Elements of Plus-level Style Shifts in Japanese: Determining the Boundaries in Style Shift Occurence
van der Schaaf, Daniëlle

Citation
Van der Schaaf, D. (2022). *Elements of Plus-level Style Shifts in Japanese: Determining the Boundaries in Style Shift Occurence*.

Elements of Plus-level Style Shifts in Japanese

—Determining the Boundaries in Style Shift Occurence—

Daniëlle van der Schaaf

s1780026

Leiden University

MA Asian Studies (120 EC) Master's Thesis

1 july, 2022

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

The phenomenon known as *keigo* or honorifics, has been described as "an elaborate system that includes grammatically encoded polite forms, special vocabulary, and several terms of address for self and others" (Takeuchi 2021). It is an indispensable part of the Japanese language, based on a report by the Japanese Agency for Cultural Affairs (the *Bunkachō*) from 2000, which is further supported by a study from the same agency from 2004 that concluded an overall 96,1% of 3000 participants that answered *keigo* was 'necessary' or 'somewhat necessary' (Bunkachō 2000; Bunkachō, 2004). This is often linked to the importance of politeness and social hierarchy in Japanese culture. However, as research has also shown, expressing politeness or deference is not the only function of *keigo* (Cook, 2008; Dunn, 2005; Obana, 2016; Obana, 2017; Obana, 2021; Okamoto, 2011; Okamoto & Shibamoto-Smith, 2016; Okushi, 1997; Pizziconi, 2011; Takiura, 2007; Yoshida & Sakurai, 2005). In fact, *keigo* usage has a variety of functions, including the construction of the speaker's identity, manipulating or playing into the situation and the speaker's relation to other interlocutors, as well as expressing one's emotions and feelings, as will be explained in more detail in chapter 2. These functions aren't simply products of using *keigo* or not, but can attributed to so-called 'style shifts' as well. The term 'style shift' refers to a change in speech style between two interlocutors, often in the middle of an exchange. In this thesis, it will refer to a change from a speech style that does not use *keigo* to one that does (also called a 'plus-level shift'; Obana, 2017), or a change from a speech style that does use *keigo* to one that does not (also called a 'minus-level shift') A more detailed explanation of this phenomenon will be given in chapter 2.

In this thesis I will dive deeper into the phenomenon of style shifts and the different factors that influence the viability of the occurence of style shifts. I will start by explaining in greater detail how exactly *keigo* works grammatically and the different types that *keigo* can be classified into in this chapter. After that, I will conduct a detailed literature review and determine the current state of research into *keigo* in chapter two. Then, I will introduce my own study, its methodology, the results it produced, and an in-detail discussion of what this means for *keigo* research as a whole in chapters 3, 4, and 5. Finally, in chapter 6 I will reflect on this research, as well as discuss how this type of research could be improved upon in the future, and what kind of knowledge is still lacking.

1.1 *Keigo* in the Japanese language

Generally referred to in English under the term 'honorifics', *keigo* in the Japanese language encompasses an elaborate system within the language's grammar used to express respect and politeness, but also the speaker's relation to the addressee or the referent, and even the speaker's

identity (Barke, 2010; Dunn, 2005; Hasegawa, 2014; Hudson, 2011; Okamoto and Shibamoto-Smith, 2016; Okamoto, 2011; Obana, 2017; Takiura 2007, Yoshida and Sakurai, 2005). In this section, I will explain the different subtypes of *keigo* and how their functions can be distinguished from one another, using example sentences to show how they are used in language.

1.1.1 *Teineigo*

Teineigo, also known as *taisha keigo*, or 'addressee honorifics', is the first subtype of *keigo*, and, as the name suggests, is used to express politeness to the listener. This type of *keigo* is used on the level of the sentence. Also called the *desu/masu* form, for reasons that will be clear from the examples below, it is used as follows:

1	*kore*	*wa*	*ki*	*da*
	this	TOP	tree	COP:NPST[1]

'This is a tree'

2	*kore*	*wa*	*ki*	*desu*
	this	TOP	tree	COP:POL:NPST

'This is a tree'

3	*kono*	*doresu*	*wa*	*akai*
	this	dress	TOP	be-red:NPST

'This dress is red'

---

[1] Glossing uses the following abbreviations:
TOP = topic marker;
NOM = nominative case marker;
ACC = accusative case marker;
DAT = dative case marker;
GEN = genitive case marker;
Q = question marker;
COP = copula;
NPST = nonpast tense;
PAST = past tense;
POL = polite language (using addressee honorirfics);
HON = honorific language (using referent honorifics);
HUM = humble language (using referent honorifics)

4   *kono   doresu wa   akai desu*

      this   dress   TOP   be-red:POL:NPST

      'This dress is red'

Examples 2 and 4 contain addressee honorifics in the form of the word *desu* — either replacing the copula, or being added to an adjective.

