashi poses her question in front of everyone, and Oikawa's response is equally "public." Others in the group were unaware of the contents of the packet Yaegashi was intending to use, so in order to avoid drinking bath salts, it was up to Oikawa to make sure the mistake was corrected. Rather than take a polite and indirect method of correction, however, Oikawa took a direct and confrontational one, which in this case was taken to be humorous. Thus here, too, in sense overstating the claim – "that's for the bath, you know" - makes it humorous. The fact that this "overstatement" is taken as humorous suggests that in this setting,

too, Oikawa is actually in a subordinate position to Yaegashi. Were she in fact equal to or even superordinate to Yaegashi, the utterance would not carry the same humor.

Following the brief exchange in lines 1-3, Yaegashi takes a closer look at the packet and questions whether in fact the packet is actually bath salts (line 4). Here she uses a moderately feminine form (*no*) in seeking support from others in the interaction ('it's really for the bath?'). However, she shifts to a moderate masculine form in line 6 (*hontou da*), where she proclaims that Oikawa was right, as it says 'bath' right on the packet. Her use of gender-marked forms here follows more traditional usage models, where the feminine-marked form expresses uncertainty (particularly after being corrected and laughed at in line 2) and the masculine form expresses definiteness ("it says 'bath' right on the packet").

This excerpt thus shows one way of critiquing a social superior, using a strategy that seems to flaunt social expectations about language usage. However, it is this very inversion of social expectations that makes the utterance humorous and, therefore, acceptable. The excerpt also provides an example of how a social superior responds to a critique; in this case, to being corrected in front of the other members of the group.

Excerpt two is from the Mandagera storycard group, and includes Suzuki, the woman who joined the group for the first time during my last data-collection with the Mandagera women. It is important to remember in looking at the following excerpt that Suzuki was introduced to the group through Gotoh, who is a friend of Suzuki's mother.

The following excerpt is part of an interaction that stemmed from an earlier discussion (excerpt 1 in section 4 below) about a couple that is well known to many members of the group. According to Yamanouchi, this couple married after having a passionate love relationship,<sup>116</sup> and Gotoh follows up on Yamanouchi's comments in her first utterance below.

---

<sup>116</sup> Marriages in Japan fall into two categories: *miai kekkon* ('arranged marriages') and *ren'ai kekkon* ('love marriages'). In contemporary Japan, 'arranged marriages' usually mean that two people are introduced to one another through mutual acquaintances, and if they feel well-suited to one another they will pursue a relationship that may or may not lead to marriage. Yamanouchi and the others in this interaction discuss the growing number of 'love marriages'.

**EXCERPT 2: PART 1**

- 1 G *ima no wakai hitotachi wa minna netsuretsu na*  
now young people TM everyone passionate  
Today's young people all have passionate (relationships)
- 2 *sochira no sasaki-san mo*  
that Sasaki also  
That Ms. Sasaki also (did)
- 3 S *ee* {looks up from her work at G}  
What?
- 4 G *netsuretsu na renai* {everyone laughs}  
passionate love  
A passionate love (affair)
- 5 F/Y *ee*  
What?
- 6 S {looking towards G} (*sore wa mukashi no hanashi desu*)  
{more laughter from group}  
that TM old story is  
That's a really old story. [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 7 G {laughing voice} {looking up at others, who are looking down}  
*anata ga mukashi banashi tte yuttara watashitachi wa mou*  
you SM old story that if say we TM already
- 8 *kaseki ni natteru yo ne*  
fossil become IP IP  
Your saying "that's an old story" makes us fossils, you know, is that it? [[plain]]

In lines 1 and 2, Gotoh moves the conversation from a focus on the couple under discussion until this point to the broader topic of "today's young people" (*ima no wakai hitotachi*) having passionate relationships. Her assertion that Ms. Sasaki, a woman in the community, is one example of a "passionate love marriage," elicits exclamations of surprise from Suzuki, Fujii and Yamanouchi in lines 3 and 5, and laughter from all those present in line 4. Given that the other people's passionate relationships are not a common topic of discussion in Japan, these expressions index both surprise and embarrassment.

Evidence for the interpretation of lines 3 and 5 as surprise at Gotoh's boldness in bringing up such a private matter, rather than surprise at her knowing this kind of thing in the first place, can be found in Suzuki's response in line 6, where she uses the *desu/-masu* form in stating that "that's a really old story." Her use of the *desu/-masu* form is consistent with her speaking style

throughout the rest of the interaction, but marked in comparison to the general style of the conversation overall. In fact, it is significant that Suzuki does not shift to a more formal and distant register (or a closer one for humorous effect, as in the previous excerpt) here, since her utterance directly challenges the interest in Gotoh's comments. That is, if the story is indeed an old one, participants are less likely to be titillated by it. Suzuki's statement elicits laughter from the group, which may be due in part to Suzuki's bold statement, but also to the embarrassment at discussing someone else's love life. The latter understanding is supported by utterances in the second part of the excerpt, below.

Gotoh immediately responds to Suzuki's utterance with a plain-form statement that Suzuki must think others in the group are "fossils" (line 7). Again, Gotoh's use of the plain form here is not inconsistent with the style she uses in surrounding utterances, nor is it different from what conventional understanding of speech level choice would lead us to predict. That is, Gotoh is in a superior position to Suzuki by virtue of her being a friend of Suzuki's mother, and having introduced Suzuki to the group. However, there are shifts in the tone of Gotoh's comments here that speak to her reaction to Suzuki's critique. Gotoh's voice in line 7 is tinged with laughter, but her comments are quite strong. She uses the second-person pronoun *anata* in addressing Suzuki that, although not rude, is also not common. Japanese speakers tend to elide personal pronouns, and instead address one another by name or title (as in many of the other excerpts discussed in this chapter). For example, when addressing Suzuki in previous excerpts, Narisawa said "Suzuki-san." Gotoh's use of the plain form in response to Suzuki's use of the *desu/-masu* form marks their relationships as unequal; one in which Gotoh is in a superior position to Suzuki. The presence of *anata* further highlights this asymmetry between the two women, since it would be quite rude if Suzuki used personal pronouns to address Gotoh. While highlighting the lack of

distance between them linguistically – or rather, by highlighting the fact that she does not need to attend to the distance between them – Gotoh puts emphasis on the differences/distance between herself and Suzuki by stating that Suzuki must think the other members of the group (‘we’, *watashitachi*) are ‘fossils’ if she considers the story Gotoh has related to be “really old”. In doing so, it is significant that Gotoh again uses a personal pronoun to highlight the differences between Suzuki and the other members of the group; it is not just that Suzuki must think Gotoh is a “fossil”, but that she must think everyone else in the group is. Thus, through the use of speech level choice and pronoun usage, Gotoh gives a strongly negative response to Suzuki.

Despite the lines that are being drawn linguistically, none of the other group members join in the interaction between Gotoh and Suzuki. Instead, Fujii brings the discussion back to the issue of “privacy” that had previously been the focus.

EXCERPT 2: PART 2

- 8 F *mou subete jikou da yo ne*  
 already all personal is IP IP  
 Anyway it’s all personal you know, isn’t it?
- 9 N *ne*  
 Right?
- 10 F *hakkiri (iu to) souiu ohanashi wa*  
 straight say if that kind story TM  
 To speak frankly, that kind of topic is (personal)
- 11 N *sou da yo ne*  
 That’s right you know, isn’t it?
- 12 Y *un un*  
 Mm hmm
- 13 N *sou desu ne*  
 That’s right, isn’t it [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 14 Y *sou sou*  
 That’s right, that’s right.
- 15 F *souiu koto ni shimashou*  
 that kind thing make it  
 Let’s leave it at that. [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 16 Y *sou desu jikou desu*  
 That’s right. It’s personal. [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 17 F *nn*  
 Yeah.

Fujii's utterance in line 8 brings the discussion away from the conflict between Suzuki and Gotoh, and the more general feeling of discomfort surrounding the topic of others' romantic relationships and marriages. Fujii's utterance line 8 is very effective, as can be seen by the way other interactants align themselves with and give support to her position in the subsequent lines. As in previous excerpts, Fujii uses the plain form to reorient the conversation. She also gives an implicit critique of Gotoh in particular by stating that 'it's all personal'. Fujii's use of the plain form can thus be understood as a way of mitigating a critique of another member of the group, much as Narisawa used the plain form in critiquing others in work-oriented interactions. At the same time, Fujii elicits support from others in the interaction with her use of the IP *yo ne* ('you know, isn't it'). First Narisawa and then Yamanouchi respond to this with supportive utterances in lines 9, 11, and 13.

Narisawa's shift to the *desu/-masu* form in line 13 marks, as in other excerpts, a closing of the topic. Fujii follows Narisawa's shift in line 15, as does Yamanouchi in line 16. Thus, although Fujii moves the conversation away from the volatility between Gotoh and Suzuki, it is Narisawa who starts to bring the entire conversation to a close. Here again we see Fujii and Narisawa taking leadership roles, just as they did in work-related interactions in Chapter Three.

## Summary

As excerpt 1 showed, critiques need not necessarily be couched in polite (i.e., using *desu/-masu* or 'refined' feminine forms) terms, even when directed toward a social superior. However, using masculine forms to critique in such a situation led to an ironic (and humorous) interpretation on the part of others in the interaction. It is doubtful that Oikawa could have critiqued Yaegashi in the same way were there not this ironic overtone.

In excerpt 2, Gotoh's critique of Suzuki was not supported by others in the group. Fujii indirectly critiqued Gotoh by stating that the topic of conversation Gotoh had raised was 'personal' and others in the group aligned themselves with Fujii. Thus, although Gotoh was able to express her criticism of Suzuki, others in the group undercut this criticism by labeling the

entire topic of conversation as private and, therefore, something in which the participants should not be involved. Moderately masculine forms were used both to critique (Suzuki) and to move the conversation in another direction (and indirectly critique Gotoh). As in many other excerpts already discussed, the interaction in excerpt 2 also ended with a wrapping-up session in the *desu/-masu* form.

### 3. TELLING STORIES

Participants in each of the four sites under discussion here also engaged in a good deal of story-telling. Like the first section of this chapter (evaluating others), who plays the role of storyteller is often related to the amount and kind of information various participants in the interaction have.

In the following excerpt from the Mandagera storycard group, Fujii relates how she came to find out that two people she knew from different contexts were married. Yamanouchi and Gotoh seem to have heard the story before, or at least know parts of it. In the first part, she introduces the topic.

#### EXCERPT 1: PART 1

1. F *aa yutta desho atashi sa noriko-san yoshiko-san no da-*  
oh said right I IP Noriko Yoshiko POS hus
2. *[dannasan ga sa]*  
husband SM IP  
Oh, I told you right? Noriko's, Yoshiko's hu-, husband, you know?
3. Y *[kakushiteta-n da tte ]*  
was hiding NOM COP said  
(She) said (she) was hiding (him)
4. F *kakushiteta-n ja nakute*  
was hiding NOM not  
Not that (she) was hiding (him)
5. *atashi wa ze- zenzen gofuufu da to shiranaide (unintelligible)*  
I TM not at all husband and wife are that without knowing  
I didn't have any idea that they were husband and wife and (unintelligible)
6. G *kiita -n da tte ne*  
heard NOM COP said IP  
(You) said (you'd) heard, right?



7. F *ne hiroshisan ni atta yo kawakubo no teiryuujo de toka tte*  
 IP Hiroshi met IP Kawakubo POS bus stop at like that said  
 Right? (I) said “I met Hiroshi at the Kawakubo<sup>117</sup> bus stop, you know” like that.
8. *De sore mo (yoshi-chan) zenzen iwanai -n da*  
 and that also Yoshi-chan nothing don't say NOM COP  
 And Yoshi-chan<sup>118</sup> didn't say anything at all even then.

Both Yamanouchi and Gotoh seem to be familiar with the story Fujii relates in this part of the conversation, or at least know some of the background she is giving. They are thus potential storytellers as well, in that they could share information that other participants in the interaction do not have. Fujii, however, maintains her control of the conversation – and her role of storyteller – by correcting or supporting their contributions. She does so in part by using the IP *sa* (‘well’, here used much like *ne* to hold the floor; i.e. ‘um/you know’<sup>119</sup>), and the *te*-form of verbs (which acts as a connector between clauses, as in lines 3 and 4). Fujii thus uses a somewhat different strategy than that employed by people in other interactions to maintain her role. Although she does directly confront some “interlopers”, as when she corrects Yamanouchi’s statement that “she was hiding him” in line 4, in general she uses the *te*-form and the IP *sa* to maintain her position. That is, she does not leave openings for others to join the conversation, much less take over her role. Fujii’s extensive use of connective phrasing also means that there are not verb forms that mark her utterances as plain or *desu/-masu*, since the *te*-form does not carry this speech level distinction.<sup>120</sup> However, the use of the IP *sa* indicates a casual and close level of speech, and she does in fact use a plain verb form in line 8.

Fujii does use some feminine-marked language, namely a feminine first-person pronoun (*atashi*) in both lines 1 and 5. As mentioned in relation to the previous excerpt, Japanese

---

<sup>117</sup> An area of the prefectural capital, Morioka. Prior to this excerpt the women had been discussing Fujii’s experiences when she lived in the Kawakubo area of Morioka.

<sup>118</sup> Close friends often call their female friends by an abbreviated version of their first name (in this case, Yoshiko becomes Yoshi) followed by the address term *chan*. Both Fujii and Narisawa refer to Yoshiko in this way, suggesting that they are close friends with her.

<sup>119</sup> See Squires (1994) for a more detailed discussion of *sa*.

<sup>120</sup> In fact one can make a distinction between *desu/-masu te*-forms (e.g., *shimashite*) and plain *te*-forms (*shite*). However, *desu/-masu te* forms are quite formal, and are most often used in writing (e.g. a formal business letter) or in formal speeches. Even where surrounding utterances are in the *desu/-masu* form, speakers often maintain plain *te*-form usage (i.e., *shite* rather than *shimashite*).

speakers often elide personal pronouns, especially when referring to others. The same is true of pronoun usage when referring to oneself, so Fujii's consistent use of a personal pronoun is in itself marked. She consistently uses the feminine-marked pronoun *atashi* in this interaction, as will be attested in the remaining sections of this excerpt.

