

Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics

Volume 8, Number 1

Edited by Letta Strantzali

The editor would like to express her thanks to the faculty and staff for their help in the preparation of this volume. Funding for this journal is provided by the Graduate Student Council from the Student Activity Fee.

© Linguistics Graduate Student Association
University of Kansas, 1983

Reprinted 1992

Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics

Volume 8, number 1, 1983

CONTENTS

Maria Alzira Nobre Frances Ingemann	Oral Vowel Reduction in Brazilian Portuguese	1
Patricia J. Hamel	Brazilian Portuguese Stressed Vowels: A Durational Study	31
Andrea G. Osburne	Comma Intonation in a Tone Language	47
Philip Hubbard	Albanian Reflexives: Violations of Proposed Universals	63
Mark J. Elson	The Generative Relationship	73
Hiroshi Nara	On Michael Dummett's Notion of Decidability	87
Kenneth L. Miner Barbara Lynn Taghva	Computerized Permutation of Pikean Field Matrices	97
Anne M. Ediger	An Analysis of Sex Stereotypes in the Japanese Language	107
Contents of Previous Volumes		129

AN ANALYSIS OF SEX STEREOTYPES IN THE JAPANESE LANGUAGE

Anne M. Ediger
University of California, San Diego, Extension

Abstract: By means of a questionnaire (based on a pilot study: Jorden 1974a) administered to a group of 18- to 25-year-old speakers of standard Japanese, the present study identifies 60 lexical/grammatical features which are considered to be indicators of the sex of a speaker. These 60 items are assigned a relative numerical value and are placed in a hierarchy ranging from those features which are thought to be strongly masculine or feminine, through those which are somewhat so, to varying degrees, to those which are fairly neutral. The features found to be the most statistically significant are Self-Reference and Address Forms, Sentence Particles, and Politeness Levels.

'It's a boy!' 'It's a girl!' Not only does the first description of a newborn child reflect a very real biological difference between males and females, it also reflects a distinction that follows every person into virtually all other aspects of human life, including that of speech.

Over the past two decades, significant research on sex as a sociolinguistic variable has appeared (e.g., Thorne and Henley 1975, Ide, et al 1980). Sociolinguists are now realizing that

'the female/male division is a ubiquitous feature of the deeply tacit interpretive schemes used by most people in our culture for organizing our understanding of everyday language and communication strategies. This division is so basic to our view of our world that it is taken for granted by most researchers who look for more subtle categories upon which to structure their work' (Kramer 1978b: 152).

Kramer also says that 'by making sex differences a focus in speech research, we can acknowledge a dominant conceptual division used by speakers' (Kramer 1978b: 152). Thorne and Henley (1975: 14) point out that 'the sexual differentiation of speech can be conceptualized as part of human gender display, as one way in which sex differences are socially marked, emphasized, and enacted.'

Differences between women's and men's speech have been found in a wide variety of languages and among these, Japanese is considered to have a particularly long history and many overt markers.

In preliminary studies, Jorden (1974a), McGlaufflin (1978), and

Ide (personal communication) claim that men's and women's speech differ in the following areas:

Richness of vocabulary on certain subjects
 1st }
 2nd } person references
 3rd }
 Address forms
 Sentence- and Phrase-final particles
 Copula forms
 Command and request forms
 Honorifics and levels of formality
 Use of Chinese compounds (Kango)
 Exclamations
 Conjunctions
 Pitch range and frequency of responses
 Unfinished sentences

In addition, according to Jordan (1974a: 104), 'other characteristics assigned to female speech become increasingly impressionistic: women are said by nature to be more indirect, more emotional, and less precise, all of which characteristics are supposed to be linguistically observable.'

In an attempt to identify and document more specific features of Japanese women's speech, Jordan (1974a) conducted a pilot study involving a questionnaire given to twelve subjects of various ages, educational backgrounds, and professions, in which she sought to identify the actual words and morphemes that marked speech as used differently by men and women. Because the number of subjects in her study was small, Jordan was only able to make a number of tentative observations.

The present study expands upon Jordan's method for the purpose of helping to clarify what linguistic features are attributed to sex differences (as opposed to other sociolinguistic factors such as age, socioeconomic class, etc.) by native speakers of present-day standard Japanese.

Subjects:

The subjects were the university students in four English and Literature classes at three private universities in Tokyo, ranging in age from 18 to 25. One hundred and five (105) questionnaires were distributed in the four university classes, and of the completed questionnaires obtained from speakers of standard Japanese, 50 were selected by random selection: 25 from males and 25 from females. For the purposes of this study, standard Japanese is defined as the language spoken by the people of the Tokyo area, and subjects who were considered to be native speakers of this dialect were identified as those students who had responded in the general information section of the questionnaire as having lived for at least ten years in the Tokyo area.