5   *kusuri   wa   mainichi   nomu*

      medicine   TOP   every day   drink:NPST

      '(I) take medicine every day'

6   *kusuri   wa   mainichi   nomimasu*

      medicine   TOP   every day   drink:POL:NPST

      '(I) take medicine every day'

Example 6 contains addressee honorifics in the form of the auxiliary verb *masu*, added to the verb at the end of the sentence and affecting the utterance as a whole. Both *desu* and *masu* are usually only found at the end of a sentence, though exceptions are not rare.

1.1.2 *Sonkeigo* and *kenjōgo*

The second major subtype of *keigo* is known as *sozai keigo*, or 'referent honorifics', which can further be divided into *sonkeigo* (honorific language) and *kenjōgo* (humble language). This type of *keigo* is used to express deference to the referent, which can be the listener or a third person not partaking in the exchange themselves. Referent honorifics are applied to individual words and do not necessarily affect a sentence as a whole. In this way, *sonkeigo* is applied to the target of deference, including their possessions or actions, elevating them, while *kenjōgo* is applied to the speaker and their inner circle, humbling them down (Okamoto and Shibamoto-Smith, 2016). Referent honorifics are used as follows:

7   *sensei   ga   tegami wo   kaita*

      teacher   NOM   letter   ACC   write:PAST

      'The teacher wrote a letter.'

8   *sensei*   *ga*   *tegami wo*   *o-kaki ni natta*

     teacher   NOM letter   ACC   write:HON:PAST

     'The teacher wrote a letter.'

9   *sensei*   *ga*   *tegami wo*   *kakareta*

     teacher   NOM letter   ACC   write:HON:PAST

     'The teacher wrote a letter.'

Examples 8 and 9 both include *sonkeigo*, using the two most common ways to transform a verb from its dictionary form to a form expressing *sonkeigo*; respectively *o*-V *ni naru* and V-*(r)areru*, where V represents the verb's stem. These newly formed honorifics are verbs in their own right, and can be conjugated just like the original verb, including adding *teineigo*, as shown below in examples 10 and 11:

10   *sensei*   *ga*   *tegami wo*   *o-kaki ni narimashita*

     teacher   NOM letter   ACC   write:HON:POL:PAST

     'The teacher wrote a letter.'

11   *sensei*   *ga*   *tegami wo*   *kakaremashita*

     teacher   NOM letter   ACC   write:HON:POL:PAST

     'The teacher wrote a letter.'

Other than the two *sonkeigo* forms shown above, which can be applied generally to verbs, many commonly used verbs have entirely different words used to express *sonkeigo* or *kenjōgo*. Example 13 shows the verb *meshiagaru*, the honorific form of the verbs *taberu* (to eat) and *nomu* (to drink):

12   *kēki*   *wa*   *tabemashita*   *ka*

     cake   TOP   eat:POL:PAST   Q

     'Did you eat the cake?'

13   *kēki*   *wa*   *meshiagarimashita*   *ka*

cake   TOP   eat:HON:POL:PAST Q

'Did you eat the cake?'

Kenjōgo, the humbling counterpart to *sonkeigo*, is applied in a very similar way grammatically. A verb can be conjugated into *kenjōgo* using the structure *o-V suru*, where, as above, V refers to the verb's stem. Example 15 shows an example using *kenjōgo*:

14   *nimotsu   mochimasu*

      luggage   hold:POL:NPST

      '(I) will hold (your) luggage.'

15   *o-nimotsu   o-mochi shimasu*

      luggage:HON hold:HUM:POL:NPST

      '(I) will hold (your) luggage.'

In addition to *kenjōgo* used on the verb *motsu*, to hold, which is the action the speaker is about to perform, sentence 15 also includes *sonkeigo* referring to the addressee's belongings, showing deference to them while lowering the speaker themselves down. In addition, sentence 15 also contains *teineigo*, as is almost always the case when the target of deference is also the addressee.

As is the case with *sonkeigo*, many commonly used verbs have seperate words to act as their *kenjōgo* equivalent, as can be seen in sentences 16 and 17:

16   *ashita   sensei   ni   kikimasu*

      tomorrow   teacher   DAT   ask:POL:NPST

      '(I) will ask the teacher tomorrow.'

17   *ashita   sensei   ni   ukagaimasu*

      tomorrow   teacher   DAT   ask:HUM:POL:NPST

      '(I) will ask the teacher tomorrow.'