In the next part of this excerpt, Fujii gives an example of when her friend, Yoshiko, might have mentioned to whom she is married.

EXCERPT 1: PART 2

9. *F atashi yoshi-chan uchi ni tazunete itta toki ni ne*  
 I Yoshi-chan home to visit went time at IP  
 When (I) went to visit Yoshi-chan's house, you know...
10. *uchi de yachou ga suki de katten no yo tte hanashi kara*  
 home at bird watching SM like so own NOM IP that talk from
11. *dandan moriagattara*  
 little by little worked up  
 (She) started saying "(We) like bird watching, so (we) have (some), you know" and things just started building up more and more from there.
12. *Hiroshi-san ga dannasan da tte iu no ga hajimete wakatta*  
 Hiroshi SM husband is that NOM SM first knew
13. *to iu sugoi ne*  
 that amazing IP  
 (And that's when) I first learned that Hiroshi was (her) husband. That was an amazing (thing), you know?
14. *N niyaniya shiteta -n deshou yoshi-chan ne niyaniya*  
 laughing was NOM right yoshi-chan IP laughing under her breath  
 (She) must have been laughing secretly. Yoshi-chan, you know, (must have been) laughing under her breath.
- 15. *F sou nan desu yo*  
 that NOM is IP  
 That was just the way of it, you know. [[*desu/-masu*]]
16. *G yoshi-chan mo yaru mon da nante*  
 also does COP I say  
 Yoshi-chan really does it too, she says<sup>121</sup>

As mentioned above, many people in the group know the woman under discussion, Yoshiko, so this interaction is quite different from ones in which only one or a few members

---

<sup>121</sup> *Nante* is used here to make fun of the way one says something, so the "she" in the English gloss refers to Gotoh herself.

have access to information about the topic. Thus, in line 14, for example, Narisawa is able to offer her own speculative remark about how Yoshiko must have reacted to Fujii finding out that Hiroshi was her (Yoshiko's) husband. Fujii responds to Narisawa's remark in line 15, with a shift to the *desu/-masu* form that emphasizes her agreement with Narisawa's portrayal of Yoshiko's assumed reaction. Fujii's shift to the *desu/-masu* form here works much like the use of the naked plain form in other instances where speakers are expressing strong emotional involvement.

In the third part of this excerpt, Fujii gives more background as to why finding out who Yoshiko's husband was led to embarrassing situation.

EXCERPT 1: PART 3

17. F *sore de atashi nanka zenzen shiranaide*  
 and then I like not at all don't know  
 And you know I didn't know at all... [[fem pronoun]]
- 18. *ka- ano nissan purinsu ni tsutometeratta kara*  
 that Nissan Prince at was employed so  
 I was working at that Nissan Prince<sup>122</sup> store, so... [[LLV]]
- 19. *sono koro ne asa ne rajio taisou yaru no ne*  
 that time IP morning IP radio exercises do IP IP [[mod fem]]
20. *purinsu no shain ga*  
 prince POS employees SM  
 At that time, you know, in the morning, you know, (we) would do exercises to the radio<sup>123</sup> you see, right? The Prince employees would.
21. *sono douro kawakubo no ano kokudou zoi de*  
 that road Kawakubo POS that highway next to at  
 On that road (in) Kawakubo, right along that highway.
22. N *hee*  
 Oh really?
23. F *itsuka (yoshi-chan ni) taisou da ka nan da ka wakannai no*  
 sometime to exercise is or what is don't know IP  
 Once (I told) Yoshi-chan, "I don't know if this is exercise or what it is."  
 [[mod fem]]
24. *itsumo nissan purinsu de yatta kke*  
 always nissan prince at did IP  
 (We) always did (them) at Nissan Prince, you know. [[LLV]]

<sup>122</sup> 'prince' is a car model line in Japan.

<sup>123</sup> There is a "radio exercise" program broadcast every morning throughout Japan. Schoolchildren are often required to do it over their school vacations, and many companies do it (or some modified form) as well.

25. *hiroshi-kun mo yatteta kke*

Hiroshi-kun also was doing IP

Hiroshi-kun<sup>124</sup> also did them, you know. [[LLV]]

26. *atashi yutta no taisou da ka nan da ka wake*

I said IP exercise is or what is QM reason

27. *wakannai no itta kke yo*

don't understand IP said IP IP

I said (it), you know. [[mod fem]] I'm telling you, you know [[LLV]], I said "I don't if this is exercise or what. I can't make head or tail of it." [[mod fem]]

In line 17, Fujii shifts to using local language variety forms for the first time in this interaction, and continues to use them through the rest of this part of the excerpt. Just prior to this part of the excerpt, others in the interaction have also expressed their understanding about how Fujii might have been "fooled" by Yoshiko, so Fujii's shift to LLV usage here can be understood as a means of marking commiseration with others in the interaction. There are also no verbal contributions to Fujii's story in this stretch of talk, unlike previous parts of the excerpt. Rather, Fujii holds the floor in lines 17-30 (see also below) without interruption. The only comment is from Narisawa in line 20 (*hee* 'really'), after which Fujii again is the only person verbally contributing to the interaction through the rest of this part of the excerpt. Unlike earlier parts of this excerpt, other interactants do not attempt to take on roles other than listener in this passage.

Fujii's utterances in this section of the excerpt under investigation shift to a style characterized by LLV and moderately feminine forms. She shifts to this speaking style at the beginning of this section (lines 18-19), and out of it in the next section (line 28 below), but uses it consistently throughout this passage. Even when quoting what she said to other people (namely, Yoshiko) who are not present in the interaction under discussion, Fujii maintains her use of feminine-marked forms.

In the next part of this excerpt, Fujii continues relating her experience of complaining to Yoshiko about the exercises they have to do at work every morning, without knowing that Yoshiko is married to one of the people making these exercises a requirement.

---

<sup>124</sup> "kun" is the male equivalent for the "chan" in "Yoshi-chan" discussed above.

EXCERPT 1: PART 4

28. F *yoshi-chan ga hiroshi-san ni sore yutta (ato)*  
 Yoshi-chan SM Hiroshi-san to that said later  
 Yoshi-chan told Hiroshi that later.
29. *mada gofuufu da tte shiranakatta -n da mon*  
 still husband and wife are that didn't know NOM COP IP
30. *sono toki atashi*  
 that time I  
 But you know I still didn't know they were husband and wife, at that time I (didn't know).
31. G {laughs heartily}
- 32. F *hontou ni (sou taihen de ) hontou ni makka ni nacchatta wa yo*  
 really that difficult and really very red became IP IP  
 It was really terrible, and (I) really turned beet red, don't you know.  
 [[ strong fem]]
- 33. G *iisobir[e datta -n ] ja nai no*  
 oversight was NOM wasn't NOM  
 Wasn't it just that (she) forgot to tell you? [[mod fem]]
- 34. F *yomoya gofuufu da to omowanakatta yo*  
 don't tell me husband and wife are that didn't think IP  
 Don't tell me (I) should have thought that they were husband and wife  
 [[mod masc]]
35. *ikura nandemo ne*  
 how much no matter IP  
 No matter how much (else I knew), you know?

In line 28, Fujii continues her use of moderately feminine forms in expressing her dismay at having told Yoshiko something negative that involved Yoshiko's husband, without knowing that Hiroshi was Yoshiko's husband. Fujii uses a strong feminine form in her response (line 32) to others' laughter at her ignorance, a shift that marks her intense emotional involvement as she recalls the scene she describes here. Gotoh also uses a (moderately) feminine form in line 33, the only instance for her in this excerpt, in suggesting that Yoshiko might just have forgotten to tell Fujii that Hiroshi was her husband. If this suggestion were true, it would undercut Fujii's righteous embarrassment (and perhaps, anger) at Yoshiko for keeping this vital piece of information from her. Gotoh's use of the feminine-marked *no* here, then, works to soften a suggestion that Fujii is not likely to like. In fact, Fujii responds with a moderately masculine

form<sup>125</sup> (*omowanakatta yo*) in stating that she couldn't have been expected to know that Yoshiko and Hiroshi were married; in other words, the Yoshiko should have told her.

### Summary

This section has given further support to the suggestion that speakers do not always use *desu/-masu* forms when initiating new topics, as well as contributed to our understanding of how speakers negotiate who will tell a story. In this case, because Fujii is relating a personal experience, she is the main teller. However, others also comment on how Fujii and “Yoshi-chan” must have felt or thought at particular moments, given their knowledge of both people.

### CONCLUSION

This chapter has provided further evidence for the patterns observed in Chapter Three, as well as complicated these patterns with counterexamples. Although there was evidence of shifts to the *desu/-masu* form when completing a topic, this did not always happen. In addition, this chapter has given further examples of how speakers align themselves with one another in contributing to, supporting, or undercutting utterances by others in the group.

---

<sup>125</sup> However, the syntax of this utterance makes it difficult to be sure if this is a masculine-marked form. That is, a plain, past negative verb (here, *omowanakatta*) followed by the IP *yo* is marked for strong masculinity according to the typology used in this dissertation, but it is immediately followed by a post-posed clause. Given that *omowanakatta yo* is classified as strongly masculine in the typology when it occurs in a sentence-final position, it is less certain that it can be said to be strongly masculine when it is followed by another clause. On the other hand, the clause that follows it is postposed, and in writing, for example, or more “careful” speech would occur before the phrase *omowanakatta yo*.

## CHAPTER FIVE: Conclusions and discussion

This chapter begins with a summary of the finding from the data analysis in the previous two chapters, and then considers how these finding relate to the broader question of women and language use posed at the outset of this dissertation

### LINGUISTIC FEATURES: LIMITATIONS OF PREVIOUS MODELS

The excerpts analyzed in the previous two chapters have clarified several patterns of language usage in relation to the three sets of linguistic features that are the focus of this dissertation. There is some evidence that supports previous models for understanding speakers' use of these features, but the following patterns contradict or complicate previous models.

1. Feminine-marked features are used in interactionally effective ways.
2. Women use masculine-marked speech.
3. Local language variety forms are an important linguistic resource for speakers.
4. Local language variety forms are used as a means of expressing empathy.
5. Shifts to *desu/-masu* forms are often used to mark the end of a topic
6. Speakers often shift styles when reiterating a point
7. Naked plain forms elicit reactions from other participants, and are therefore not simply self-oriented.
8. Humiliative strategies (including local language forms and feminine-marked speech) are used to reject or hesitate in taking high-status roles.

In order to see how these patterns compare with previous models, each of the three sets of linguistic features will be considered separately below.

### GENDER-MARKED LANGUAGE

One of the questions posed at the outset of this dissertation ties to a query articulated by Patricia Wetzel in her contribution to the landmark *Aspects of Japanese Women's Language* (1990) – whether women's language in Japanese is “powerless” or, in the terminology I use here, “ineffective”. As mentioned in Chapter Two, part of answering this question involves a clarification of just what is meant by the phrase “women's language in Japanese”. If we take it to mean the stereotypical features of JWJL, then the data presented in this dissertation gives evidence that these features – even those most strongly marked for femininity – can be used in

effective ways. For example, by taking a humiliating stance – expressed linguistically through features associated with femininity – speakers effectively rejected high-status roles suggested to them by others.

There are also instances of speakers using masculine-marked language in the excerpts from Chapters Three and Four. While this is not unique to my data set (cf. Okamoto 1995), it is significant that women do use forms that are explicitly marked for masculinity.

It is also important to keep in mind that the gender-marked features I discussed in the two previous chapters drew attention because they stood out against their gender-neutral surroundings. That is, there were both specific instances of speakers using feminine-marked features in effective ways and instances of masculine-marked speech, both of which stood out against a background of gender-neutral speech.

#### **SPEECH LEVELS**

As outlined in Chapter Two, previous studies of speech level usage – honorifics, *desu/-masu* and plain forms – have done much toward accounting for the shifts in levels found in conversational interactions where outside factors (setting, age, etc.) remain constant. Ikuta (1983) has tied the underlying concept of interpersonal distance to empathy, as expressed through speech level shift (where the plain form is more empathetic). According to this model, one might expect that speakers could shift to plain forms within a *desu/-masu* interaction in order to express empathy with their interlocutor. Although there are some examples of this in the data presented in Chapters Three and Four above, we need a clearer way of delineating the difference between empathy and highlighting asymmetries between speakers. For example, a person in a position of authority speaking to a subordinate who shifts from *desu/-masu* to plain forms could be said to be empathizing with her interlocutor, or could be said to be highlighting her higher status (in the case of non-reciprocal plain-form usage). More research needs to be done to clarify how we can determine when a shift is “empathy” and when it is “higher-status-marking”. This also suggests a difficulty in talking about plain form usage, which I have discussed (following



other scholars) as a marker of interpersonal closeness. However, I have also noted that when non-reciprocal (i.e., when one participant uses the plain form but the other uses *desu/-masu* forms), the plain form can mark a hierarchical relationship between interlocutors, where the plain-form speaker is in a higher position than the *desu/-masu* speaker. Thus, plain forms *can* express empathy, but we need to be clearer about the conditions under which this is the case.

Cook's work on speech levels as social deictics focused on speech level shifts as points that mark where speakers highlight particular roles (caregiver, friend, etc.). The social expectations of each role – including the relationship these roles put people in with respect to their interlocutors – helps to explain these shifts. The data in this dissertation has supported the idea that at least some shifts can be accounted for by role changes and, consequently, changing degrees of appropriate interpersonal closeness. For example, we have seen that speakers tend to use a formal, *desu/-masu* style when giving instructions to a group, even when they use plain forms elsewhere in the interaction. Following Cook's model, speakers shift to a "teaching" role, which entails the use of *desu/-masu* forms (the plain form would assume too much interpersonal closeness). Such a role/degree of closeness shift can also help to account for the tendency among speakers in this data set to shift to *desu/-masu* forms to mark the end of a topic, although this had not been mentioned in previous literature. Topic closings also seem to be places where speakers take on a formal/distancing role, and thus, shift to *desu/-masu* forms.

However, not all shifts can be accounted for by these models. For example, in the data for this dissertation, speakers often shifted to the plain form in adding commentary, after they had marked the end of a topic by a shift to the *desu/-masu* style. In addition, although previous literature had suggested that speakers use *desu/-masu* forms when introducing a topic, the excerpts examined above have shown that this is not always the case. Even where speakers do use *desu/-masu* forms at these junctures, they often begin the topic introduction in the plain form, then shift to *desu/-masu* immediately afterwards. These problems suggest that there is more to shifts between the plain and *desu/-masu* forms than can be accounted for with our existing models.