Gathering the data:

A written questionnaire (based on a similar questionnaire used in Jorden's study) was developed in order to identify linguistic features of sex without prejudicial judgment based on the pitch or voice of a speaker. The questionnaire consisted of a number of general questions about the subjects and five dialogs presented as transcriptions of spontaneous speech. The general questions included: birthdate, sex, name of university, year in school, major field of study, length of residence in Tokyo, place of upbringing, original home of parents, number of hours the subject viewed television in a week, and what the subject thought he or she might be doing at the age of 29 in terms of profession, marital status, etc. The responses for major, sex, parents' background, university, hours of television viewing, and career/life expectations were later correlated with the patterns found in the subjects' responses to the portion of the questionnaire involving speaker sex identification. This was done for the purpose of seeing if some significant relationship between the two might exist. For each of these, a Chi-Square test was then administered. All results reported in the present study are significant at the .05 level or below.

Of the written transcriptions, two were selections from written transcriptions of spontaneous speech recorded in issues of the magazine Gengo Seikatsu 'Language Life' (1972, 1975), two were written transcriptions taken from recordings of actual speech of students in the tennis clubs of two private universities in Tokyo (transcriptions from Ide, 1979a, courtesy of Sachiko Ide), and the last transcription was an artificial dialog. Dialogs 1, 2, and 4 each involved three speakers (Speakers A, B, and C) and the other two dialogs each involved two speakers. In each dialog, all introductory information indicating the sex of the speakers had been previously deleted.

Although the fifth dialog was presented as a transcription of actual speech, in reality, it was a dialog (constructed for the purposes of this study), in which sex markers, as identified by Jorden (1974a) and Ide (as reported in McGlauflin, 1978, and by personal communication) were mixed up in such a way that each 'speaker' was given both male and female markers. These included personal referents and address forms, sentence-final particles, and polite or informal forms. The purpose of this dialog was to check up on the judgments made regarding the previous dialogs, and to test Jorden's conclusion (1974a: 110) that there existed a hierarchy among features marking the sex of the speaker. It would be significant in indicating whether the 'strength' of certain features could overrule the conflicting messages of weaker features normally ascribed to the opposite sex, but appearing together in this dialog.

After reading the dialogs, the subjects were asked to identify the sex of the speakers in each dialog. This identification was to be indicated by assigning each speaker a value on a 5-point scale as follows:

- 1--male
- 2--probably male
- 3--unclear if male or female
- 4--probably female
- 5--female

Occasionally, decisions as to the sex of the speaker were required in the middle of a dialog and the subjects were asked to make their decisions on the basis of what they had read thus far. They were also told that they should feel free to change their minds on the sex of the speaker at a later decision point, should later evidence cause them to think differently.

In her pilot study, Jordan (1974a: 110) found that men and women showed differences in their answering patterns: women chose less definite categories of identification than men. In an effort to test whether this was true of the present questionnaire as well, the sex of the respondents was also correlated with their tentativeness of identification (based on the choice of a value of 1 or 5--definitely male/female--as opposed to a value of 2 or 4--probably male/female--on the 5-point scale).

In the second part of the questionnaire, the subjects were asked to indicate the linguistic evidence in the dialogs on which they had based their decisions by circling the words or phrases that showed masculine or feminine features. In the analysis of the data, then, the circled features were considered to be indicators of the sex of the speaker which the respondents had marked at the end of each dialog.

Because of the somewhat open-ended nature of responses in this second section of the questionnaire, a list of sex-marked features was obtained by putting together the forms which were marked, with the contexts in which they appeared. This allowed marked features to be put into syntactic or other categories which captured significant generalizations. Then, the simple formula $\frac{m}{n}$ was used, where m equals the number of times a given feature was actually marked for a given sex and n equals the total number of times that feature could possibly have been marked.

This formula assumes that the subjects marked every occurrence of a given feature considered to be a marker of sex. The choice of this method was made for several reasons:

1. The linguistic as well as the sociolinguistic context of a given feature makes an important contribution to the perception of the degree of markedness of that feature. If a single instance of being marked were interpreted as signifying that every occurrence of that feature was marked, it would completely overlook the role that the context plays in the choice of a sociolinguistic variant.
2. The fact that a segment was not marked is important because it

indicates that it is not considered to be a marker of sex.

In the event where a feature was marked as characteristic of both male and female speech, the smaller value was subtracted from the larger value and the new reduced value was assigned to the sex which was considered to use it more.

Finally, in the third part of the questionnaire, the subjects in the present study were invited to comment freely on why they had chosen one sex or the other, as well as on their impressions of the characters or relationships of the speakers. Open-ended responses were encouraged so that some information on content-related clues to sex choice might be obtained from their answers and to test the findings of other researchers regarding women's speech.

Results and Discussion

General Information and Correlations:

Since the present study made use of Jordan's methods, it was not surprising that a large number of Jordan's (1974a) findings were confirmed in the present study. However, the restricted group of respondents in this study limits the present findings to characteristics of speakers of the 18 to 25 age group.