Finally, referent honorifics can be applied to other word classes as well. Sentences 18 and 19 below include examples of *sonkeigo* used to modify an *i*-adjective and noun, respectively. Other forms of honorifics, such as the phenomenon known as *bikago*, or 'beautifying language', where

keigo is used to 'beautify' one's speech, differing first person pronouns, differing forms of address including suffixes to the referent's name, and seperate words for specific nouns including differing prefixes to those are also used in *keigo*, but are beyond the scope of this chapter, though some can be seen in the material used in the experiment described in chapter 3.

18   *hime-sama   wa   o-utsukushii*
      princess   TOP   be-beautiful:HON:NPST
      'The princess is beautiful.'

19   *kore   ga   sensei   no   o-nimotsu   desu*
      this   NOM   teacher   GEN   luggage:HON COP:POL:NPST
      'This is the teacher's luggage.'

All of the examples above show the different ways in which keigo is applied from a grammatical standpoint.

1.2 Purpose of this study

The purpose of this study is to deepen the current understanding of the various functions of *keigo*, including both when used as a speaker's default speech style and when used in a style shift. In this study, I will attempt to do so, not by analyzing occurences of style shifts themselves, but by gauging Japanese native speakers' perceptions of when, where and how style shifts are possible. By isolating several elements of utterances containing style shifts, and tweaking those, I seek to find the border between what circumstances can prompt style shifts and what circumstances can't. In the next chapter, I will discuss the current state of research regarding *keigo* and style shifts, and what research questions and hypotheses I have derived from it.

2. Literature Review

Research into the topic of *keigo* is heavily tied to research regarding politeness itself, and thus many studies draw on classic works such as Brown & Levinson (1978, 1989), which has described *keigo* as a 'negative politeness strategy', falling into the same category as apologies and requests meant to save one's 'negative face', i.e. one wants to be unimpeded (Brown & Levinson, 1978, 1989; Obana, 2021). This view of *keigo* has however been heavily criticized, most famously by Ide (1989, 1992, 2006), who argues that the choice of whether to use *keigo* is dictated by societal

norms, a phenomenon she refers to as *wakimae*. Yet, many scholars since have presented evidence that though *keigo* usage is indeed dictated by *wakimae*, it is also dynamic and the subject of linguistic strategies. One interesting way this has been shown is through style shifts, the subject of this thesis. As will be discussed in this chapter, *keigo* can serve many functions, starting with its normative function of showing respect or politeness, and including a variety of other functions researchers have found by analyzing style shifts.

The most important thing to recognize here, is that *keigo* can be used dynamically, with speakers changing their strategies according to their linguistic goals (Obana, 2021). It does not contribute to the semantic content the way other elements of an utterance do, but rather functions as a conversion of social context to a grammatical system (Obana, 2021). For example, a student asking her professor a question might use *keigo* to mark the vertical distance between herself and her professor. In this case, the hierarchy between them is social context — it exists outside of her question. Yet, its existence is reflected in the grammar she uses. Style shifts function in a similar way, but rather than reflecting vertical or horizontal distance, something that is always present, they reflect more short-lived social context, such as the speaker's feelings. This will be discussed in more detail in section 2.2.

2.1 Style shifts

The phenomenon here refered to as a 'style shift' has been researched under many different names, including 'style shift' (Cook 2008), 'speech style shifting' (Isaka, 2010), and 'speech level shifts' (Obana, 2017; Obana, 2021), as well as in researches that do not specifially name or define it (Okushi 1997; Yoshida and Sakurai, 2005), but ultimately refers to the same thing: a temporary shift from a speaker's default speech style under a certain set of circumstances to a different speech style. A style shift can be brought upon for many reasons, some of which will be lined out and discussed in depth below in section 2.2, and depending on what reasons incited it, the nature of the shift can be expected to vary as well. To reiterate, in this thesis I will discuss two distinct types of style shifts: 'plus-level shifts', which are style shifts from a speech style that does not use *keigo* to one that does, and 'minus-level shifts', which are style shifts from a speech style that does use *keigo* to one that does not (Obana, 2017).[2]

---

[2] Other types of style shifts include shifts to and from regional dialects, and shifts in the use of gendered language (Jones & Ono, 2008).

Although in this research I will focus solely on plus-level shifts, I will discuss literature regarding both in this section, as understanding how these different types of style shifts relate to each other can in turn help us understand them individually.