## Expanding our notion of speech levels and shifts

A larger concern is that of what is included in speech level shift research. In the studies cited above, the focus was on *desu/-masu* and plain shifts. However, other kinds of shift also need to be considered. Maynard's work has suggested that the naked plain form should be considered as a separate category in discussions of speech levels and shifts. However, while the data presented in this dissertation has at some points followed Maynard's model for naked plain form usage, (e.g., in echo responses and questions), overall the data does not support the claim that such forms are fundamentally not oriented toward other participants in interactions. When considered in the context of the interaction as a whole, naked plain forms rarely stand alone; i.e., do not elicit a response from others. Thus, from an interactional standpoint it cannot always be said that naked plain forms are internally oriented.

This dissertation has also shown that local language forms are an important resource for speakers, and should be included in discussions of speech level shifts as well. Although the majority of Japanese speakers use some kind of local language variety, there has been very little research that includes these forms.<sup>126</sup> Local language form usage in data from the previous two chapters has illustrated how these forms are used to express another level of empathy that is unavailable through the plain form. Further, local language forms can be used effectively to question claims made by another (as in the Mandagera storycard example) or to hesitate in taking on a high-status role (e.g., in the Hataya weaving workshop example).

Evidence of the need to include more than just the *desu/-masu* and plain speech levels in investigating level shift also comes from the number of instances in which speakers shifted level when repeating a point they had made previously. Although some of these shifts were between *desu/-masu* and plain, a number of others were to/from local language varieties. LLV forms are thus a rich resource for speakers in my data set and, one would expect, for speakers in other regions where LLV forms are in use.

---

<sup>126</sup> See Sunaoshi (forthcoming) for an exception in relation to women's language usage, and Sturtz (2001) for men's language usage.

## COMBINATIONS OF FEATURES

As was suggested at the outset of this work, the three sets of features that are the focus here do not necessarily work independently of one another. For example, local language varieties are used in combination with plain forms to express a more close and empathetic relationship between speakers. This combination fits relatively easily into existing models for understanding speech level usage, since plain forms express interpersonal closeness and LLV forms express even more closeness as well as ties to a particular region or community.

In addition, LLV can also be used with *desu/-masu* forms. This would seem to be paradoxical, since *desu/-masu* forms are instancing whereas local language forms work in the opposite way. However, in situations that socially call for the use of *desu/-masu* forms (i.e., situations defined as “formal”), speakers will often use local language forms to express closeness within this formal context.<sup>127</sup>

There are also instances in which speakers use both feminine-marked features and local language forms in the same utterance. Given that feminine-marked features have been discussed in terms of indexing refinement and politeness, while local language forms are both informal and interpersonally close, one would not expect these two features to co-occur. However, in these instances it seems that speakers are both highlighting closeness while marking their refinement as JWL users.

## ROLE AND STATUS NEGOTIATION

In addressing the questions of what shifts in linguistic features can tell us about women’s social organization, it is particularly useful to return to the examples of role negotiation (offering, attempting to take, refusing, and so on). Not all speakers were successful in getting others to take up roles, or in laying claim to particular roles themselves. Those in positions of authority at the outset of the interaction (e.g., Odashima in the Hataya weaving workshop) had the greatest

---

<sup>127</sup> Sunaoshi (forthcoming) also gives evidence of this pattern.

success in getting others to take up roles, but even in those cases the person being given the role did not necessarily take it up immediately.

When assigned an “inappropriate” role (e.g., when Fujii was asked to be an advisor in the Mandagera storycard group), interactional participants used linguistic resources to create a humiliating stance in rejecting it, i.e. ‘I am not worthy.’ In other instances, however, participants readily accepted high-status roles assigned to them by other participants, as when Narisawa responded with evaluative comments when others in the Mandagera group asked for her advice.

In making claims to particular roles (e.g. in the Mandagera storycard group), support was needed from others in the group to ensure success. When a participant tried to contribute to a story being told by another participant, for example, she was only successful in gaining the floor if others in the interaction recognized her. In many cases, there were particular participants whose contributions had more interactional impact than others, as when Narisawa silenced Suzuki’s contributions to her story despite support from others in the group.

Taken as a whole, what these patterns of role and status negotiation suggest is that although hierarchy is certainly a valued model, this hierarchy should not be overdone or taken for granted. In attempts to reject a role in the Mandagera storycard group, for example, Gotoh and Yorozu found that Narisawa challenged their attempts. In other words, Gotoh and Yorozu were trying to bypass the “proper” channels of role distribution in stating that they should be exempt from reading, and thus, to take on roles that to which they were not necessarily entitled.

The rejection of high-status roles also reminds us that every role carries with it certain rights and responsibilities; in the case of high-status roles, sometimes the responsibilities are more than a person wants, and thus, they reject them. Especially in cases where a social subordinate (e.g., Kabata in the Hataya workshop) was assigned a high-status role by a social superior (e.g., Odashima), subordinates tried to reject such roles, or accept them with hesitation.

## CONTRIBUTIONS

The work presented here contributes to several areas: gender and language, interactional processes in Japanese, style shifts, and analyses of role and status.

In terms of gender and language research models, this dissertation has given further support to the need for a more complex approach, by showing that gender-marked features are not necessarily used in (exclusively) gendered ways. In terms of interactional processes, there is still very little known about how interactions work in Japanese in part because a focus on language in interaction has not been the method of choice until very recently. There is, however, a growing body of literature in this field (see for example Ford and Mori 1994, Szatrowski 1993, and Tanaka 2000) and this work has sought to contribute to developing an understanding of how such processes work in Japanese. As mentioned above, work on style shifts has also been limited by the focus on only certain forms. This dissertation has shown the need for a consideration of other “speech levels” (i.e., local language forms and the naked plain form) when examining such shifts.

## FUTURE RESEARCH

The research presented here also highlights the need for further investigation in several areas. First, in addition to the need for more research into interactional processes in Japanese generally, there is also a dearth of information on the interactional functions of local language variety forms. The information available on local language forms in Iwate Prefecture (of which Towa is a part), for example, is limited to questionnaire studies that do not cover many aspects of the varieties of language in use. One instance where this limited information becomes problematic is in trying to analyze the function of particular local language features that seem to work like interactional particles, but do not necessarily correspond directly to an IP in standard Japanese. For example, although the local language particle *kke* is phonologically parallel to a form found in standard Japanese,<sup>128</sup> it seems to function quite differently. Speakers use *kke* to

---

<sup>128</sup> *Kke* in standard Japanese is used when one is talking to oneself, particularly when forming a reflective question, e.g., *nan da kke* (‘what is it, I wonder?’)

add emphasis (much like *yo* in standard Japanese), as in *nda kke* ('that's right, you know'), but also in ways very similar to standard Japanese *ne* (e.g., *sou shita kke* 'and then, you know...'). However, more research is needed before anything can be said definitively about *kke* and many other local language forms. Another problem is that of speech levels in local language varieties. As discussed in Chapter Two, the prevalent questionnaire-based research shows that there are speech levels equivalent to *desu/-masu* and plain distinctions in standard Japanese, but in the data presented in this dissertation speakers do not make such distinctions. Again, further research (based on actual conversational material) is needed to address this discrepancy between reported and actual language use.

In addition to issues surrounding local language varieties, the research presented here also supports Okamoto's (1996) call for research on gender and language (in Japan) in a variety of places and settings. As a growing number of scholars doing work on gender and language in Japan have shown, a focus on JWL obviates much that is important in terms of the variety of linguistic resources available to women and the strategies they use in speaking.

Finally and at a much broader level, this dissertation suggests the need for research into local ideologies of gender. The women whose interactions have been presented in this dissertation are not stereotypical female speakers, according to the JWL model. They use very little polite speech, do not use many feminine forms, and rarely use beautification/hypercorrected honorifics. By this standard, therefore, the women in my study are not very feminine. However, what 'feminine' means in this area very likely may not be that same as what 'feminine' means in the gender ideology that underlies JWL. Here it is useful to recall the discussion related in Chapter Two, between a group of women who were talking about JWL usage among women in Towa. Speaking specifically about husbands and wives working together in the fields, one woman garnered laughter from the rest of the group when she stated that "if women talked like that, they would never get any work done." Although this is certainly not the basis for making any strong claims about gender ideologies, it does suggest that JWL usage is not practical or effective for some women in this area.

Research on local gender ideologies is particularly as the Japanese central government continues to implement programs at the local level aimed at attaining gender equality. Like the standardized language practices that JWL reflects, these programs too take 'gender inequality' to be a homogenous problem throughout Japan. If gender equality is a goal, the first step becomes understanding the current situation. In order to do so, more research is needed on how men and women perceive themselves in relation to one another now, in ways that are likely to vary from region to region.

## APPENDIX A: DIALECT SUMMARY

The following table summarizes Hondoh's findings for the region that includes Towa. The highlighted forms are those that appear in my data corpus.

**TABLE 1: KEIGO AMONG TOWA LOCAL LANGUAGE VARIETY SPEAKERS**

	2P-SG "YOU" ("ANATA") <sup>129</sup>	3P-SG ("ANO HITO")	DESU*	KUDASAI ("PLEASE")
<b>ADDRESSEE</b>				
EXTREME SOCIAL SUPERIOR	Omesan (anada)	Ano kada (aono hito, ano okada)	Gozansu (degozarisu, degansu)	Ogureyanse ( <b>kunanse</b> <sup>130</sup> , kedeganse)
SOCIAL SUPERIOR	Omesan (anada)	Ano hito (ano kada)	Degansu (degasu, degozarisu, <b>su</b> )	<b>Kunanse</b> (ogureyanse, kedeganse)
SOCIAL EQUAL	<b>Omee</b> (omesan)	<b>Aizu</b> (are, ano hito)	<b>Su</b> (da <sup>131</sup> )	<b>Kede (kero)</b>
SOCIAL INFERIOR	Una (omee, uga)	Aizu (are, ano yazu)		

\**desu* is the copula in Japanese, often (but not always) translatable as a form of "to be." *Desu* is the *desu/masu* form of the copula. The plain form is *da*.

The following are results from a 1982 study (cf. Hondohh) that divides Iwate Prefecture into only two regions, where Towa falls into the region that includes Morioka (the prefectural capital). The chart below shows dialectal equivalents for respect (*sonkeigo*) forms in standard Japanese (SJ).

**TABLE 2: KEIGO FORMS IN DIALECT**

SJ	LOCAL LANGUAGE VARIETY
Oide ni naru	Odearu
Otabe ni naru	Oaegeru
Okaki ni naru	Ogageru
Goran ni naru	Gorou zuru
nerareru	Oyoreru
Desu ne	Danassu/ dassu
De gozaimasu	De gozansu/de goansu/de ansu
Ikimasu	igiansu

<sup>129</sup> Standard Japanese equivalents are given in parentheses for each category. However, in standard Japanese as in the dialects, pronouns and verb forms shift depending on the addressee and situation. I have given only the most "neutral/common" form in each case.

<sup>130</sup> Forms in bold are those that appear in my data corpus.

<sup>131</sup> *Da* is exactly the same form as the plain form for *desu* in standard Japanese.



**APPENDIX B: GENDER CLASSIFICATIONS FOR SENTENCE-FINAL FORMS (INCLUDING IP)<sup>132</sup>**

STRONGLY FEMININE		MODERATELY FEMININE		STRONGLY MASCULINE	
Form	Example	Form	Example	Form	Example
<i>wa</i> (with rising intonation for mild emphasis.) Variants: <i>wa ne</i> , <i>wa yo</i> , <i>wa yo ne</i>	Iku <u>wa</u> ('I'm going')	<i>desho(u)</i> for expressing probability or seeking agreement or confirmation	Iku <u>deshou?</u> ['You're going, aren't you?']	<i>Ze</i> and <i>zo</i> for assertion	Iku <u>ze</u> ['I'm going, I tell you']
<i>no</i> (after a noun or na-adj in a statement)	Ashita na <u>no</u> ('It's tomorrow')	<i>no</i> (after a plain verb or i-adj for emphasis or explanation in a statement)	Iku <u>no</u> . ['I'm going']	Plain imperative for of a verb alone or followed by <i>yo</i>	Ike ['Go']
<i>no</i> (followed by <i>ne</i> or <i>yo ne</i> for seeking confirmation of agreement; followed by <i>yo</i> for assertion)	Ashita na <u>no ne?</u> ('It's tomorrow, isn't it?')	<i>Mono (mon)</i> <sup>133</sup> Makes a strong assertion, with overtones of complaint or dissatisfaction	Datte <u>ikitakunai mon.</u> ['But I don't want to go.']	Phonological form <i>ei</i> replacing <i>ai</i> or <i>oi</i> <sup>134</sup>	Shiranei ['I don't know']
<i>kashira</i> ('I wonder')	Kuru <u>kashira</u> ('I wonder if he's coming.')				

<sup>132</sup> Adapted from Okamoto (1995)

<sup>133</sup> Adapted from Drohan (1991)

<sup>134</sup> The *ei* variant is used by both men and women quite commonly in Towa, and is part of the phonological variation found in the local language variety used there.

MODERATELY MASCULINE		NEUTRAL	
Form	Example	Form	Example
<i>Yo</i> after a plain form verb or <i>i</i> -adj for assertion	Iku <u>yo</u> (I'm going, I tell you')	Plain for of a verb or <i>i</i> -adj for assertion	Iku ('I'm going')
<i>Da</i> alone for declaration Variants: <i>da ne</i> , <i>da yo</i> , or <i>da yo ne</i>	Ashita <u>da</u> ('It's tomorrow')	Plain form plus <i>yo</i> , followed by <i>ne</i> for seeking agreement or confirmation	Iku <u>yo ne</u> ? ('You're going, right?')
Volitional form plus <i>ka</i> for an invitation or offer	Ikou ka ('Shall we go?')	Neg auxiliary <i>ja nai</i> for mild assertion or to seek agreement	Ashita <u>ja nai</u> ('It's tomorrow, isn't it?')
		<i>Ka na</i> ('I wonder')	Iku <u>ka na</u> ('I wonder if he's going')
		Gerundive form of a verbal lone or followed by the particle <i>ne</i> or <i>sa</i> (with sentence-final intonation and/or semantic completeness)	<i>Ikou to omotte</i> ( <i>ne/sa</i> ) ['I thought I would go']
		Exclamatory particle <i>naa</i>	Ii <u>naa</u> ['How nice']

)

## APPENDIX C: DIALECTAL FORMS IN THE DATA CORPUS

### Phonological changes<sup>135</sup>

/k/ to /g/	‘iku’ becomes ‘igu’ (‘go)
/t/ to /d/	‘tomete’ becomes ‘tomede’ (‘stop’)
/ch/ to /j/	‘machigatta’ becomes ‘majigatta’ (‘made a mistake’)
/ai/ to /e/	‘wakaranai’ becomes ‘wakarane’ (‘don’t understand’)

### 1. Present progressive/stative: v-continuative+ ra

A Yamaguchi-san wa irasshaimasuka? ‘Is (Ms.) Yamaguchi in?’