As in Jordan's pilot study, the subjects showed no evidence of surprise that Male/Female differences should be expected in Japanese. The high average rate of accuracy in Dialogs 1-4 (80.4%) was also similar to Jordan's results (76%). This is a significant indicator that there are clearly-marked features in the Japanese language. In fact, these appear to be so clear that most people can judge the speaker's sex without hearing the voice of the speaker--a judgment made on the content of the utterance alone (see Table 1).

Table 1.

Percentage of Accurate Responses Regarding Speaker Sex
Dialogs 1-4

	Dialog	Speaker	% Correct
Overall Average: 80.4%	1	A	96
		B	100
		C	100
	2	A	100
		B	100
		C	100
	3	A	60
		B	26
	4	A	68
B		34	
C		100	

In one dialog in particular (Dialog 3, hereafter called D3), possibly because of the very informal level of the speech and the fact that the speakers were discussing a subject which the respondents associated with the other sex (two women were discussing the building and costs of houses), the rate of accuracy dropped quite low. In fact, although 26% of the subjects guessed accurately (see Table 1), the majority of the subjects (56%) guessed the sex of Speaker B totally incorrectly and assigned that speaker to the opposite sex. In D3, a large number of the subjects were left very unsure of the sex of both speakers and they assigned them a value of 3 (unclear if male/female) on the 5-point scale (Speaker A: 16% and Speaker B: 18% of the subjects). In D4, the speech of Speaker B (male) also caused much confusion and the subjects' answers ranged over the whole 5-point scale. However, in the evaluations for six of the eleven speakers in D1-D4, the rate of accuracy was 100%. This discrepancy seems to indicate that there must be something in the content of these speakers' utterances that would cause the sex of these particular speakers to be identified so clearly while others were not so clear. This will be made clear in the discussion of sex-marked features which follows.

Because of D5's artificial nature, it was tabulated separately, with the result that Speaker A was generally considered to be female (68%) and Speaker B was thought to be male (86%). In spite of the intentional ambiguity of this dialog, as well as the fact that it never actually took place, a majority of the subjects was able to assign a sex to each of the speakers.

In the correlation of personal characteristics of the subjects with their patterns of answering, very little was found to be significant. A correlation was found to exist between the sex of the speakers and their major fields of study--women more often were pursuing language-related fields and men tended to be in non-language-related fields. But sex, major, parents' backgrounds, hours of TV watching, university affiliation, and future plans were found to have no significant correlation with the ways the subjects answered on the questionnaire.

Unlike Jordan's results, where male and female subjects were found to differ in their answering patterns, general uniformity was the case and no significant differences were found between male and female subjects in the present study.

Regarding accuracy of determination of speaker sex, there was little difference in terms of whether male and female subjects' use of categories 2 and 4 ('probably male/female') were counted as correct answers. In the case of men, there was a 6.6% difference in accuracy as opposed to the women's 6.3% difference. Overall, it seems fair to say that this group of subjects showed no significant difference between men's and women's patterns of response or degree of accuracy. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, it can be considered to be a fairly homogeneous group. This finding differed from Jordan's results. A possible

explanation would be that present-day university students would show more homogeneity than a group of people of mixed ages and professional backgrounds, as were involved in Jordan's study.

Lexical/Grammatical Markers of Speaker Sex:

In an analysis of the lexical/grammatical markers which were considered by the 50 subjects to be indicators of the sex of the speaker, approximately 60 features were isolated. These appear in Table 2. Because of the limitations of the content of the dialogs, certain possible grammatical forms did not appear. Consequently, it is important to keep in mind that the features that were found were reflections only of the content of the questionnaire used in this study, and thus, only a part of Japanese speech in general.

Based upon the application of the formula $\frac{m}{n}$ (see discussion above), these sex-marked features were assigned a value for masculinity or femininity and a hierarchy of these features (based on Jordan's (1974a) proposal for the existence of such a hierarchy) was established (see Tables 3 and 4). Because of D5's different nature, a separate hierarchy was proposed along with the hierarchy for all of the dialogs together. The hierarchy shows values of 1 for maximally masculine and feminine features on either side of a neutral, but marked, zero, representing features which are considered to be used equally by both sexes. This mid-point zero should still be considered somewhat distance from those 'transparent' forms, which received no marking at all by the subjects.

Of the items in the hierarchy, the areas which showed the greatest amount of difference between masculine and feminine speech involved terms of self-reference and address, politeness levels, sentence-final particles, contracted and slang forms, request and command forms, diminutives, styles of laughter, and response forms.¹ As in Jordan's study, these same features were cited repeatedly.

Table 3.