2.1.1 Plus-level shifts

Plus-level shifts, though rarer than minus-level shifts, according to a study by Okushi (1997), can have a wide variety of potential meanings and functions, as will be discussed in section 3 of this chapter. Plus-level shifts include shifts to any type of *keigo* usage, including both addressee honorifics and referent honorifics, or a combination of both. It is not expected though that every type of *keigo* can be used for every type of shift, as is the hypothesis of the current study, though which works in what type of situation is not yet clear.

One example of a plus-level shift can be found in Okushi (1997), where a girl eating dinner with her family notices her napkin is wrinkled. When she asked what happened to it, her mother responded as follows:

20   *watashi   ga   tsukatta n desu.   suimasen.   machigaimashita.*
      I   NOM   use:POL:PAST   sorry:POL   mistake:POL:PAST
      'I have used it. I'm sorry. I made a mistake.'

In this example, a mother uses addressee honorifics when talking to her daughter, something she would normally not do. By combining excessive use of *keigo* with a playful tone, she is attempting to downplay the severity of the situation (Okushi, 1997).

2.1.2 Minus-level shifts

Compared to plus-level shifts, minus-level shifts were found to occur much more frequently (Okushi, 1997). In a study by Isaka (2010), a total of 16 semi-interview conversations between either two native speakers or a native and non-native speaker were analyzed for style shifts, in this case all minus-level shifts. Though the frequency of shifting differed from individual to individual, all native speakers employed the phenomenon throughout their conversations. Analyzing those instances of style shifts, she categroized them into the following five functions: assimilating new information, realization, emotive expression, suggesting candidate wordings, and finally, talking to self (Isaka, 2010).

One example, found in Okushi (1997), shows the use of a minus-level shift in an emotive expression. A woman, after receiving a compliment from her knitting teacher, answers in the following way:

21	*sō*	*desu*	*ka.*	*waa,*	*ureshii!*
	in that way	COP:POL	Q	Oh	be-happy

'Is that so? Oh, I'm glad!'

In the second part of her comment, the woman expresses how happy she is, without using *keigo*, as she normally would when talking to her teacher.

2.2 Functions of *keigo*

The functions of various *keigo* usages (both as a standard speech style and in style shifts) have been studied in prior research, inlcuding both those researches that specifically take a look at style shifts, and those that do not (Cook, 2008; Dunn, 2005; Obana, 2016; Obana, 2017; Obana, 2021; Okamoto, 2011; Okamoto & Shibamoto-Smith, 2016; Okushi, 1997; Pizziconi, 2011; Takiura, 2007; Yoshida & Sakurai, 2005). Though these reported functions can be quite far apart from each other, as shown by the seemingly contradicting functions of *keigo* as a tool to show anger, irony or sarcasm (Obana, 2017; Okushi, 1997; Pizziconi, 2011), and *keigo* as a tool to show playfulness, or to make a conversation more entertaining (Okushi, 1997), one research that tried to unify all of its functions under a single term is Obana (2016). She argued that what unites all functions of *keigo* is the notion of 'distance', which she ties to the horizontal and vertical distance that accompany 'regular' *keigo* usage, and to the various functions of plus-level shifts, including 'formality', 'gratitude', 'carefulness', and 'consideration' (Obana, 2016). In this regard, *keigo* derived from plus-level shifts is not necessarily different from 'regular' *keigo*, she concludes.

Though there certainly is merit in looking for a single term to describe the function of *keigo*, by researching *keigo* as having seperate, though related functions and studying both their similarities and differences, we will be able to see a much more detailed picture of how *keigo* can be — and is — used in the Japanese language, which is why, in this thesis, I will not focus on attempting to find a unifying concept to describe the various functions of *keigo*.

2.2.1 Showing respect or deference

The primary and most notable function of *keigo* is its function as a grammatical tool to show respect or deference to the listener and/or a third party referent. This is done by utilizing its two systems, *taisha keigo*, or addressee honorifics, and *sozai keigo*, or referent honorifics, as explained in chapter 1. Speakers might adhere to a speech style that uses *keigo* because of a number of factors, most notably the existence of either horizontal distance with the subject of *keigo*, i.e. when the

speaker and the subject are not very close, or vertical distance with the subject of *keigo*, because of age, social standing or other factors (Takeuchi, 2021). Speakers might also be influenced by the situation, such as when two friendly coworkers are in a meeting together, they might use honorifics amongst themselves when usually they would not. Furthermore, speakers might also use a speech style including *keigo* to further their own social and linguistic goals, as shown by the deictic nature of *keigo* that can be seen in the existence of style shifts. This is what the speaker in example 20 did; she used *keigo* to achieve her goal of downplaying her mistake. Finally, the concepts of *uchi* and *soto* are of great importance to the use of *keigo* (Takeuchi, 2021), as will be explained in more detail in the next section. Of all the functions of *keigo*, this one is tied the most to Ide's (1989, 1992, 2006) notion of *wakimae*, though there still exists disagreement even among native speakers as to when, and how much *keigo* is appropriate (Okamoto & Shibamoto-Smith, 2016).