B Ima dekakete-ra ‘(She’s) out.’

Standard Japanese (SJ) for this form would be *dekakete iru*. In the dialect the SJ helping verb *iru* becomes *ra*.

### 2. Past tense: -tatta

asoko sa (besuto) *kattatta* yo ‘I bought a vest there, I’m telling you.’  
[SJ: katta]

*tta* is added to the SJ plain past *katta* in this form.

### 3. Past progressive: -ratta

sore de ii kara na toka tte *yutteratta* da zu.  
[SJ: itte imashita]  
‘(She said) ‘It’ll be okay like that, you know?’”

Parallel to 1 above, where *ratta* takes the place of the helping verb *ita* to form a past progressive form..

### 4. na ha

muzugashii *na ha*  
‘It’s difficult, isn’t it?’  
[SJ: ne/desu ne]

### 5. ssu

*Kekko jikan kakaru ssu* ‘It takes quite a lot of time, I’m telling you.’  
SJ: desu yo (interactional particle: ‘I’m telling you.’)

---

<sup>135</sup> As a consideration of phonological/intonational variation is beyond the scope of this work, these are not marked in the transcriptions. However, it is important to note at the overview level that there are phonological and intonational differences between SJ and the Towa LLV.

**6. kka = question marker**

*kocchi tomereru kka* ‘Can you stop this?’

In SJ, the question marker is *ka* (without the initial glottal stop). Using a plain verb with *ka* is very abrupt, and associated with masculine-marked speech. In the local dialect, however, both male and female speakers commonly use the *kka* question marker with plain verbs, and there does not seem to be any sense of abruptness.

**7. kke**

A. *are atta kke yo* ‘That was there, you know.’

B. *kono aida no tesuto no kekka mottekita kke na. sagatta kke*

‘(He) brought the results from the recent test, you know? They’d gone down.’

**8. ccha**

*Kono goro sakkaa ii kke ccha* ‘Soccer is really good these days, I’m telling you.’

SJ: *yo* (Interactional particle: ‘I’m telling you’).

**9. be**

*basho majigatta be na* ‘(They) must have gotten the place wrong.’

[SJ: *deshou* (‘probably’)]

**10. gotta**

*Nanmai mo aru gotta* ‘There must be several of them.’

[functions like ‘be’ above]

**11. nda**

A. *nda kke ne* ‘That’s right, isn’t it?’

B. Y *okaasan ga ida no* ‘Was (your) mother there?’

M *nda nn* ‘Yes, mm hmm.’

[SJ: *sou (da/desu)* ‘That’s so’]

Another instance in which native speakers do not make a distinction between whether this corresponds to the plain (*sou*) or *desu/-masu*-form (*sou desu*) in SJ.

12. **Various other** (SJ equivalents are given to the right of the equal sign)
- A. *ikatta* = *yokatta* ‘(It) was good.’
  - B. *nanbo* = *ikura/ikuraka* ‘some/several’
  - C. *nantara* = expression of dismay, complaint
  - D. *sa* = *e/ni* (particle that marks a destination or purpose: e.g., ‘I’m going to the bank.’)
  - E. *ya*
  - F. *mon ya/mo ya* = *wakaru deshou* ‘You know what I mean, right?’
  - G. *kunanse* = *kudasai* ‘please’ [[*masu*]]
  - H. *kete/keru* = *kudasai/kureru* ‘Someone does something for me.’<sup>136</sup> [[plain]]

The distinction between *kunanse* and *keru* (G and H above) is one place where both *desu/-masu* and plain forms are still commonly in use.

Native speakers claim that male speakers use the informal command form of *keru* (*keru*) much more often than female speakers do. If empirically true, this would parallel a gender-marked distinction found in SJ, where the plain command form (e.g., *tabero*) is marked for masculinity. See Appendix B for details on this form.

---

<sup>136</sup> *Kureru* is one of several “giving and receiving” verbs in Japanese. These include honorific forms that indicate the relationship between the receiver and agent. For example, if a teacher does something for a student the teacher would use *itadaku* (‘I receive from a social superior.’) or *kudasaru* (‘A social superior gives me something/does something for me.’). *Keru* is also used as the plain form of *kunanse*.

## APPENDIX D: TRANSCRIPT CONVENTIONS

Line 1 (italics)	original Japanese
Line 2	word for word translation
Line 3 (bold)	gloss
(...) in gloss	word inserted for natural English
IP	interactional particle
<i>Desu/-masu</i>	<i>desu/-masu</i> form
EMPH	particle or word used for emphasis (e.g., <i>mon</i> )
NOM	nominalizer ( <i>no</i> or <i>n</i> )
SM	subject marker ( <i>ga</i> )
TM	topic marker ( <i>wa</i> )
DO	direct object ( <i>o</i> )
POSS	possessive ( <i>no</i> )
QM	question marker ( <i>ka</i> or <i>no</i> )
LOC	locative ( <i>ni</i> )
[...]	overlap
=...=	latching
a:	elongated sound
mod	moderately (masculine/feminine)
strong	strong (masculine/feminine)
masc	masculine
fem	feminine
hon+	exalting/respect honorific (sonkeigo)
hon-	humbling honorific (kenjougo)

APPENDIX E: UNINTERRUPTED TRANSCRIPTS

CHAPTER THREE: ACTIVITY-CENTERED INTERACTIONS

[EVALUATION/ASSESSMENT]

EXCERPT 4

- 1 O *chotto: komatta ne*  
 little bothered IP  
 Oh no. [[plain]]
- 2 *Tate saki no ikatta no ka na:*  
 warp POS good NOM I wonder  
 I wonder if I should have made it the warp [[LLV]]
- 3 *ori ga tate saki*  
 weaving SM warp  
 made the weaving on the warp
- 4 K *hmm demo ima hitotsu boya: to (shita) no na ha*  
 but now one blurred that became NOM IP  
 Hmm, but now it's all blurred together, isn't it? [[LLV]]
- 5 O *nn nn*  
 Yeah, yeah.
- 6 K (unintelligible) *demo shikata nai- n da yo*  
 but way of doing isn't NOM COP IP  
 But there's nothing to be done about it now, I'm telling you. [[moderately masculine]]
- 7 *ochisaite shimatta (kara)*  
 woven in completed so  
 You've already put it in (the weaving) so
- 8 *iya iya de wa nai*  
 unpleasant unpleasant is not  
 It's not, it's not unpleasant. [[naked plain]]
- 9 O *nai*  
 It's not [[naked plain]]
- 10 K *nn*  
 Yeah (meaning, "it's not")
- 11 O *sou*  
 Oh?
- 12 K *nn so soiu no ga suki na hito ga iru to omou*  
 like that thing SM like people SM are that think  
 Mm, I think there are people who like that sort of thing. [[naked plain]]
- 13 O *sou da ne*  
 That's right, isn't it? [[mod masc]]
- 14 K *nn*  
 Yeah.

[DECISION MAKING]

**EXCERPT 1**

- 1 C *ninjin nai mon ne*  
carrots aren't IP  
There aren't any carrots, are there? [[plain]]
- 2 A *nn nai desu tsukatte shimatta kara*  
mm aren't COP used up so  
Mm, there aren't any [[*desu/-masu*]] because I used them all. [[plain]]
- 3 C *nda ato wa kaimono nai*  
that's so other TM shopping isn't  
Okay. Is there any other shopping? [[LLV]]
- 4 A *nai no ka na tamago wa aru shi*  
isn't NOM IP IP eggs TM are and  
I don't think there's anything else. We have eggs, and...
- 5 C *tamago wa ippai aru*  
eggs TM lots are  
There are plenty of eggs. [[naked plain]]
- 6 *ashita wa watashi tsukawanai kedo*  
tomorrow TM I won't use but  
I won't use (them) tomorrow, but.
- 7 A *demo kore demo igakke o ne emu esu demo*  
but this even okay IP IP M S even  
But this is okay anyway, right? Even MS. [[LLV]]
- 8 C *igakke yo*  
okay IP  
That's fine.
- 9 A *igakke o ne*  
okay IP IP  
That's fine, right?

**EXCERPT 2**

- 1 N *daitou-chou no ni ne ano:*  
Daitou-town POS at IP um
- 2 *ichiou daimei o kaite dasanakya nakatta-n da kedo*  
for now title DO write had to turn in NOM COP but  
(I) had to go ahead and turn in a title for the Daitou thing for now, but.
- 3 F *aa aa*  
Oh, oh
- 4 N *kisetsuteki ni awabuku [nukabuku (ga iin) desu]*  
according to season name of story SM good is  
In terms of the season, "Awabuku Nukabuku" is (good). [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 5 F/T  
[nn nn ]  
mm hmm



- 6 N *soshite kono fukube warashi to*  
and this name of story and  
And also this “Fukube warashi.”
- 7 F *aa*  
mm
- 8 T *nisaku ne*  
two pieces IP  
Two pieces, right?
- 9 G (*soshitara*) *yomu hito mo kimete kudasai*  
if that’s the case read people also decide please  
Please also decide who’s going to read.
- 10 N *sou desu ne*  
right is IP  
That’s right, isn’t it. [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 11 *dakara kyou watashi yametara renshuu chotto*  
so today I when (we) finish practice little
- 12 *suru tame ni atsumaru to omou - n desu ne*  
do in order to gather that think NOM is IP
- 13 *juukunichi no ne*  
nineteenth for IP  
So (I) think today after (we) finish (we will) get together to practice a little, for the 19<sup>th</sup>.
- 14 G *atashi ikkai yatta kara*  
I once did so  
I’ve already done it once, so [[fem pronoun, plain]]
- 15 N *nda kke ka*  
Is that right? [[LLV]]
- 16 Y *mou nikai yatta kara*  
already twice did so  
(I’ve) already done it twice, so.
- 17 YA {raising her hand}  
*hippari yaku yaru*  
pull role do  
I’ll pull the cards out of the way. [[naked plain]]
- 18 G *ne ikkai [yatta hito ga ii n da]*  
IP once done people SM okay NOM are  
People who’ve done (it) once are okay.
- 19 Y *[kondo ii wa ne ] menjo*  
This time okay IP IP exempt  
This time (we) are okay, right? [[strong fem]] (We’re) exempt. [[naked plain]]
- 20 G *menjo*  
Exempt [[naked plain]]
- 21 N *nensuu kasanereba yatta na minna yatta*  
years put together did IP everyone does  
If we include all the years we’ve done it, then everyone has read before. [[naked plain]]
- 22 F *[sou da ne ]*  
That’s right, isn’t it [[mod masc]]

- 23 G *[minna de naku] asoko de asoko de*  
 everyone not there at there at  
 Not everyone, (I did it) there, there
- 24 N *asoko de yatta kke ka*  
 there at did IP QM  
 Did (you) do it there?
- 25 Y *asoko de yatta*  
 there at did  
 (She) did it there
- 26 G *nn asoko de*  
 Mm hmm (I) did it there
- 27 YA *watashi mo yatta*  
 I also did  
 I did it, too.
- 28 G *ussou yaranai yo*  
 lie don't IP  
 You're kidding, you didn't. [[strong masc]]  
 {C laughs, looks across the table at Y}
- 29 *sonna koto iwanaide*  
 such things don't say  
 Don't say such things.  
 {C laughs, looks down at work}
- 30 YA *oogata dakara hipparu hito mo nakya nai kara ne*  
 big size so pull people also have to have so IP  
 (The cards) are big, so we need people to pull (them out of the way) as well.
- 31 G *kyou kono mae wa watashi yatta-n da wa*  
 today this before TM I did NOM COP IP  
 Today, I've done it before this. [[strong fem]]

### EXCERPT 3

- 1 O *kore wa dono gurai hoshii-n da kke na kono nagasa wa*  
 this TM how much want NOM COP QM IP this length TM  
 How much do (they) want of this, of this length? [[plain]]
- 2 *Kono hito fushi: ijou ni hoshii-n desu ne*  
 This one joint more than want NOM COP IP  
 (They) want more than this one joint's length, right? [[desu/-masu]]
- 3 *Hito fushi han gurai da yo ne*  
 One joint half about COP IP IP  
 About one a half joint length's worth, isn't it? [[mod masc]]
- 4 O *kou yatte desho*  
 like this do right  
 (You) go like this, right? [[desu/-masu]]
- 5 K =*de guruun to mawasu gurai*=  
 and completely turn about  
 And just about turn it completely around

- 6 O =a cho chotto kore ja nagai ka  
oh just a minute this well long QM  
Oh wa- wait a minute. This is too long, huh?
- 7 K guruun to mawasereba ii [no ]  
completely if can turn good IP  
If you can turn it all the way around it's fine. [[mod fem]]
- 8 O [a mawa] seru=  
Oh can turn  
Oh, (I) can turn (it).
- 9 K =da yo ne=  
is IP IP  
See you can, right? [[mod masc]]
- 10 O =da yo ne  
COP IP IP  
Yeah right.
- 11 mazu yatte miru ka hito fushi han gurai  
first do try QM one joint half about  
Shall I just try it? About a joint and a half.
- 12 chotto {cuts} kore sa nani ire  
a little this well what put in  
Wait a minute, what shall (we) put in...
- 13 totemo kusa no you ni ne shikisai kankaku (ikunai) kara  
not at all grass POS like IP grass colors doesn't go so  
(It) just doesn't want to take on colors like grass so
- 14 K (unintelligible)(komatta-n da kke na ha) someta no  
troubled NOM COP QM IP IP dyed ones  
(We're) having a lot of difficulties aren't we? [[LLV]]
- 15 O a someta no ne  
oh dyed things IP  
Oh, with the dyed stuff, yeah.
- 16 K =a a kore ni irete ratta ne {pointing to material on the table}  
Oh oh this in was in IP  
Oh, oh, it was in here wasn't it. [[LLV]]
- 17 O =a sou  
Oh yeah.
- 18 K mada wa aru kedomo  
still there is but  
(We) still have (some) but
- 19 O hai hai  
Yes, yes.
- 20 K de sumimasen sou dattaraba ne  
and I'm sorry that way if it is IP  
I'm sorry, but if that's the case
- 21 O mm  
Yeah