Hierarchy of Sex-Marked Features
Dialogs 1-5

- 1.0000 Maximally Masculine
 - .9000 haha/hehe (laughter)
 - .8100 boku (self-referent)
 - .5314 ore (self-referent)
 - .4800 omae (address form)
 - .4200 Pln + zo (SP)
 - .4200 Pln + Presumptive (daroo)
 - .3000 oi (interjection)
 - .2600 Slang words
 - .2200 da + yo + na (copula + SP + SP)
 - .2000 Negative commands
 - .2000 kimi (address form)
 - .2000 yatsu (address form)
 - .1800 Pln + no sa (SP + SP)
 - .1480 da + yo (copula + SP)
 - .1467 Pln + ka (SP)
 - .1110 Pln + ka na (SP)
 - .1000 wachi (self-referent: slang)
 - .1000 soitsu (address form)
 - .0867 Pln + no + ka na (SP + SP)
 - .0812 Contracted forms
 - .0800 Yobisute (address form)
 - .0741 na (SP: all environments)
 - .0734 da + ne (copula + SP)
 - .0720 da + na (copula + SP)
 - .0647 da forms (copula: total)
 - .0600 sa (SP: all environments)
 - .0600 Pln + no ka (SP + SP)
 - .0534 -chan (diminutive title)
 - .0528 na (SP: not incl. ka na)
 - .0507 sa (SP: not incl. no sa)
 - .0450 sugoi ('amazing')
 - .0400 shikashi ('however')
 - .0400 Pln + ya (SP)
 - .0400 dee (conjunctive particle)
 - .0397 Pln + na (SP)
 - .0350 Pln + yo (SP: not incl. da, na, na no, soo, no, wa)
 - .0300 nonbee ('drunkard')
 - .0240 da + Pln (total)
 - .0200 otoko ('man')
 - .0200 da + yo + ne (copula + SP + SP)
 - .0200 yoshi ('all right')
 - .0200 chodai ('please give')
 - .0200 da + mon (copula + SP)
 - .0200 iya (informal response form: negative)
 - .0150 un + iya (informal response forms)
 - .0116 un (informal response form: positive)

Table 3, continued...

-
- .0115 Pln + -tte (reportative)
 - .0105 Plain forms (total)
 - .0095 Informal responses (total)
 - .0067 chotto ('a little')
 - .0066 are ('that thing')
 - .0037 un + uun (informal response forms)
 - .0022 nanka ('something')
 - 0.0000 Neutral for both male and female speakers
 - .0000 Pln + mon (SP)
 - .0020 Pln + ∅
 - .0029 -san (polite address form)
 - .0050 moo (interjection)
 - .0054 anoo (hesitation filler)
 - .0086 haha/chichi (references for relatives)
 - .0100 -te shimau/-chau (completive form)
 - .0100 -tte (reportative: total)
 - .0100 datte (conjunctive particle)
 - .0114 desu + ka (SP)
 - .0200 janai ('isn't it')
 - .0220 ne (SP: all environments)
 - .0229 -tte (topic marker)
 - .0237 desu/masu forms (polite forms: total)
 - .0271 Pln + ne (SP)
 - .0333 uchi (self-referent)
 - .0334 Polite forms (o-, response forms, desu/masu forms: total)
 - .0400 iie (polite response form: negative)
 - .0400 desu + ne (SP)
 - .0400 dame ('don't')
 - .0400 Pln + mon + ne (SP + SP)
 - .0450 o- (honorific prefix)
 - .0510 Pln + no (SP: incl. no ka, no ka na, no sa, no yo)
 - .0525 Pln + yo (SP: all forms)
 - .0560 Polite response forms (total)
 - .0600 Pln + no (SP: not incl. no ka, no ka na, no sa, no yo)
 - .0600 ee (polite response form: positive)
 - .0600 desu + -kke (question ending)
 - .0695 desu + Presumptive (deshoo)
 - .0734 -(t)te (request form)
 - .1000 uun (informal response form: negative)
 - .1120 na no (SP + SP)
 - .1200 desu + -tte (reportative form)
 - .1400 Pln + wa + yo + ne (SP + SP + SP)
 - .2600 chitchai ('tiny')
 - .2800 kashira (SP)
 - .3000 watashi (self-referent)
 - .3200 ufufu (laughter)
 - .3700 Pln + no + yo (SP + SP)
 - .4600 Pln + wa + yo (SP + SP)
 - .5000 na no + yo (SP + SP + SP)
 - .6000 soo + yo ('so' + SP)
 - 1.0000 Maximally Feminine

Table 4.

Hierarchy of Sex-Marked Features
Dialog 5

- 1.0000 Maximally Masculine
 - .7600 boku (self-referent)
 - .4800 yatsu (address form)
 - .4200 Pln + zo (SP)
 - .3000 oi (interjection)
 - .2000 kimi (address form)
 - .1400 janai ('isn't it')
 - .1300 Pln + ka (SP)
 - .1200 Yobisute (address form)
 - .0400 Pln + ya (SP)
 - .0400 da forms (copula)
 - .0200 Pln + na (SP: total)
 - .0200 iya (informal response form: negative)
 - .0200 yoshi ('all right')
 - .0100 Pln + no (SP)
 - .0067 un + iya (informal response forms)
- 0.0000 Neutral for both male and female speakers
 - .0000 Pln + ne (SP)
 - .0000 un (informal response form: positive)
 - .0222 Plain forms (total)
 - .1000 -te shimau/-chau (completive form)
 - .1266 Pln + no (SP: incl no yo)
 - .2500 Pln + yo (SP)
 - .2800 kashira (SP)
 - .5000 Pln + wa yo (SP + SP)
 - .5400 Pln + no yo (SP + SP)
 - .7200 watashi (self-referent)
- 1.0000 Maximally Feminine