One important caveat here is that *keigo* usage and politeness, or showing respect are not one and the same. Pizziconi (2011), drawing on the work of Agha (2007) in her analysis of honorifics, states that using *keigo* is 'neither necessary nor sufficient to show 'respect' or deference". This is because respect can be shown without using *keigo*, i.e. by staying quiet, and *keigo* can be used without showing respect by doing so, as can be seen in sections 2.2.3 through 2.2.5 below discussing its other functions (Pizziconi, 2011).

2.2.2 The notion of *uchi* and *soto*

Now that it is established that *keigo* can be used to express respect or deference to the listener and/or the referent, the next logical question becomes: 'exactly when and with whom is *keigo* used?' The answer to that question is not as simple as it might seem, as there are no iron-clad rules, but there are a few key notions at play here. First, I will examine a study by Okamoto and Shibamoto-Smith (2016), to show that the often-cited simple rule to use *keigo* 'to mark vertical or horizontal distance' is hardly sufficient as an explanation. Then, I will introduce the concept of *uchi* and *soto*, and how they tie into the usage of *keigo*, both when used normatively as a speech style and when used as a style shift.

Okamoto & Shibamoto-Smith (2016) examined data from an earlier study by Okamoto (2011b), where six pairs of participants' conversations were recorded, each with vertical distance and an age difference, but with varying degrees of horizontal distances. The older participants were noted as O1 through O6, and the younger as Y1 through Y6. Unsurprisingly, both the older and younger participants used fewer addressee honorifics the less horizontal distance there was, but there were some interesting observations. Neither O2 nor O4 were close to their conversation partner, yet O2 used honorifics 42% of the time, compared to O4's 3%. The authors give a few

possible explanations for this fact, such as that O4 might prioritize vertical distance over horizontal distance in her choice of speech style, but also that she might be trying to construct a friendly relationship with Y4, or that it is influenced by the fact that the conversation takes place in Y4's home, or a combination of the three (Okamoto & Shibamoto-Smith, 2016). In conclusion, a number of factors can influence a speaker's choice of speech style besides the existence of horizontal or vertical distance, including personal preference, individual perceptions of 'the norm', and influences from the situation, to name a few. The rules for when and where to use *keigo* are not set in stone, yet they are also not as arbitrary as this conclusion might suggest. To understand this, we need to look at the concept of *uchi* and *soto*.

The study of the concepts of *uchi* and *soto* — also called the 'inner group' and 'outer group' respectively — bears nearly unbreakable ties to the study of Japanese behaviour, and its research has spanned widely beyond linguistic research (Wetzel, 1994). The concepts are deicitc by nature; *uchi* must, by default, always include the speaker, but otherwise the boundary between the two is fluid (Wetzel, 1994), and can vary from situation to situation. One example that shows this is given in Takiura (2007). Here, an employee utters the phrase '*kachō mo hontō wa chigau koto wo nasaritai you nan desu ga*' to a coworker from her division, which can be translated as 'It seems the section chief also actually wants to do something else', where she refers to their section chief using *sonkeigo*, showing deference and elevating him. Yet, during a meeting spanning multiple divisions, she utters the following phrase to an employee of a different division, regarding the same section chief: '*watakushi-domo no kachō mo sō mōshite orimasu*', roughly translating to 'Our section chief also mentioned as such.' In this sentence, she refers to her section chief using *kenjōgo*, humbling him down. This seems contradictory, seeing as he is her boss and therefore higher in standing, but this can be explained using the notions of *uchi* and *soto*. In the first interaction, she and her coworker were part of *uchi*, the inner group, and the boss was part of *soto*, the outer group. Then, when talking to an employee of a different division in the company, the boundary between *uchi* and *soto* was moved to include her boss, being in the same division as her. This results in the employee using *kenjōgo*, humbling language, when referring to her boss, as he was part of her *uchi* at this point in time (Takiura, 2007).

2.2.3 Placing the other interactant in *soto*

As explained above, the line between *uchi* and *soto* is not set in place, and can move between different situations and with different interlocutors. However, it can also move within the same set of circumstances, and even within a single conversation (Takiura, 2007). For example, getting angry with the other interactant might result in removing them from *uchi* and expelling them into *soto*.