- 22 K *{showing other possibilities}* *kouiu no mo omoshiroi ka na*  
like this things also interesting I wonder  
(I wonder) whether this might be interesting, too.
- 23 O *aa aa [kurashikku ni ne kurashikku]*  
Oh oh classic make IP classic  
Oh, oh. Making it classic, huh? Classic.
- 24 K *[shizuppoi ka na shizuppoi] ka na*  
understated I wonder understated I wonder  
Is it kind of understated, I wonder? Is it kind of understated, I wonder?
- 25 *Konna fuu na kanji ga ii ka na toka ne*  
Like this feeling SM good I wonder and so on IP  
I wonder if something like this would be good, something like this, you know.
- 26 O *kore uru da ne a uru [chigau ne]*  
this sell COP IP oh sell wrong IP  
This is for sale, right? [[*masc*]] For sale, oh, no it's not
- 27 K *[kore wa]*  
This (is)
- 28 O *chigau ne*  
wrong IP  
It's not, right?
- 29 K *nn chotto chigau [yo ne]*  
mm little wrong IP IP  
Mm, no, not really.
- 30 O *[nn ](jinken)*  
Mm, (rayon).
- 31 K *motto kocchi no*  
More like this
- 32 O *araa [wakannai yo]*  
Oh don't know IP  
Oh, I'm telling you, I don't know! [[*mod masc*]]
- 33 K *[unintelligible]*
- 34 O *makaseta: omakase da*  
leave it (to you) (it's) left cop  
I leave it up to you. It's up to you. [[*mod masc*]]
- {K laughs}
- 35 K *nanka [mayotte] shimau na ha*  
somehow confused completely IP IP  
It, you know, really makes your head spin, doesn't it? [[*LLV*]]
- 36 O *[watashi] nn aa kou=*  
I, mm, oh like this
- 37 K *=(unintelligible)*
- 38 O *=kore de ne kore wa donna moikkai moikkai*  
this with IP this TM what kind once more once more  
With this, right? What kind of is this? Once more, once more.

- 39 K *mm kore ii kka*  
 this good QM  
 Hmm, this is okay, huh? [[LLV]]
- 40 O *ara [nan daro ]*  
 Oh no what is (it I) wonder  
 Oh, what's this?
- 41 K *[(somete inai)] shi*  
 not dyed and  
 It's not dyed and
- 42 O *aa wakaranai::=*  
 Oh, I don't know. [[naked plain]]
- 43 K =(unintelligible)
- 44 O =(shi) *nanka kou naru to are da*  
 and somehow like this become then that is
- 45 (*igai to chigau*) *fuu ni natte shimaui ka*  
 pretty different like become completely QM  
 Somehow when it's like this it, is it completely different? [[LLV]]
- 46 K *nn chotto yari sugi=*  
 little do too much  
 Mm, it's a little bit much.
- 47 O =*nn yari sugi*  
 Mm, too much.
- 48 K *[(unintelligible)] shimatte=*  
 Go ahead and (unintelligible)
- 49 O [*nn kocchi*] *yappari shizentai kore ga=*  
 this of course natural state this SM  
 Mm, this, of course in the natural state this (is)
- 50 K =*ka kore da to [konna kanji ka na ] toka*  
 or this is if like this I wonder and  
 Or if it's like this, it's a sense like this, isn't it (I wonder)? And so on
- 51 O *[nn sou da ne]*  
 mm that way is IP  
 Mm, that's right, isn't it? [[mod masc]]
- 52 K *kocchi ka kocchi ka*  
 this QM this QM  
 This? This?
- 53 O *wakannai wakannai*  
 I don't know, I don't know. [[naked plain]]
- 54 K {laughing} *wakannai*  
 (You) don't know.
- 55 O *wakannai*  
 I don't know.
- 56 K (unintelligible)
- 57 O *wakannai yo mm*  
 don't know IP  
 I'm telling you, I don't know. [[mod masc]]

- 58 K *ato ni shurui yaru ka dousei aru kara*  
 more two kind send QM anyway there are so  
 Shall (we) send two more kinds? I mean we already have them so
- 59 O *mm sou da ne*  
 that way is IP  
 Hmm, that's right, isn't it? [[mod masc]]
- 60 K [(unintelligible)]
- 61 O [*datte kore demo nai*] *n ja ne=*  
 but this even isn't NOM isn't it  
 Yeah but it's not this, right?
- 62 K *=aka ga ne*  
 red TM IP  
 The red, right?
- 63 O *nn*  
 Mm hmm.
- 64 K *chotto iro ga chigau kara*  
 little color SM different so  
 The color's a little different, so
- 65 K *ja kore [to kore de ii desu ka]*  
 well this and this okay is QM  
 Is this and this okay? [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 66 O [*hai hai hai*]  
 Yes, yes, yes.
- 67 K *nayamu kara naka naka ne*  
 be troubled so it's hard IP  
 It makes you wonder, so it's really hard (to make a decision) isn't it? [[plain]]
- 68 O *demo ne kodawa:ru toiu koto wa ii koto desu yo*  
 but IP being particular that thing TM good thing is IP  
 But you know, I'm telling you, being particular is a good thing. [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 69 K *hai*  
 Yes.

## CHAPTER FOUR

[ASSESSING OTHERS]

### EXCERPT 1

1. B *otousan nani shiteru no (shibaraku uchi ni) iru no*  
 Husband what is doing QM (awhile home at) is QM  
 What's your husband doing? Is he at home for awhile?
2. A *otousan nn mazu karada o*  
 Husband hmm first body DO  
 My husband, hmm... Well, his body, you know...
3. B (unintelligible)

- 4. A *koshi (ga itakute) souiu koto de (dakedo yasumi wa shite imasu)*  
 Back SM hurts like that thing with but vacation TM is doing  
 (His) back hurts and like that...but he's taking a vacation. [[*desu/-masu*]]  
 {A and U laugh}
5. A *shitsugyou hoken moraeru uchi mazu uchi ni ite*  
 unemployment insurance can get home anyway home at is and
6. *jojo ni shigoto sagasu tte mon ne (unintelligible) wa ne*  
 gradually work look for says EMPH IP (unintelligible) TM IP  
 As long as (he) can get unemployment insurance (he's) home, and (he) says he'll  
 gradually look for a job. (unintelligible)
7. B (unintelligible)
- 8. A(unintelligible) *datte zutto tatteru to ne anou dame na no yo*  
 but long time standing if IP um no good NOM IP  
 (unintelligible). But you know, if (he) stands a long time it isn't good. [[strong  
 feminine]]  
 [elipsis]
14. A *zutto nagaku aruitari suru to dame da tte*  
 very long time walk and do if no good is says  
 (He) says (he) runs into trouble if he does things like walk for a very long time.
15. *kanzen ni naoranai (tte sensei ni iwareta) itami ga mazu ne*  
 completely won't heal that doctor was told pain SM anyway IP  
 The doctor told him that it wouldn't completely heal, the pain anyway.
16. U *un nakunareba iin darou kedo*  
 mm hmm if it goes good probably but  
 Mm hmm, if it went away that would be good, I think, but.
17. A *minna ni wakai mada wakakute tte iwareru kedo sa*  
 everyone young still young and that am told but well  
 Everyone tells me "He's young." "He's still young," but, you know.
- 18. B *ndatte koshi yaru no tte wakai toshi yori kankei*  
 but back do NOM that young older relationship
19. *ne be kara*  
 not probably so  
 But you know, back pain has nothing to do with being old or young, right? [[LLV]]
20. A *iwareru kedo yappashi sono itami mo honnin shika*  
 am told but naturally that pain also person himself only
21. *wakanne beshi sa*  
 understand shouldn't IP  
 That's what people tell me, but you know, I think only the person himself can  
 understand the pain. [[LLV]]
22. *Dakara kono aida mo sou yuttera kke (zutto tatte ite tsurakatta no)*  
 so recently also that was saying IP long standing difficult QM
23. *tsurakatta tte*  
 difficult said  
 So the other day (he) said the same thing. [[LLV]] (I asked him) "Was it hard  
 standing for such a long time?" And he said, "It was hard."

24. U *nn*  
 Hmm
25. A *watashi ga nanboka chikara ni (naranakucha)*  
 I SM somewhat strength become  
 I'm going to have to be of some help. [[LLV]]  
 [elipsis]
- 26. A *datte sore shika nai*  
 but that only isn't  
 Yes, but that's all I can do. [[naked plain]]
27. B *(tanoshimi)*  
 I'm looking forward to...
28. A *sore shika ja nai yappa*  
 that only isn't naturally  
 That's all I can do, of course.
- 29. B *nda na ha*  
 That's right, isn't it? [[LLV]]
30. A *mada kore kara yareru kurai ne*  
 still from now on can do about IP  
 (I'll) still do what I can from here on, you know?
- 31. *dakara kotoshi wa taue mo mou tanonda hou*  
 so this year TM rice planting also already request part
32. *iin da tte no*  
 better is said NOM  
 So this year's rice planting as well, (he's) said it would be better to ask someone else to do it. [[moderately feminine]]
33. U *un jouyou da be demo*  
 hmm transfer is probably but  
 Yeah, it'll probably (mean) handing it over but. [[LLV]]
33. A *jouyou dakedo sa [(yappari kore kara mo)]*  
 transfer but IP of course from here on also  
 It is handing it over, but you know, of course from here on out also...
34. U *[yappari omoi mono] motte ne*  
 of course heavy things carry IP  
 Of course carrying heavy objects (is difficult), right?
35. A *sou sou sou*  
 Yes, yes, yes.
36. U *ne yappari are suru no mo nottari oritari*  
 IP of course that do NOM also getting on and getting off  
 Right? Naturally doing that also, getting on and getting off
37. B *ano notte ueteru toki ii kedo sa*  
 um ride planting when okay but IP  
 Um, when you plant while you're sitting it's okay, but well...  
 [elipsis]
- 40. B *ano nae hakobi mo ne tsukareru kke cche ne*  
 that seedling transport also IP get tired IP IP IP



41. *[sungoku (aru) shi sa]*  
 very much there is and IP  
 You really get tired moving seedlings don't you, you know? [[LLV]].  
 There's so much and you know.
41. A *[ne nanmai mo ]*  
 IP several layers even  
 Right? There are so many layers
42. *ippai ne tsumaneba ne shi ne*  
 Lots IP have to layer and IP  
 You have to stack several together and things, right? [[LLV]]
43. U *chuugoshi ga ichiban taihen da o na*  
 crouching down TM most difficult is IP IP  
 Crouching down is the most difficult, isn't it? [[LLV]]
44. A *sore demo pachinkoya sa itteru you da kke yo*  
 that even pachinko store to goes seems is IP IP  
 Even so, it seems he goes to play pachinko, you know. [[LLV]]
- {laughter from B and U}
45. B *nde sore shika ne be iku toko*  
 and that only not probably go place  
 Well, that's probably the only place he can go, isn't it? [[LLV]]
46. A *datte koshi dakara suwatteru no mo tsurai tte ittete sa*  
 But back so sitting NOM also painful that says IP  
 But it's his back, so (he) says that sitting is also painful.
- 47. *ano hito no baai sou ja nai-n da yo ne*  
 that person POS case that way not NOM is IP IP  
 That isn't the case with him, is it now? [[moderately masculine]]
48. B *haa kou yatteru hou ii wake da*  
 Oh like this doing part good reason is  
 Oh, so it's that he's better going like this. [[moderately masculine]]
49. U *ndemo sa chigau koto sa shuuchuu shiteru kara sa*  
 but IP different thing IP concentrate doing so IP  
 But (he's) concentrating on something different, so, you know.
50. B (unintelligible)
51. U *nn iin ja nai no un kou chigau hou sa*  
 Hmm good isn't it mm like this different part LOC
52. *me ga itteru kara*  
 eyes SM going  
 Uh huh. That's all right, isn't it? [[mod fem]] Umm, his eyes are focused somewhere else, so... [[LLV]]

EXCERPT 2

1. N *Hakoda-san wa nanka okosan dekinakatta koto ga genin de*  
Hakoda TM like child couldn't have thing SM cause and
2. *chotto noirouze mitai na (kanji datta ne)*  
little neurosis like sense was IP  
Because she couldn't have children, Ms. Hakoda had something like a slight neurosis, you know?
3. G *aa (noirouze)*  
Oh, a neurosis.
4. F *Hakoda-san kodomosan nakatta -n da*  
Hakoda children weren't NOM COP  
Oh, Ms. Hakoda didn't have any children.
5. G *(unintelligible)*
6. S *(ryouzan de) dekinaku natte*  
miscarriage with unable became  
She became unable (to have children) because of a miscarriage.
7. Y *nanka ii oyomesan moratta tte ne yorokondeta tte*  
like good wife got said IP was happy that
- 8. *kikimashita kedo ne*  
heard but IP  
You know, (they) said he'd gotten a good wife. I'd heard (he) was really happy but, you know? *[[desu/-masu]]*
9. F *zannen datta ne*  
unfortunate was IP  
It was unfortunate, wasn't it?
10. G *hontou ne*  
really IP  
It really was, wasn't it?
11. N *hoikusho de shiranaide hoikuen de shiranaide*  
nursery school at don't know nursery school don't know
12. *yatotta rashii -n dakedo*  
hired seems NOM but  
It seems to be that they didn't know at the nursing school, at the nursery school when they hired her, but.
13. S *(unintelligible) hanamaki hoikuen de ne*  
Hanamaki nursery school at IP  
(unintelligible) at the Hanamaki Nursery School, you know?
14. F *a hontou ni*  
Oh really?
- 15. N *asoko ni ita sou desu (yo ne)*  
there LOC was heard is IP IP  
I've heard that she was there, you know, wasn't she? *[[desu/-masu]]*
16. *saisho kara haruyama iin no ne*  
beginning from Haruyama clinic POS IP  
From the beginning at the Haruyama clinic, you know?