Self-reference Forms:

Probably the single strongest lexical feature was the choice of a term of self-reference by a speaker (terms such as boku, watashi, ore, and uchi 'I'). A number of the highest positions in the hierarchy of features (see Table 3) were boku (M.8100) and ore (M.5314) on the Masculine side, and on the Feminine side, watashi (F.3000) and slightly lower on the scale, uchi (F.0333). In D1 and D2, each speaker uses a term of self-reference at least once, and it is precisely in these two dialogs that the subjects' rate of accuracy on speaker sex is highest (99.3%). It was generally at the appearance of these self-reference forms that the subjects were able to reach a definite conclusion about the sex of a speaker. Since D3 and D4 did not contain a single self-reference form, it also accounts for the subjects' difficulties in identifying the sex of the speakers. Interestingly, in D5, 26% of the respondents made their decision on speaker sex solely on the appearance of the self-reference forms boku and watashi, the most farked features for masculine and feminine (M. 7600 and F.7200, respectively). In other words, no other marker was identified and the self-reference forms were thought to be sufficient indicators of speaker sex.

Address Forms:

Address forms (see Footnote 1 for definition) also rated high on the scale. Omae (M.4800), kimi (M.2000), yatsu (M.2000), and soitsu (M.1000), as well as Yobisute (M.0800, 'discarded address form') were forms generally assigned to males. It generally is the case that these forms are used by males toward males, and not usually by or toward females.

Another address form, -san, was felt to be used by both men and women, (accounting for its near-neutral rating of F. 0029), although in the case of women, it was the only form used in the present set of data.

Formality Levels:

In the present study, formality and informality in verb and adjective forms were divided into three levels: desu/masu forms, da forms, and 'plain forms'. Most grammars of Japanese accept desu/masu forms as the formal level (desu being the formal form of the copula and masu being the formal ending for verbs). The plain forms, making up the informal level of the language, include the non-desu/masu forms and the da forms (the informal form of the copula). In the present study, the respondents identified the da forms and the plain forms quite differently, and thus, although these forms are both informal, they are treated as separate categories.

The forms thought to be used more by women included:

- F.0029 -san (polite address form)
- F.0237 desu/masu forms (polite verb/adjective endings)
- F.0450 0- (honorific prefix)
- F.0560 ee/iie (polite response forms)

Those assigned to male speakers were:

- M.0105 Plain forms (all forms)
- M.0150 un/iya (informal response forms)
- M.0647 da forms (informal verb/adjective endings)

In general, then, it can be seen that women were assigned the use of the more polite, formal forms (composite value of all polite forms: F.0334), while men were thought to use slightly more of the informal level of speech (plain forms, and to a greater degree, da forms), as well as less polite address forms, response forms, and fewer honorifics (i.e. the 0- prefix). Especially the da forms, with their 'harsh sound' were considered to be strongly masculine (M.0647). Plain forms otherwise were much less so, with a rating of M.0105, indicating use by both men and women (though slightly more common to male speakers overall).

Sentence Particles:

Japanese grammarians differ in their analyses and classifications of Sentence Particles (SPs). For the purposes of this study, these particles will be dealt with in a manner which reflects the way in which they were perceived and identified by the subjects involved. The particles no and mono are usually not classed as SPs; however, because of the grammatically unsophisticated nature of the subjects' responses, no and mono were marked separately as features of sex. Thus, they will be included in the category of SPs because of their sentence-final location.

The SPs which were marked for sex in the present data were ka, ka na, mon (shortened form of mono), na, na no, ne, no, sa, wa, ya, and zo.⁴ Kashira 'I wonder', another form marked for sex in the dialogs, can be analyzed (Martin 1975: 936-937) as the question particle ka + shiranu (as in shiranai, 'I don't know'). It, too, only occurred sentence-fianlly, and was identified as a sex marker by the subjects in a way similar to SPs. Based upon this, as well as the fact that Tanaka (1977) includes them in his classification of SPs, it was put into this category with the other SPs.

In categorizing the masculine or feminine qualities of the SPs, it soon became clear that because different particles can be used together with desu/masu, da, or plain forms, as well as with other SPs, their environments were very important contributing factors. In the case of ne and ka, it must be seen that these SPs in themselves have little or no significance as sex markers, but when used in combination with various formality levels of speech, they could be seen as taking on the masculine or feminine qualities of their environments. Thus, usage with a desu/masu form was generally ascribed to women and usage with a da form was generally ascribed to men. When the value for ne was tabulated in all its forms, it did, however, come out as very slightly feminine (F.0220).

This characteristic also applied to the other SPs, but since many of them never were used with desu/masu forms, it became clear that another SP could also greatly influence the masculine or feminine quality of a particle.

In general, the SPs fell into categories as shown below, but as can be seen from Table 5, their values were significantly influenced by other particles used near them.