Conversely, an attempt to get closer to the other interactant might lead to them being drawn inside *uchi*. These shifts in the line between *uchi* and *soto* can linguistically be marked by a style shift — a plus-level shift in the former case, and a minus-level shift in the latter. Switching our perspective around, this means that one function of *keigo* is as a 'linguistic marker that the referent has been pushed into the *soto* context.' This can happen for a variety of reasons, including sarcasm, criticism, anger, and irony (Takiura, 2007; Pizziconi, 2011; Obana, 2017; Okushi 1997).

One clear example of a switch like this can be found in Pizziconi (2011). She offers up the example sentence '*ashita made ni todokete itadakemasu ka?*' ('Could you (kindly) deliver it by tomorrow?') and discusses how this sentence might fit into different contexts, one of which being a married couple going through a divorce. In this case, the speaker, the wife, is displaying a cold, or even hostile attitude toward her soon-to-be ex-husband, and does so by using excessive *keigo* when speaking to him. In this way, she marks the social distance created between them by expelling him into *soto* territory (Pizziconi, 2011).

2.2.4 Indexing a role or identity

Cook (2008) discussed the use of the *masu*-form the perspective of self awareness. She described one function of *keigo*, specifically *teineigo*, or addressee honorifics, as being used when the speaker presents themselves 'on-stage'. Referring to the notion of a 'self-presentational stance', she defines it as the 'self which presents an on-stage display of a positive social role to the addressee' (Cook, 2008). She supports the idea of *keigo* originating from a speaker's self awareness by noting that Japanese children often start preferring the use of *keigo* to speak to someone in the *soto* context around the time they start puberty, when they become 'more conscious of their behaviour' (Cook, 2008).

After analyzing data from parent/child conversations, Cook (2008) specifically listed the following as functions of the *masu*-form: using set formulas, such as *itadakimasu* (I humbly receive, using both *kenjōgo* and *teineigo*) which is said before eating; indexing a variety of social identities, including those of an authoritative figure, a teacher, and a mother (when serving food); and quoting the speech of others, specifically those in the *soto* context. Children are reported to acquire the social skills necessary to use *teineigo* in these dynamic contexts by the age of three, as shown by data from Cook (1997) and Nakamura (2002).

Yoshida & Sakurai (2005), a different research that analyzed data from conversations within a family, reported similar findings. Their data included similar plus-level style shifts, which they analyzed could be the result of taking on a role, similar to Cook (2008). They then went one step further by tying this back to the concept of identity, referring to Markus & Kitayama's (1991)

'interdependent self'. Speakers would switch freely between one of their many 'role-oriented identities' given within a specific situational context, and adapt speech styles accordingly. Contrary to Cook's analysis, the speaker does not assume a role as a form of public display, but uses roles that are part of their own identity (Yoshida & Sakurai, 2005).

2.2.5 Comprehensive lists of functions of plus-level shifts

One research focused on categorizing functions of plus-level shifts by examining previous studies was Obana (2017). She places the functions of plus-level shifts into the following three groups: group A, 'creating a psychological barrier', group B, 'placing oneself on a public stage', and group C, 'careful, tentative approach to the other interactant'. Group A has very strong ties to the type of plus-level shifts discussed in 3.2.2, where the psychological barrier could be interpreted as the line between *uchi* and *soto*. *Keigo* usage to show anger, irony, criticism, sarcasm, but also weakness or vulnerability fall in this category. Group B is based on the works here discussed in 3.3, regarding *keigo* usage to take on a role, or express one's role-oriented identity, and works in a similar way to how a formal situation might lead a speaker to start using *keigo* (Obana, 2017). Examples of *keigo* usage in this group include expressing authority, taking on a role, and presenting oneself. Finally, group C includes all types of plus-level shifts where a careful approach is warranted, such as when conveying (important) information, stating one's own opinions, or when making a request (Obana, 2017). Apologizing or delivering bad news would also fall under this category.

Another research that attempted to register as complete a list of functions of *keigo* as possible was Okushi (1997). Although she did not make as strict a distinction between regular *keigo* usage and style shifts as seen in later researches, instead marking a instance of *keigo* as what she refeers to as '[+AH] forms' (where AH stands for addressee honorifics) when an utterance 'could have not used *keigo*', most of her categorizations are still relevant, as many are supported by data that does indeed include style shifts. Focussing on just the plus-level shifts she analyzed, we can find some overlap with Obana's (2017) findings, such as the use of *keigo* for expressing sarcasm or criticism or to promote clear communication, which respectively fall under groups A and C in the latter research. Moreover, the function that Okushi (1997) labels as 'to express formality and soften imposition' has some overlap with Obana's (2017) group C as well, mainly regarding using *keigo* for apologizing or requesting, but also including greeting and thanking. Finally she refers to one more distinct category in using *keigo* to 'express playfulness', characterized by the use of a playful tone (Okushi, 1997).