17. S *aa nn nn*

Oh, mm hmm.

[elipsis]

→28. N *tabun ne souiu no wa hontou da to omou no*  
maybe IP like that NOM TM really is that think IP

Maybe, you know? I think that kind of thing was true, you know. [[mod fem]]

29. *ano kodomo ni taishite no are ga chotto ijou de*  
that child for thing that SM little irregular and

30. *chotto nn abunai tte iu no de*  
little mm dangerous that said so

They said that thing for that child was a little irregular and, um, dangerous, so...

→31. *en no hou kara yamete moratta mitai desu kke nn*  
school part from quit get seems COP IP mm

...the school - it seems that the school had her quit, you know?

[[*desu/-masu*, LLV]]

31. F *aa sou datta no nn*

Oh is that how it was? Hmm

[elipsis]

50. F *okosan nakatta no*  
child wasn't QM

She didn't have children?

51. N *nn*

Yeah. (meaning "No, she didn't.")

→52. F *a sou datta*

Oh, that's how it was. [[naked plain]]

53. G *(unintelligible) no ka na*  
I wonder if (unintelligible)

→54. N *nn rashii toiu hanashi da kke*  
mm hm seems that talk is IP

Uh huh, it seems so, that's the talk, you know? [[LLV]]

55. G *nn hontou ni kodomosan hoshikatta-n da ne*  
hmm really children wanted NOM COP IP

Hmm, she really wanted kids (that's the reason), huh?

### [GIVING ADVICE]

#### EXCERPT 2

1. F *shakyou de ano hora shinobu kawamura shinobu-san*  
social education that you know Shinobu Kawamura Shinobu

2. *kita deshou*  
came right

In the Social Education (office), you know, that Shinobu, Shinobu Kawamura came, right? [[*desu/-masu*]]

3. *De nan da ka iro iro kaite shirabetete sorede watashi ni*  
And something various write investigating and then me to

4. *denwa ga kite*  
phone call SM came and
- 5. *saishuu gakureki oshiete kudasai tte denwa ga kita no*  
last education level tell please that phone call SM came NOM  
And he was writing and investigating various things, and so then I got a phone call,  
a phone call asking me to tell him my highest level of education, you know.  
[[moderate feminine, plain]]
- 6. *aa mou jikou desu tte itta*  
oh already personal is that said  
(I said,) “Oh, that’s personal.” {laughs} [[naked plain]]
7. *sore de jikou de omoidashita aa mou jikou desu tte itta*  
and then personal with remembered oh already personal is that said  
And that’s why I remembered (when we were talking about) personal. “Oh, that’s  
personal,” I said (to him).
- 6 G *datte sa mou sou saishuu gakureki*  
but IP already that way last education level
- 7 *[kakanene tte nande soitsu hitsuyou ] nan da e ne*  
have to write say why that necessary NOM is IP IP  
But you know, that’s right, (they) say “You have to write your highest level of  
education.” Why is that kind of thing necessary, you know? [[LLV]]
- 8 F *[un dakara jikou desu tte itta mon shou ga naku]*  
hmm so personal is that said couldn’t be helped  
Mm hmm, so that’s why I said “That’s personal,” because there was nothing else I  
could do.  
[elipsis]
- 22 G *kore watashi ittsumo sou omotteratta*  
this I always like that thought  
I always thought like that (on) this (issue). [[LLV]]
- 23 *nande kore kakanakya nannai-n darou tte*  
why this have to write NOM wonder said  
“Why (should we) have to write this, I wonder?”
- 24 F *jikou desu tte nani ni tsukau-n da ka shiranai kedo*  
personal is said what for use NOM is QM don’t know but  
(You) say “it’s personal.” (I) don’t know what it’s going to be used for, but...
- 25 *jikou desu tte ichatta* {laughs}  
personal is that said  
...I just said, “It’s personal.”
- 26 N *saikin yutta zo tto omotta -n da*  
recently said IP that thought NOM COP  
(You must) have thought recently, “I said it.” [[strong masculine]]
- 27 F *nn*  
Yeah
- 28 N *demo kyohi suru koto dekiru-n da yo ne*  
but refuse do thing able NOM COP IP IP  
But you can refuse, you know, right? [[masculine]]

- 29 F *nn*  
Yeah
- 30 G *aa hontou*  
Oh really?
- 31 N *nosetakunai kara toka shirare [taku nai ]*  
don't want to include so like that don't want to be known  
“Because (I) don't want it to be included, or something like that, (I) don't want it to be known.”
- 32 G *[sore shiranai kara]*  
that don't know so
33. *hitori de nande konna no o kakanakya naranai na to ka omotte*  
alone why this thing DO have to write wonder like that think  
See I don't know that, so I always think to myself, “Why do (I) have to write this?”

[CRITIQUING OTHERS]

**EXCERPT 2**

- 1 G *ima no wakai hitotachi wa minna netsuretsu na*  
now young people TM everyone passionate  
Today's young people all have passionate (relationships)
- 2 *sochira no sasaki-san mo*  
that Sasaki also  
That Ms. Sasaki also (did)
- 3 S *ee* {looks up from her work at G}  
What?
- 4 G *netsuretsu na renai* {everyone laughs}  
passionate love  
A passionate love (affair)
- 5 F/Y *ee*  
What?
- 6 S {looking towards G} *(sore wa) mukashi no hanashi desu* {more laughter from group}  
that TM old story is  
That's a really old story. [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 7 G {laughing voice} {looking up at others, who are looking down}  
*anata ga mukashi banashi tte yuttara watashitachi wa mou*  
you SM old story that if say we TM already
- 8 *kaseki ni natteru yo ne*  
fossil become IP IP  
Your saying “that's an old story” makes us fossils, you know, is that it? [[plain]]
- 9 F *mou subete jikou da yo ne*  
already all personal is IP IP  
Anyway it's all personal you know, isn't it?
- 10 N *ne*  
Right?

- 11 F *hakkiri (iu to) souiu ohanashi wa*  
straight say if that kind story TM  
To speak frankly, that kind of topic is (personal)
- 12 N *sou da yo ne*  
That's right you know, isn't it?
- 13 Y *un un*  
Mm hmm
- 14 N *sou desu ne*  
That's right, isn't it [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 15 Y *sou sou*  
That's right, that's right.
- 16 F *souiu koto ni shimashou*  
that kind thing make it  
Let's leave it at that. [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 17 Y *sou desu jikou desu*  
That's right. It's personal. [[*desu/-masu*]]
- 18 F *nn*  
Yeah.

[TELLING STORIES]

**EXCERPT 1**

1. F *aa yutta desho atashi sa noriko-san yoshiko-san no da-*  
oh said right I IP Noriko Yoshiko POS hus
2. *[dannasan ga sa]*  
husband SM IP  
Oh, I told you right? Noriko's, Yoshiko's hu-, husband, you know?
3. Y *[kakushiteta-n da tte ]*  
was hiding NOM COP said  
(She) said (she) was hiding (him)
4. F *kakushiteta-n ja nakute*  
was hiding NOM not  
Not that (she) was hiding (him)
5. *atashi wa ze- zenzen gofuufu da to shiranaide (unintelligible)*  
I TM not at all husband and wife are that without knowing  
I didn't have any idea that they were husband and wife and (unintelligible)
6. G *kiita -n da tte ne*  
heard NOM COP said IP  
(You) said (you'd) heard, right?
7. F *ne hirosHisan ni atta yo kawakubo no teiryuujo de toka tte*  
IP Hiroshi met IP Kawakubo POS bus stop at like that said  
Right? (I) said "I met Hiroshi at the Kawakubo bus stop, you know" like that.
8. *De sore mo (yoshi-chan) zenzen iwanai -n da*  
and that also Yoshi-chan nothing don't say NOM COP  
And Yoshi-chan didn't say anything at all even then.

9. *F atashi yoshi-chan uchi ni tazunete itta toki ni ne*  
 I Yoshi-chan home to visit went time at IP  
 When (I) went to visit Yoshi-chan's house, you know...
10. *uchi de yachou ga suki de katten no yo tte hanashi kara*  
 home at bird watching SM like so own NOM IP that talk from
11. *dandan moriagattara*  
 little by little worked up  
 (She) started saying "(We) like bird watching, so (we) have (some), you know" and things just started building up more and more from there.
12. *Hiroshi-san ga dannasan da tte iu no ga hajimete wakatta*  
 Hiroshi SM husband is that NOM SM first knew
13. *to iu sugoi ne*  
 that amazing IP  
 (And that's when) I first learned that Hiroshi was (her) husband. That was an amazing (thing), you know?
14. N *niyaniya shiteta -n deshou yoshi-chan ne niyaniya*  
 laughing was NOM right yoshi-chan IP laughing under her breath  
 (She) must have been laughing secretly. Yoshi-chan, you know, (must have been) laughing under her breath.
- 15. F *sou nan desu yo*  
 that NOM is IP  
 That was just the way of it, you know. [[*desu/-masu*]]
16. G *yoshi-chan mo yaru mon da nante*  
 also does COP I say
17. F *sore de atashi nanka zenzen shiranaide*  
 and then I like not at all don't know  
 And you know I didn't know at all... [[fem pronoun]]
- 18. *ka- ano nissan purinsu ni tsutometeratta kara*  
 that Nissan Prince at was employed so  
 I was working at that Nissan Prince store, so... [[LLV]]
- 19. *sono koro ne asa ne rajio taisou yaru no ne*  
 that time IP morning IP radio exercises do IP IP [[mod fem]]
20. *purinsu no shain ga*  
 prince POS employees SM  
 At that time, you know, in the morning, you know, (we) would do exercises to the radio you see, right? The Prince employees would.
17. *sono douro kawakubo no ano kokudou zoi de*  
 that road Kawakubo POS that highway next to at  
 On that road (in) Kawakubo, right along that highway.
22. N *hee*  
 Oh really?
23. F *itsuka (yoshi-chan ni) taisou da ka nan da ka wakannai no*  
 sometime to exercise is or what is don't know IP  
 Once (I told) Yoshi-chan, "I don't know if this is exercise or what it is."  
 [[mod fem]]

24. *itsumo nissan purinsu de yatta kke*  
 always nissan prince at did IP  
 (We) always did (them) at Nissan Prince, you know. [[LLV]]
25. *hiroshi-kun mo yatteta kke*  
 Hiroshi-kun also was doing IP  
 Hiroshi-kun also did them, you know. [[LLV]]
26. *atashi yutta no taisou da ka nan da ka wake*  
 I said IP exercise is or what is QM reason
27. *wakannai no itta kke yo*  
 don't understand IP said IP IP  
 I said (it), you know. [[mod fem]] I'm telling you, you know [[LLV]], I said "I don't  
 if this is exercise or what. I can't make head or tail of it." [[mod fem]]
28. *F yoshi-chan ga hiroshi-san ni sore yutta (ato)*  
 Yoshi-chan SM Hiroshi-san to that said later  
 Yoshi-chan told Hiroshi that later.
29. *mada gofuufu da tte shiranakatta -n da mon*  
 still husband and wife are that didn't know NOM COP IP
30. *sono toki atashi*  
 that time I  
 But you know I still didn't know they were husband and wife, at that time I (didn't  
 know).
- 31.G {laughs heartily}
- 32. F *hontou ni (sou taihen de ) hontou ni makka ni nacchatta wa yo*  
 really that difficult and really very red became IP IP  
 It was really terrible, and (I) really turned beet red, don't you know.  
 [[ strong fem]]
- 33. G *iisobir[e datta -n ] ja nai no*  
 oversight was NOM wasn't NOM  
 Wasn't it just that (she) forgot to tell you? [[mod fem]]
- 34. F *yomoya gofuufu da to omowanakatta yo*  
 don't tell me husband and wife are that didn't think IP  
 Don't tell me (I) should have thought that they were husband and wife  
 [[mod masc]]
35. *ikura nandemo ne*  
 how much no matter IP  
 No matter how much (else I knew), you know?



## Bibliography

- Abe, Hideko** 1995. "From stereotype to context: The study of Japanese women's speech" *Feminist Studies* 21(3): 647-672.
- Agha, Asif** 1994. "Honorification". *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23:277-302.
- Ahearn, Laura M.** 2001. "Language and agency" *Annual review of anthropology* 30:109-37.
- Aoki, Yayoi** 1997. "Interview". In *Broken silence: Voices of Japanese feminism*. Sandra Buckley, ed. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1-31.
- Bachnik, Jane** 1992. "*Kejime*: Defining a shifting self in multiple organizational modes". In *Japanese sense of self*. Nancy R. Rosenberger, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ----- 1994. "Indexing self and society in Japanese family organization". In *Situated meaning: Inside and outside the Japanese self*. Jane Bachnik and Charles Quinn Jr., eds. Princeton: Princeton University Press 143-167.
- Barrett, Rusty** 1995. "The Markedness Model and style switching: Evidence from African American drag queens." In *SALSA II: Proceedings of the Second Annual Symposium About Language and Society – Austin*. Pamela Silberman and Jonathan Loftin, eds. Austin, Texas: University of Texas, Department of Linguistics. 40-52.
- Bauman, Richard and Joel Sherzer** 1989. *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking*, second edition. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Befu, Harumi** 2000. "Globalization as human dispersal". In *Globalization and social change in contemporary Japan*. J. S. Eades, Tom Gill and Harumi Befu, eds. Melbourne, Australia: TransPacific Press. 17-40.
- Bem, Sandra** 1993. *The lenses of gender*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Ben-Ari, E., Brian Moeran and James Valentine, ed.** 1990. *Unwrapping Japan: Society and culture in anthropological perspective*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Bernstein, Gail** 1983. *Haruko's world: A Japanese farm woman and her community*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bestor, Theodore** 1989. *Neighborhood Tokyo*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bishop, Beverly** 2000. "The diversification of employment and women's work in contemporary Japan." In *Globalization and social change in contemporary Japan*. J. S. Eades, Tom Gill and Harumi Befu, eds. Melbourne, Australia: TransPacific Press. 93-109.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana** 1987. "Indirectness and politeness in requests: Same or different?" *Journal of Pragmatics* 11:131-46.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana and G. Kasper, eds.** 1990. "Politeness" *Journal of Pragmatics* (special issue): 14
- Boden, Deirdre and Don H. Zimmerman** 1991. *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre** 1991. *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Brinton, Mary C.** 1993. *Women and the economic miracle: Gender and work in postwar Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Brown, Penelope** 1994 (1990). "Gender, politeness and confrontation in Tenejapa." In *The women and language debate: a sourcebook*. Camille Roman, Suzanne Juhasz and Cristanne Miller, eds. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press. 322-339.
- Brown, Robert and A. Gilman** 1960. "The pronouns of power and solidarity." In *Style in language*. Thomas A. Sebeok, ed. Cambridge, MA: Technology Press of MIT. 253-276.