Table 5.

<u>Feminine Particles</u>		<u>Masculine Particles</u>	
kashira	F.2800	zo	M.4200
no	F.0600	no	
na no	F.1120	no ka	M.0600
no yo	F.3700	no ka na	M.0867
na no yo	F.5000	no sa	M.1800
yo	F.0525	ka na	M.1350
wa yo ne	F.1400	na	M.0741
wa yo	F.4600	da na	M.0720
soo yo	F.6000	da yo na	M.2200
ne	F.0220	sa (alone)	M.0507
		no sa	M.1800
		ya	M.0400

Neutral
mon .0000

In particular, of the SPs, yo and no showed widely varying values, based on their environments, as shown below: (Table 6).

Table 6.

Sex-Marked Features Containing NO and YO
*Pln=Plain forms

<u>NO</u>	<u>YO</u>
<u>Masculine</u>	<u>Masculine</u>
.1800 Pln + no + sa	.2200 da + yo + na
.0867 Pln + no + da + na	.1480 da + yo
.0600 Pln + no + ka	.0400 Pln + ya
.0000 <u>Neutral</u>	.0350 Pln + yo (not incl. combinations)
.0510 Pln + no (all forms)	.0200 da + yo + ne
.0600 Pln + no (not incl combinations)	.0000 <u>Neutral</u>
.1120 na + no (sent. finally)	.0525 Pln + yo (total of variations)
.3700 Pln + no + yo	.1400 Pln + wa + yo + ne
.5000 na + no + yo	.4600 Pln + wa + yo
	.6000 soo + yo
<u>Feminine</u>	<u>Feminine</u>

Contracted and Slang Forms:

One very large group into which many marked features fell was the category of contracted forms. In general, informal speech in Japanese contains many shortened or contracted forms, and interestingly, a general tally of markings revealed that these forms were considered to be predominantly masculine (M.0812).

Table 7. Contracted Forms

<u>Contracted Forms</u>	<u>Non-Contracted Equivalent</u>	<u>Gloss</u>
akko	asoko	'over there'
jan	kanai	'isn't it?'
koe	kowai	'I'm scared'
korya	kore wa	'this (TOPIC)'
(narana)kya	(narana)kereba	'(sound)' CONDITIONAL
kudaran	kudaranai	'worthless'
mottekun	motte iku no	'take to _____'
nannai	narana	'it doesn't sound'
(Taniguchi)n toko	(T) no tokoro	'(Taniguchi)'s place'
shaberun	shaberu no	'to speak'
shabettoru	shabette iru	'to be speaking'
soide	sore de	'and then'
son nanja	sonnano ja	'if it's one like that'
son nara	soo nara	'if it's that way...'
son toki	sono toki	'that time'
sunnayo	suru na yo	'don't do it'
(torare)tonno	(torare) te iru no	'to be taken'
wakannai	wakaranai	'I don't understand'
yanno	yaru no	'Are you going to _____?'

Also related to contractions were 'slang' forms (e.g., wachi, a self-referent related to watashi 'I'; and ossan, an address form related to oji-san 'old man') which were also assigned to male speakers (M.2600).

Request and Command Forms:

Three different request and command forms were marked for sex: -na (negative command ending), M.2000; -(t)te (request ending), F.0734; and choodai (informal request form), M.0200. The most strongly marked negative command form, -na, being a negative form, its strong sense of prohibition may be the reason for its being attributed to males. The subjects suggested that a female speaker would use one of the other forms in giving a command (if they didn't choose to use some less demanding form, such as a request form, that is).

Miscellaneous Marked Features:

Other lexical/grammatical forms which were identified as characteristic of one or the other sex were as follows (see Table 3 for values):

<u>Masculine</u>		<u>Feminine</u>	
are	'that thing	anoo	(hesitation filler)
chotto	'a little'	dame	'don't'
dee	(conjunctive particle)	datte	(conjunctive particle)
nanka	'something'	janai	'isn't it?'
nonbee	'drunkard'	moo	(interjection)
otoko	'man'	-tte	(topic marker)
shikashi	'however'	chitchai	'tiny'
sugoi	'amazing!'	-tte	(reportative verb ending)
yoshi	'all right'	-kke	(question marker which seeks confirmation from the listener)

The majority of these items were very weakly marked for masculine or feminine.

Laughter Styles:

Another interesting result in terms of stereotyped differences in male/female speech was in the area of styles of laughter. According to the subjects, men laugh as haha or hehe, while women laugh as ufufu. These opinions seemed to be widely held, as shown though the very high numerical values attached to them by the subjects (haha/hehe: M.9000; ufufu: F.3200). However, one must be cautioned in an interpretation of these figures in that it is highly likely that they are the result of a transcriber's bias. Nevertheless, the fact that it was marked so strongly cannot be ignored. The beliefs about the way men and women laugh can be traced back to the custom where women typically cover their mouths when they laugh. This is based on the notion that a woman should not show her open mouth to another person when laughing.