2.2.6 Summary

Keigo is deictic in nature, as it has different meanings and functions in different contexts. One way we can research the different functions it holds is by looking at style shifts, which is a 'temporary shift from a speaker's default speech style under a certain set of circumstances to a different speech style'. From previous researches that have looked into this phenomenon, we can conclude the following as functions of *keigo*, other than its normative function of 'showing respect or deference': anger, irony, criticism, sarcasm, and similar acts where the speaker puts up a psychological barrier, pushing the other interactant into *soto*; taking on a role or identity; taking a careful approach, such as when delivering bad news, apologizing, or requesting something; seeking information; and making playful conversation.

All of these sets of circumstances have the possibility of inviting a plus-level shift, as has been observed in prior research. What is missing from this information however, is concrete knowledge of exactly what concrete circumstances make these shifts possible, what concrete circumstances encourage or discourage these shifts, and what type of *keigo* can be used for style shifts under these various circumstances. That is the goal of this research — to figure out what types of circumstances enable, encourage or discourage plus-level shifts. As such, I will attempt to answer the following four research questions about the possibility of plus-level shifts occurring, as described in further detail in the next chapter:

1 What is the effect of speaker gender on the acceptance rate of plus-level shifts?

2 What is the effect of speaker age on the acceptance rate of plus-level shifts?

3 What is the effect of the relationship between interactants, as determined by the speech style of the interactant not performing the style shift, on the acceptance rate of plus-level shifts?

4 What is the effect of the type of *keigo* utilized in style shifts on the acceptance rate of plus-level shifts?

Based on the reviewed literature, I have formulated the following hypotheses:

1 There will be an effect of speaker gender on the acceptance rates of plus-level shifts; being female will encourage plus-level shift occurence. This is because female speakers are, by many, regarded to use more formal language in general (Kinsui, 2003). This phenomenon is known as *onna-kotoba*, also known as *joseigo* or

17

women's language — a subtype of *yakuwarigo*, or role language.

2   There will be no effect of speaker age on the acceptance rates of plus-level shifts; there is currently no evidence suggesting this.

3   There will be an effect of relationship between interactants, as determined by the speech style of the interactant not performing the style shift, on the acceptance rates of plus-level shifts; conversations where the other speaker uses *keigo* will encourage plus-level shifts, as both participants will match each other's speech style.

4   There will be an effect of the type of *keigo* utilized on the acceptance rates of plus-level shifts; usage of addressee honorifics will make it easier for style shifts to occur, as these have been used in the majority of examples of plus-level shifts in prior research.

3. Methodology

In this chapter, I will discuss the methodology used in this research to collect data, including information about the participants, the questionnaire used, as well as information on the raw data used to construct the questionnaire. First, however, I will explain what type of information can be gained from holding a questionnaire such as this one, and why this is the type of information that will be useful in the current study.

Most studies into plus-level style shifts have been qualitative studies, analyzing data from a small set of participants, if any. This works very well if the goal of the study is to figure out why something happens, in this case a style shift. However, as mentioned in chapter one, in this study I aim to find out where the border between the possibility of a style shift occurring and the lack thereof lies. This means that analyzing existing style shift data is insufficient as a research method, since a lack of evidence, i.e. not finding a style shift under specific circumstances, can never be decisive proof to the contrary. For this reason, I devised a questionnaire with created sentences. Okamoto & Shibamoto-Smith (2011) in their analysis of a series of blog posts regarding *keigo* usage shows us how Japanese' speakers perception of what is appropriate and what is not can differ. Since any one speaker might hold perceptions not shared by the majority of native speakers, a qualitative study with a small number of participants carries an innate risk of not being representative. Therefor, it was determined a quantitive study would yield more useful results.

3.1 The questionnaire

The questionnaire was conducted online in april and may of 2022. All participants were native speakers of Japanese, but had otherwise no restrictions. They were tasked with determining the possibility of a series of style shifts appearing in natural Japanese. The questionnaire opened with an introduction explaining what style shifts are, and how they would be marked in the questions. This was necessary to make sure participants did not judge any other aspect of the conversation excerpt. Every question contained a short introduction with necessary background information, an excerpt of conversation containing a style shift, followed by the question 'Do you think this style shift could appear in natural Japanese?', with three multiple choice answers: 'It could', 'It could not', and 'I cannot say'. These questions were then repeated with 1 to 3 variations of the same excerpt, all with a single aspect changed, these being the speaker's gender, the speaker's age, the type of *keigo* used in the style shift, and the speech style of the other interactant. All changes were marked in red for the participants' convenience, as well as to make sure none of them were overlooked.