- Brown, P. and S. Levinson** 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Butler, Judith** 1993. *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex"*. New York: Routledge.
- 1999 (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. (tenth anniversary edition) New York: Routledge.
- Cameron, Deborah** 1985. *Feminism and linguistic theory*. London: Macmillan.
- Cavallaro, Joanne and Suellen Rundquist** 1994. "Indirectness in women's communication: how "power" and status interact." In *Cultural Performances: Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Women and Language Conference*. Mary Bucholtz, A.C. Liang, Laruel A. Sutton and Caitlin Hines, eds. Berkeley Women and Language Group. Berkeley: University of California. 86-92.
- Cherry, Kittredge** 1987. *Womansword: What Japanese words say about women*. Tokyo and New York: Kodansha International.
- Coates, Jennifer** 1986. *Women, Men and Language*. New York and London: Longman.
- Cook, Haruko Minegishi** 1999. "Situational Meanings of Japanese Social Deixis: the mixed use of the masu and plain forms" *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*. 8(1): 87-110.
- 1992 "Meaning of non-referential indexes: A case study of the Japanese sentence-final particle *ne*." *Text* 12(4): 507-39.
- 1990 "The sentence-final particle *ne* as a tool for cooperation in Japanese conversation" In *Japanese/Korean linguistics*. Hajime Hoji, ed. Stanford: Stanford Linguistics Association.
- Coulmas, Florian** 1992. "Linguistic etiquette in Japanese society." In *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory, and practice*. Richard J. Watts, Sachiko Ide, and Konrad Ehlich, eds. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter Publishers. 131-153.
- Crawford, Mary** 1995. *Talking Difference: On gender and language*. London and Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Dalby, Liza** 1999. *Geisha*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Doi, Takeo** 1973. *The anatomy of dependence*, John Bester (trans.). Tokyo: Kodansha International.
- 1986. *The anatomy of self: The individual versus society*, Mark A. Harbison (trans.). Tokyo: Kodansha International.
- Dore, Ronald P.** 1978. *Shinohata: A portrait of a Japanese village*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Dower, John** 1999. *Embracing defeat: Japan in the wake of World War II*. W. W. Norton and Company: The New Press.
- Drew, Paul and John Heritage, eds.** 1992. *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, Paul and Anthony Wootton, eds.** 1988. *Erving Goffman: Exploring the interaction order*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Drohan, Francis G.** 1991. *A handbook of Japanese usage*. Rutland, Vermont and Tokyo, Japan: Tuttle Language Library
- Dunn, Cynthia** 1996. *Style and genre in Japanese women's discourse*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Texas at Austin. Anthropology.
- Duranti, Alessandro** 1994. *From grammar to politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Edwards J. and M. Lampert, eds.** 1993. *Talking data: Transcription and coding in discourse research*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: Hillsdale, New Jersey.

- Ehara, Yumiko, Michiko Nakajima, Yayori Matsui and Tomoko Yunomae** 1996. "The movement today: Difficult but critical issues." *Voices from the Japanese women's movement*. AMPO: Japan-Asia Quarterly Review. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe. 38-52.
- Embree, John** 1939. *Suye Mura: Portrait of a Japanese village*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Endo, Orie** 1995. "Aspects of sexism in language". In *Japanese women: New feminist perspectives on the past, present, and future*. Kumiko Fujimura-Fanselow and Atsuko Kameda, ed. New York: The Feminist Press. 29-42.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan, Kei Kanamura and Jiansheng Guo** (1995). "Shifting face from Asia to Europe". manuscript.
- Fair, Janet K.** 1996. *Japanese women's language and the ideology of Japanese uniqueness*. The University of Chicago: Department of Anthropology. Ph.D. dissertation
- Fishman, Pamela M.** 1983. "Interaction: the work women do" In *Language, gender and society*. Barrie Thorne, Cheris Kramarae and Nancy Henley, eds. Rowley, MA: Newbury House. 89-101.
- Ford, Cecelia E. and Junko Mori** 1994. "Causal markers in Japanese and English conversations: A cross-linguistic study of interactional grammar." *Pragmatics* 4(1): 31-61.
- Ford, Cecelia E. and Barbara A. Fox, eds.** 2002. *The language of turn and sequence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Freed, Alice F.** 1994. "A cross-cultural analysis of language and gender". In *Cultural Performances: Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Women and Language Conference*. Mary Bucholtz, A.C. Liang, Laruel A. Sutton and Caitlin Hines, eds. Berkeley Women and Language Group. Berkeley: University of California. 197-204.
- Fujieda, Mioko** 1995. "Japan's first phase of feminism". In *Japanese women: New feminist perspectives on the past, present, and future*. Kumiko Fujimura-Fanselow and Atsuko Kameda, ed. New York: The Feminist Press. 323-342.
- Fujitani, Atsuko** 2001. *Nihon nougyo no joseigaku: danjo kyoudo sankaku shakai to ekorojikaru raifu o mezashite* ("Women's studies in Japanese agriculture: Towards a gender equal society and ecological life"). Domesu: Tokyo.
- Gal, Susan** 1991 "Between speech and silence: The problematics of studying research on language and gender. In *Gender at the crossroads of knowledge: Feminist anthropology in the postmodern era*. Micaela di Leonardo, ed. Berkeley: University of California Press. 175-203.
- 1992. "Language, gender and power: An anthropological view". In *Locating power: Proceedings of the second Berkeley Women and Language Conference*. 153-161.
- Garfinkel, Harold** 1967. *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gergely, Mohasci** 2001. "Learning to be rural women: Reproduction of gender at the Ladies Farm School, Shintoku Town". Paper presented at the GALE & EASH 3rd International Conference. *The Other Hokkaido: Gender, Diversity and Minorities*. Sapporo, Japan.
- Goffman, Erving** 1969. *Strategic interaction*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- 1974. *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Doubleday
- 1981. *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Golden, Arthur** 1995. *Memoirs of a geisha*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Goodwin, Charles** 1993. "Recording human interaction in natural settings." *Pragmatics* 3(2): 181-209.

- Goodwin, Charles and Marjorie Harness Goodwin** 1992. "Assessments and the construction of context". In *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*. Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 147-190.
- Goodwin, Charles and John Heritage** 1990. "Conversation analysis". *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19:283-307.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness** 1990. *He-said-she-said: Talk as social organization among Black children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Gray, Joel** 1992. *Men are from Mars, women are from Venus: A practical guide for improving communication and getting what you want in your relationships*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Gumperz, John J.** 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Gupta, Arjun and John Ferguson** 1997. *Anthropological locations: Boundaries and grounds of a field science*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hamabata, Matthews M.** 1990. *Crested kimono: Power and love in a Japanese business family*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Hendry, Joy** 1992. "Individualism and individuality: Entry into a social world". In *Ideology and practice in modern Japan*. Roger Goodman and Kirsten Refsing, eds. London and New York: Routledge. 55-71.
- Henshall, Kenneth G.** 1999. *Dimensions of Japanese society: Gender, margins and mainstream*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Heritage, John** 1984. *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hondoh, Hiroshi** 1982. "Iwate-ken no hougen" (Dialects in Iwate Prefecture). In *Kouza hougen-gaku 4: Hokkaido/Tohoku chihou no hougen*. Ki'ichi Iitoyo, Sukezumi Hino and Shoh'ichi Satoh, eds. Tokyo: Kokushokan Gyoukai. 237~269.
- 1994a (1977). "Iwate-ken hougen ni okeru keigo chitsujo ni tsuite no ikkousatsu" (A consideration of the honorific system – keigo – in Iwate Prefecture dialects). In *Nihon rettou hougen sousho: Tohoku hougen so, Iwate-ken, Miyagi-ken, Fukushima-ken*. Fumio Inoue, Takashi Kobayashi, and Ohnishi eds. Tokyo: Yamani Shoboh. 375-388
- 1994b (1977). "Iwate-ken hougen no keitou to kukaku ni tsuite" (Iwate Prefecture dialects: Systems and regions). In *Nihon rettou hougen sousho: Tohoku hougen so, Iwate-ken, Miyagi-ken, Fukushima-ken*. Fumio Inoue, Takashi Kobayashi, and Ohnishi eds. Tokyo: Yamani Shobo. 431-459.
- 1994c (1975). "Chiiki shakai no kyoutsugoka: Iwate-ken Shimano-gun Kawai-mura no gengo henyou" (Language standardization in regional societies: Language change in Kawai Village, Iwate Prefecture). In *Nihon rettou hougen sousho: Tohoku hougen so, Iwate-ken, Miyagi-ken, Fukushima-ken*. Fumio Inoue, Takashi Kobayashi, and Ohnishi eds. Tokyo: Yamani Shobo. 475~85.
- Hikita, Mitsuko** 1996. "Women and alternatives to agricultural decline." In *Voices from the Japanese feminist movement*. AMPO- Japan Asia Quarterly Review, ed. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe: 144-149.
- Hunter, Janet** 1993. *Japanese women working*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hymes, Dell** 1995 (1972). "The ethnography of speaking." In *Language, culture and society*, second edition. Benjamin G. Blount, ed. Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc. 248-282.
- 1974. *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Ide, Sachiko** 1982. "Japanese sociolinguistics: Politeness and women's language" *Lingua* 57:357-385.
- 1983. "Onna rashisa gengogaku" (The study of feminine language). Osamu Mizutani, ed. *Hanashi kotoba no hyougen*. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobou. 174-193.
- 1990. "How and why do women speak more politely in Japanese?" In *Aspects of Japanese Women's Language*, Sachiko Ide and Naomi Hanaoka McGloin, eds. Tokyo: Kurocio Publishers.
- 1993. "Sekai no joseigo Nihon no joseigo: Joseigo kenkyuu no shintenkai o motomete" (Women's languages in the world, women's language in Japan: Searching for new developments in studies on women's language) *Nihongokaku* 12 (6): 4-12
- Ide, Sachiko, Beverly Hill, Yukiko M. Carnes, Tsunao Ogine, and Akiko Kawasaki** 1992. "The concept of politeness: An empirical study of American English and Japanese" In *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory and practice*. Richard J. Watts, Sachiko Ide, and Konrad Ehlich, eds. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter Publishers. 281-297.
- Ide, Sachiko, Motoko Hori, Akiko Kawasaki, Shoko Ikuta and Hitomi Kaga** 1986. "Sex difference and politeness in Japanese". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 58:25-36.
- Ikuta, Shoko** 1983. "Speech level shift and conversational strategy in Japanese discourse". *Language Sciences* 5(1): 37-53
- Imamura, Ann E.** 1987. *Urban Japanese housewives: At home and in the community*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Inoue, Miyako** 1994. "Gender and linguistic modernization: Historicizing Japanese women's language." In *Cultural performances: Proceedings of the third Berkeley women and language conference*. Mary Bucholtz, A. C. Liang, Laurel A. Sutton and Caitlin Hines, eds. Berkeley Women and Language Group, Berkeley: University of California. 322 – 333.
- 1996. *The political economy of gender and language in Japan*. Washington University, Department of Anthropology. Ph.D. dissertation.
- Irvine, Judith** 1998. "Ideologies of honorific language." In *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn Woolard and Paul V. Kroskrity, eds. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press. 51-67.
- Ishiwatari, Sadako** 1996. "A cooperative restaurant on the Miura Coast". In *Voices from the Japanese feminist movement*. AMPO- Japan Asia Quarterly Review, ed. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe: 175-178..
- Itami, Juzo** 1987. *Minbo no onna* (A taxing woman). Toho Kabushikigaisha. English version distributed through Fox/Lorber Home Video.
- Ivy, Marilyn** 1995. *Discourses of the vanishing: Phantasm, modernity, Japan*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Iwao, Sumiko** 1993. *The Japanese woman: Traditional image and changing reality*. New York: Free Press.
- Kanai, Yoshiko** 1996. "Issues for Japanese feminism". In *Voices from the Japanese feminist movement*. AMPO- Japan Asia Quarterly Review, ed. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe: 3-22.
- Kanazumi, Fumiko** 1997. "Interview". In *Broken silence: Voices of Japanese feminism*. Sandra Buckley, ed. Berkeley: University of California Press. 66-101.
- Kawanari, Mika** 1993. "Irai hyougen" (Request phrases). *Nihongokaku* 12(6): 125-34
- Keating, Elizabeth** 1998. *Power sharing: Language, rank, gender and social space in Pohnpei, Micronesia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- 2000. "The ethnography of communication." In *Handbook of ethnography*, Paul Atkinson, Amanda Coffey, Sara Delamont, Lyn Lofland, and John Lofland, eds. London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Keating, Elizabeth and Maria Egbert** forthcoming. "Conversation across cultures". In *Companion to linguistic anthropology*, Alessandro Duranti (ed.). Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.
- Kelly, William** 1986. "Rationalization and nostalgia: Cultural dynamics and new middle-class Japan." *American ethnologist* 13(4): 603-18.
- 1991. "Directions in the anthropology of contemporary Japan". *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 20:395-431.
- Kendon, Adam** 1992. "The negotiation of context in face-to-face interaction". In *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*. Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 323-334.
- Kindaichi, Oki Hayashi and Takeshi Shibata** (eds.) 1988. "Hougen no keigo" (Honorifics in dialects). In *Nihongo hyakka daijiten*. Tokyo: Haruhiko Taishukan Publishing Company. 659-664.
- Knight, John** 1993. "Rural Kokusaika? Foreign Motifs and Village Revival in Japan" *Japan Forum* 5(2): 203-216.
- Kobayashi, Mieko** 1993. "Sedai to josei-go: Wakai sedai no kotoba no 'chuusei-ka' ni tsuite" (Generation and women's language: On the "neutralization" of speech among the younger generation) *Nihongogaku* 12(6): 181-192.
- Kondo, Dorinne** 1990. *Crafting selves*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kramarae, Cheris** 1981. *Women and men speaking: frameworks for analysis*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Lakoff, Robin Tolmach** 1975. *Language and woman's place*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lebra, Takie S.** 1984. *Japanese women: Constraint and fulfillment*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Levinson, Stephen** 1989. "Conversational structure." *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Long, Daniel** 1996. "Variation of 'standard' as the speech variety of a specific region: Computer-produced maps of perceptual dialect regions." Paper presented at *Methods IX*. Bangor: University of Wales.
- 1997. "Hougen kara mita Nihongo-rashisa" ('Japanese-ness' from the perspective of dialects). *Nihon Gengaku* 7: 6-13
- 1998. "Gaikoku kara mita Nihongo no hougen" (Japanese dialects as viewed from abroad). *Kokubungaku* 6: 38-43.
- Lunsing, Wim** 2001. *Beyond common sense: Sexuality and gender in contemporary Japan*. London: Kegan Paul.
- Mackie, Vera** 1988. "Feminist politics in Japan." *New Left Review* 167: 53-76.
- Matsumoto, Yoshiko** 1988. "Reexamination of the universality of face: politeness phenomena in Japanese". *Journal of Pragmatics* 12:403-426.
- 1989. "Politeness and conversational universals – observations from Japanese". *Multilingua* 8(2-3):207-221.
- Maynard, Senko K.** 1989. *Japanese conversation: Self-contextualization through structure and interactional management*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