Content-Related Indicators of Speaker Sex:

Analysis of the free responses in the third section of the questionnaire revealed two distinct categories of responses. The first involved the subject matter of a person's speech that revealed that he or she played a particular role that coincided with certain stereotypical sex roles in Japanese society. By reading a person's speech, a reader could see which role he or she assumed and then could judge that speaker's sex accordingly (independently, or in addition to lexical/grammatical sex markers, that is). These are 'socially-related' speech indicators of sex.

Some of these 'socially-related' speech indicators included the notions that women can't drink as much as men, if at all; that women go to their husband's home upon marriage; and that women are more easily frightened than men. Men, on the other hand, were thought to be more likely to discuss the building of houses than women.

These subject-matter-related markers become very important in that

it is highly likely that their existence gives many subtle clues to a reader about the sex of the speakers. The question is, to what extent did this information influence the subjects in their identification of sex markers? Since this involved such subtle bits of information about the speakers, no way was found to measure their effect on the subjects' judgments in the present study. However, it is important to recognize that overt lexical/grammatical markers work together with the less clear, but nevertheless revealing information contained in the subject matter of a person's speech.

The second category of content-related indicators consists of the 'discourse-related' indicators. In other words, these are strings of words (often whole phrases or utterances), involving the way a person spoke, that led the reader to come to certain conclusions about the speaker's sex. Usually these are related to social stereotypes also, but primarily in terms of the style or manner of speech (how it was spoken) rather than the subject matter of the utterance (what was said). Unlike Jordan's results, where very few comments with any sex connection were found, the present study was able to elicit comments describing several masculine/feminine traits.

Men were thought to be somewhat more blunt, curt, brusque, or direct than women. The conversation of men was also variously described as 'frivolous and insincere' (D2), 'frank and casual' (D2), and 'not polite' (D2). Men were given the credit for saying things that were 'bigger' (D1) and for being the ones who 'stimulated the conversation' (D1).

Women, on the other hand, were described as 'speaking in a cute way' (D3), being 'mild and meek' (D1), and 'childish' (D3, D4). In general, they were described as more polite, but the occurrence of much hesitation made their speech seem 'round-about' (D2). D3 in particular inspired many comments to the effect that 'men wouldn't throw the conversation around in this way', and that the 'flow of speech, the method of questioning, and the role of asking questions is that of a women'. Men evidently wouldn't 'repeat things as much'.

Dialog 5:

D5 was primarily an attempt to check on how much real *awareness* there was among the subjects regarding sex-related markers in their language. As a result, it revealed some of the most interesting findings of this study. By mixing up some of the male/female features which had already been tentatively identified by previous linguistic analysis, D5 was a test as to whether the subjects would see through its guise as a 'natural' piece of discourse.

In spite of its being an artificial dialog, most of the subjects were able to assign a sex to each speaker: Speaker A was female and Speaker B was male (see Table 8).

Table 8.

Judgments regarding speaker sex (Dialog 5)
(% of respondents)

	Male	Unknown	Female
Speaker A	8	24	68
Speaker B	86	10	4

The features marked in D5 were fairly consistent with those marked for the other dialogs in spite of the fact that one found masculine and feminine markers in each speaker's use of words. However, the general comments on this dialog show that the subjects were not quite as sure of themselves as it may appear. The subjects indicated through their comments that they were somewhat puzzled by the utterances in the dialog and tried to provide various explanations for their confusion:

- 'The first-person form and the use of words don't match'.
- 'It seems like an active woman and a weak man'.
- 'If A is a woman, she speaks to B as an equal'.
- 'Both speakers could be either sex'.
- 'Men's and women's speech is becoming all mixed up'.
- 'I wouldn't speak this way, but maybe some people would'.

A number of the respondents were very close to the truth about D5's artificial nature, but several were totally convinced of their opinions, as exemplified by the comment, 'A is definitely male!' Only one person hit the nail on the head by asking, 'Didn't you make this up to test us?'

Summary and Further Implications:

In summary, then, it is evident that young adult Japanese speakers of the 18 to 25 age group do indeed have a clear concept of sex-related features in their language, in spite of the continuing popular insistence that these features are disappearing. With the establishment of a tentative hierarchy, it is also clear that different morphemes and lexical items have different relative values with regard to degree of markedness for sex. Of these markers, self-referents, sentence-final particles, and politeness levels are the most statistically significant. In a number of cases, forms that appear to be sex markers in their own right, such as the particles ne and ka, are actually relatively neutral, but are perceived as masculine or feminine according to what precedes them. Subjects showed some lack of agreement when it came to certain 'grey' or more neutral areas of sex markers. This is only natural because some of these forms can be used by both sexes to a greater or lesser degree.

On the other hand, the fact that quite a number of subjects were rather misled by Dialog 5 makes it seem as though many of these features are not quite as clear-cut as many people would like to believe. And it is precisely this trait that the hierarchy proposed in this study tries to account for. Describing these features as belonging to a hierarchy allows for the fact that a person may use a feature that is highly marked for a person of the opposite sex. Indeed, the value of that feature in the hierarchy is the result of an attempt to show the probability of what the sex of a person who uses a given feature will be.

It is also interesting that many subjects, upon reading D5, tried to account for the confusion they felt about it by trying to find another explanation for the mixed-up speech in the dialogs they read. However, considering the fact that the subjects were able to identify a substantial variety of sex markers, it is reasonable to hypothesize that an awareness of sex-marked features in Japanese is still a very significant part of knowing that language.

There is still much that needs to be done before a comprehensive analysis of sex as a sociolinguistic variable in Japanese can be presented. Future studies will need to find a method which avoids ambiguity in the way respondents mark features associated with sex. This is true for both lexical/grammatical and content-related features. Possibly some future study will also better be able to elicit comments from respondents concerning the styles of speech associated with the different sexes. Also, because of the overall informal nature and limited length of the dialogs in the present study, many possible grammatical (and even content-related) forms did not appear. In order to completely describe sex-marked features in Japanese, future studies will need to expand on the variety of possible forms which can be elicited from the respondents. Future studies will also need to sample both language use and attitudes about its use in order to gain a more complete picture of language use in Japanese.

NOTES

1 Response forms can be defined as those words used to indicate positive or negative agreement, as well as to acknowledge having heard what the speaker has said.

2 Takao Suzuki, in his book, Japanese and the Japanese--Words in Culture (1978: 93) argues for substituting the terms self referent and address form for the concept of pronouns when referring to the Japanese language. He argues for this change because the use of reference and address forms in Japanese is substantially different from the use of pronouns in Indo-European languages, and there is considerable overlap between the equivalents of '2nd- and 3rd-person pronouns' in Japanese. Since these terms represent useful categories for the present study, they will be used instead of the more common term 'pronoun'.

3 'Plain Forms' are generally considered to be the informal (non-desu/masu) forms of verbs and adjectives. For the purposes of this study, they have been defined slightly differently and exclude da forms as well.

4 Linguists have long argued over the semantic content of the sentence-final particles in Japanese. For the sake of providing a simple gloss for these particles, they are defined below in a very loose way. For a more complete analysis and explanation of their meaning, see Tanaka (1977).

ka--question particle

ka na--question particle + na: 'I wonder'

mon--nominalizer, assertive particle

na--variant of ne?--particle which seeks confirmation from listener, somewhat rough

na no--often described as variant of da + no--mildly assertive

ne--particle which seeks confirmation from listener

no--mildly assertive particle

sa--assertive particle--rough equivalent of 'you see?'

wa--very mildly interjective particle

ya--variant of yo?--assertive particle

yo---assertive particle (strong)

zo--very strongly assertive particle, demanding

REFERENCES

- Gengo Seikatsu 'Language Life' 1972, 1975. Selected Dialogs.
- Ide, Sachiko. 1979. 'Daigakusei no Hanashi Kotoba ni Mirareru Danjo Sai: Chuukan Happyoo' (Male/Female Differences as Seen in the Spoken Language of University Students: A preliminary report), Paper presented at the Sixth I.C.U. Sociolinguistics Symposium.
- Ide, Sachiko, S. Ikuta, Y. Kitagiri, and I. Aoki. 1980. A bibliography of Contemporary Male/Female Language in Japanese. Unpub. Paper.
- Jorden, Eleanor. 1974a. 'Female Speech: Persisting Myth and Persisting Reality', in Report of the Second U.S.-Japan Joint Sociolinguistics Conference, Tokyo: Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, pp. 103-107.
- _____. 1974b. 'Language--Female and Feminine', In Proceedings of a U.S.-Japan Sociolinguistic Meeting, San Antonio, Texas: Trinity Univ. Press, pp. 57-70.
- Kramer, Cheris. 1978a. 'Perceptions of Female and Male Speech', Language and Speech, 20, pp. 151-161.
- _____. 1978b. 'Women's and Men's Ratings of their own Ideal Speech', Communication Quarterly, 26, pp. 2-11.
- Martin, Samuel. 1975. A Reference Grammar of Japanese, New Haven: Yale Univ. Press.
- McGlaufflin, Deborah. 1978. 'The Status of Women's Language in Hawaiian Japanese', Unpub. Reprint of Paper Presented at the Fifth I.C.U. Sociolinguistics Symposium.
- Smith, Philip. 1979. 'Sex Markers in Speech', In Social Markers in Speech. (H. Giles and K. Scherer, eds.), Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, pp. 109-146.
- Suzuki, Takao. 1978. Japanese and the Japanese--Words in Culture. Tokyo: Koodansha International.
- Tanaka, Akio. 1977. 'Hyoogen Naiyoo o Aite ni Mochikakeru Shuuujoshi' (Sentence-Final Particles which Work to Ask Hearer's Consent) in Nihongo (Japanese) 7, Bumpoo (Grammar) II. Tokyo: Iwanami Kooza, pp. 359-445.
- Thorne, Barrie and Nancy Henley, eds. 1975. Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance, Rowley Mass: Newbury House.