- 1993. *Discourse modality: Subjectivity, emotion and voice in the Japanese language*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- 1997. *Japanese communication: Language and thought in context*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- McConnell-Ginet, Sally** 1988
- McGloin, Naomi Hanaoka** 1989. *A students' guide to Japanese grammar*. Tokyo: Taishukan
- Mikanagi, Yumiko** 2000. "A political explanation of the gendered division of labor in Japan." In *Gender and global restructuring: Sightings, site and resistances*, Marianne H. Marchand and Anne Sisson Runyan, eds. London and New York: Routledge. 116-128.
- Moeran, Brian** 1984. "Individual, group and *seishin*: Japan's internal cultural debate." *Man* 19(2): 252-266.
- Morley, Patricia** 1999. *The mountain is moving: Japanese women's lives*. New York: New York University Press.
- Morris, Rosalind C.** 1995. "All dressed up: Performance theory and the new anthropology of sex and gender". *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24:567-592.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol** 1994. "What do speakers want? Codeswitching as evidence of intentionalism in linguistic choices." In *SALSA II: Symposium About Language and Society – Austin*. Pamela Silberman and Jonathan Loftin, eds. Austin, Texas: University of Texas, Department of Linguistics Austin: Texas Linguistic Forum. 1-17 .
- 1993. *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Nagatsuka, Takashi** 1993. *The soil: A portrait of rural life in Meiji Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Nakamichi, Hitomi** 2000. "Current issues on women's policy in rural areas: The establishment of partnerships in farm families and in the rural community. In Masae Tsutsumi, ed. *Women and families in rural Japan*. Tokyo: Tsukuba Shobo. 13-37.
- Nakamura, Akira** 1991. *Atarashii danjosou o motomete: "Omoikomi" kara no itsudatsu* (In search of a new man/new woman image: Deviance from "set" ideas). Osaka: Gensosha.
- Nakane, Chie** 1970. *Japanese society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Nakano, Mami** 1996. "Ten years under the Equal Employment Opportunity Law." In *Voices from the Japanese feminist movement*. AMPO- Japan Asia Quarterly Review, ed. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe: 65-81.
- Niyekawa, Angas M.** 1991. *Minimum essential politeness: A guide to the Japanese honorific language*. Tokyo, New York and London: Kodansha International.
- Nolte, Sharon H. and Sally Ann Hastings** 1991. "The Meiji state's policy toward women, 1890-1910". In *Recreating Japanese women, 1600-1945*. Gail Lee Bernstein, ed. Berkeley: University of California Press. 151-174.
- Ochs, Elinor** 1992. "Transcription as theory" In *Developmental pragmatics*, Bambi Schieffelin and Elinor Ochs (eds.) New York: Academic Press. 43-72.
- 1992a. "Indexing gender". In *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*. Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 336-358.
- Ogasawara, Yuko** 1998. *Office ladies and salaried men: Power, gender and work in Japanese companies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ogawa, Naoko and Janet S. (Shibamoto) Smith** 1997. "The gendering of the gay male sex class in Japan: A case study based on Rasen no Sobyoh". In *Queerly phrased: Language*,

*gender, and sexuality*. Anna Livia and Kira Hall, eds. New York and Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

**Ohinata, Masami** 1995. "The mystique of motherhood: A key to understanding social change and family problems in Japan." In *Japanese women: New feminist perspectives on the past, present, and future*. Kumiko Fujimura-Fanselow and Atsuko Kameda, ed. New York: The Feminist Press. 199-212.

**Ohno, Kazuoki** 1988. "Japanese agriculture today: The roots of decay" In *The other Japan: Conflict, compromise and resistance since 1945*. Joe Moore, ed. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe. 176-198.

**Ohnuki-Tierney, Emiko** 1993. *Rice as self: Japanese identities through time*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

**Okamoto, Shigeko** 1995a. "'Tasteless' Japanese: Less 'Feminine' Speech among Young Japanese Women." In *Gender Articulated: Language and the socially constructed self*. Kira Hall and Mary Bucholz, eds. Routledge. 297-325.

----- 1995b. "'Gendered' speech styles and social identity among young Japanese women". In *Cultural performances: Proceedings of the third Berkeley women and language conference*. Mary Bucholtz, A. C. Liang, Laurel A. Sutton and Caitlin Hines, eds. Berkeley Women and Language Group. Berkeley: University of California. 569 – 581.

----- 1996. "Indexical meaning, linguistic ideology, and Japanese women's speech." In *Gender and belief systems: Proceedings of the fourth Berkeley Women and Language Conference*. Natasha Warner, ed. Berkeley Women and Language Group. Berkeley: University of California

**Otohiko, Hasumi** 1985a. "Rural society in postwar Japan: Part I". *The Japan Foundation Newsletter* XII (5):1-9.

----- 1985b. "Rural society in postwar Japan: Part II". *The Japan Foundation Newsletter* XII (6): 1-7.

**Philips, Susan U.** 2001. "Power". In *Key terms in language and culture*. Alessandro Duranti, ed. Oxford, UK: Blackwell. 190-192.

**Philips, Susan U., Susan Steele and Christine Tanz, eds.** 1980. *Language, gender, and sex in comparative perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Plummer, Ken** 1996. "Symbolic interactionism in the twentieth century: The rise of empirical social theory". In *Blackwell companion to social theory*. Oxford: Blackwell. 223-251.

**Robertson, Jennifer** 1991. *Native and newcomer: Making and remaking a Japanese city*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

----- 1998. *Takarazuka: Sexual politics and popular culture in modern Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

**Rodd, Laura Rasplica** 1991. "Yosano Akiko and the debate over the 'new woman'". In *Recreating Japanese women, 1600-1945*. Gail Lee Bernstein, ed. Berkeley: University of California Press. 175-198.

**Rosenberger, Nancy** 2000. *Gambling with virtue: Japanese women and the search for self in a changing world*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

**Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson** 1974. "A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation." *Language* 50:696-736.

**Schegloff, Emanuel** 1992. "On talk and its institutional occasions". In *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Paul Drew and John Heritage, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 101-134



- Schiffrin, Deborah** 1994. *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schieffelin, Bambi B., Kathryn Woolard and Paul V. Kroskrity, eds.** 1998. *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shibamoto, Janet Smith** 1985. *Japanese Women's Language* New York: Academic Press, Inc.
- Sievers, Sharon** 1983. *Flowers in salt: The beginnings of feminist consciousness in modern Japan*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Silverstein, Michael** 1976. "Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural description" In *Meaning in anthropology*. Keith Basso and Henry A. Selby, eds. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press. 11-56.
- Smith, Robert J.** 1983. *Japanese society: Tradition, self and the social order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, Robert J. and Ella Lury Wiswell** 1982. *The women of Suye Mura*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Spender, Dale** 1980. *Man made language*. London, Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Squires T** 1994. "A discourse analysis of the Japanese particle *sa*." *Pragmatics* 4(1): 1-29.
- Stone, Ruth and Vernon** 1981. "Event, feedback and analysis." *Ethnomusicology* 25 (2): 215-225.
- Stronz, Amanda** 2001. "Anthropology of tourism: Forging new ground for ecotourism and other alternatives" *Annual Review of Anthropology* 3: 261-283.
- Sunaoshi, Yukako** 1994. "Mild directives work effectively: Japanese women in command". In *Cultural performances: Proceedings of the third Berkeley women and language conference*. Mary Bucholtz, A.C. Liang, Laurel A. Sutton and Caitlin Hines, eds. Berkeley Women and Language Group. Berkeley: University of California. 678-690.
- 1995. *Japanese women's construction of an authoritative position in their communities of practice*. Master's thesis. University of Texas at Austin, Department of Linguistics.
- forthcoming. "Regionality, occupation and gender: Farm women's professional discourse in Ibaraki". Manuscript draft. Oxford University Press.
- Suzuki, Mutsumi** 1993. "Joseigo no honshitsu: Teineisa, hatsuwa kouji no shiten kara" (The essence of Japanese women's language: From the viewpoints of politeness and speech acts). *Nihongogaku* 12(6): 148-55.
- Szatrowski, P.** 1993. Nihongo no danwa no kouzou bunseki (Analysis of the structure of Japanese conversation). *Nihongogaku* 12(6).
- Taguchi, Atsuko** 1996. "Apron: A restaurant run by women". In *Voices from the Japanese feminist movement*. AMPO- Japan Asia Quarterly Review, ed. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe: 185-189.
- Takasaki, Midori** 1993. Josei no kotoba to kaisou (Women's language and social class". *Nihongogaku* 12(6): 169-180.
- Tamanoi, Mariko Asano** 1998. *Under the shadow of nationalism: politics and poetics of rural Japanese women*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Tanaka, Hiroko** 1999. *Turn-taking in Japanese conversation: A study in grammar and interaction*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Tanaka, Kazuko** 1995. "The new feminist movement in Japan, 1970-1990". In *Japanese women: New feminist perspectives on the past, present, and future*. Kumiko Fujimura-Fanselow and Atsuko Kameda, ed. New York: The Feminist Press. 343-352.

- Tannen, Deborah** 1986. *That's not what I meant: how conversational style makes or breaks your relations with others*. New York: Morrow.
- 1990. *You just don't understand : women and men in conversation*. New York: Morrow.
- 1993. *Gender and conversational interaction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 1994. *Gender and discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thorne, Barrie and Nancy Henley** 1975. *Language and Sex: Difference and dominance*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.
- Thorne, Barrie, Cheris Kramarae and Nancy Henley, eds.** 1983. *Language, Gender and Society*. Newbury House, Rowley Massachusetts.
- Tonomura, Hitomi, Anne Walthall and Wakita Haruko** 1998. *Women and class in Japanese history*. University of Michigan: Center for Japanese Studies.
- Uchida, Aki** 1992. "When 'difference' is 'dominance': A critique of the 'anti-power based' cultural approach to sex differences" *Language in Society* 21 (4): 547-68.
- Ueno, Chizuko** 1987. "The position of Japanese women reconsidered" *Current Anthropology* 28(4): S75-S84.
- 1994-95. *Nihon no feminizumu (Feminism in Japan)*. Volumes 1-8. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- 1997. "Interview". In *Broken silence: Voices of Japanese feminism*. Sandra Buckley, ed. Berkeley: University of California Press. 273-301.
- Ueno, Tazuko** 1983. *Meirei to irai (Commands and requests)*. In *Hanashi kotoba no hyougen*. Osamu Mizutani, ed. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobou.
- Uno, Kathleen S.** 1991. "Women and changes in the household division of labor". In *Recreating Japanese women, 1600-1945*. Gail Lee Bernstein, ed. Berkeley: University of California Press. 17-41.
- 1993. "The death of 'Good Wife, Wise Mother'?" In *Postwar Japan as history*. Andrew Gordon, ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Vogel, Ezra** 1963. *Japan's new middle class: The salary man and his family in a Tokyo suburb*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Walthall, Anne** 1991. "The life cycle of farm women in Tokugawa Japan". In *Recreating Japanese women, 1600-1945*. Gail Lee Bernstein, ed. Berkeley: University of California Press. 42-70.
- Watanabe, Suwako (1993)**. Cultural differences in framing: American and Japanese group discussions. In *Framing in discourse*, Deborah Tannen, ed. New York: Oxford University Press. 176-209.
- Watanabe, Tsuneo** 1989 (1986). *Datsu dansei no jidai: Andorojinesu o mezasu bunmeigaku (The times of deserting manhood: Cultural studies aiming at androgyny)*. Tokyo: Keiso Shobo.
- 1991. *Meikyuu no erosu to bunmei: Ryoudosuru jendaa, jiga, sekaikan no shinrigaku (Erotics and culture in a labyrinth: A psychology of floating gender, selves and worldviews)*. Tokyo: Shinyosha.
- Weatherall, Ann** 1998. "Re-visioning Gender and Language Research." *Women and Language* 21:1.
- Wetzel, Patricia J.** 1990. "Are 'powerless' Communication Strategies the Japanese Norm?" in *Aspects of Japanese Women's Language*, Sachiko Ide and Naomi Hanaoka McGloin, eds. Kurosio Publishers: Tokyo. 117-128.

**Wetzel, Patricia J. and Miyako Inoue** 1997. "Vernacular theories of Japanese honorifics." *Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese* 33(1): 68-101.

**Woolard, Kathryn A. and Bambi Schiefflin** 1994. "Language ideology". *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23:55-82.

**Yoshizumi, Kyoko** 1995. "Marriage and family: Past and present". In *Japanese women: New feminist perspectives on the past, present, and future*. Kumiko Fujimura-Fanselow and Atsuko Kameda, ed. New York: The Feminist Press. 183-198.

This document does not include the vita page from the original.