The survey contained 35 seperate conversation excerpts with a total of 42 style shifts. The source material was taken from a variety of Japanese media, including drama series, *anime*, *manga*, and visual novels. There were two reasons for this. First of all, lines written for a script are in most cases intended to emulate natural Japanese conversation. In addition, elements of written scripts that deviate from natural Japanese, such as *yakuwari-go* (Kinsui, 2003) do not usually include style shifts, so it can be expected that any style shifts occurring in media were written because they seemed natural to the author. Secondly, all source conversations were judged by the participants as well as their variations, so any 'unnaturelness' could be easily identified and accounted for in the results.

3.1.1 Structure of the questions

Questions included a short introduction to provide context, followed by the conversation itself. Names were redacted, and replaced by *A-ko* or *B-ko* for female interactants and *A-suke* or *B-suke* for male interactants. Both of these suffixes can be found in many Japanese names, and are clearly gendered. The suffixes *-chan* and *-kun* were used to signify young participants, while the suffix *-san* was used to signify older participants.

Next, let us take a look at one of the questions of the survey, followed by its English translation:

A助くんとB助さんは話しています。A助くんは、雇い主であるB助さんに頼みたいことがありますので、B助さんに声かけしました。

19

A助：だけど、警戒してしすぎることはない。

だから、頼みたいことがある。

B助：ほう、君から私にかね。

それはぜひ、**<u>お聞きしよう</u>**じゃないか。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

A-suke-kun and B-suke-san are talking. A-suke-kun wants to ask B-suke-san, his employer, something, so he called out to him.

A-suke: But, we can never be too careful. So, I have something to ask you.
*B-suke: Oh, from you to me? By all means, I **<u>will hear you out</u>**.*

Do you think this style shift could appear in natural Japanese?

The first two sentences establish the relationship between interactants A and B, namely that of employee and employer, while also stating the necessary background information for the conversation. Interactant B's plus-level shift was marked using bold and underscored interface.

Next, let's take a look at one of this same conversation's variations:

A助くんとB助さんは話しています。A助くんは、雇い主であるB助さんに頼みたいことがありますので、B助さんに声かけしました。

A助：ですが、警戒してしすぎることはありません。
なので、頼みたいことがあるんです。
B助：ほう、君から私にかね。
それはぜひ、**<u>お聞きしよう</u>**じゃないか。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

A-suke-kun and B-suke-san are talking. A-suke-kun wants to ask B-suke-san, his employer, something, so he called out to him.

A-suke: But, we can never be too careful. So, I have something to ask you.
*B-suke: Oh, from you to me? By all means, I **<u>will hear you out</u>**.*

Do you think this style shift could appear in natural Japanese?

In this variant, with changes marked in red, interactant A's speech style was changed to include *keigo*. Other variations of this same conversation inlcuded changes to interactant A's age, and the type of *keigo* interactant B used in his style shift. Changing only one factor at a time in this way allows us to isolate factors that might include the possibility of a style shift occurring in a certain way.

All questions were in multiple choice format, with the following answers: '*arieru*', ('yes, it could appear'); '*arienai*', ('no, it could not appear'); and '*dochira to mo ienai*' ('I cannot say either way').

3.2 The participants

A total of 16 participants answered the questionnaire, 6 of which completed the questionnaire while the other 10 dropped out at various points in the first half of the questionnaire, including 4 who dropped out before the first question. The participants that did answer at least one question included 10 female participants and 2 male participants, 5 participants between the ages of 20 and 29, 6 between the ages of 30 and 39, and 1 between the ages of 50 and 59. The 6 that did complete the questionnaire included 5 female participants, 1 male participant, 2 participants between the ages of 20 and 29, 3 between 30 and 39, and 1 between 50 and 59. All were native Japanese speakers.

4. Results

To determine the acceptance rate of the utterance data used in the study, numerical values were assigned to the various answers — 1 for 'yes, it could appear', 0 for 'no, it could not appear', and 0.5 for 'I cannot say either way. Next, the average for each variation was calculated. Finally, significance for every result was calculated using a sign test, using the average scores as values. The reason that the average score was used, rather than each participant's individual score, is that this does not artificially increase the weight of the earlier questions, which were answered by more participants. If an effect is found to be significant, the strength of the effect is determined by looking at the differences in average acceptance rate, where a difference of less than 0.10 is considered a small effect, a difference between 0.10 and 0.20 a medium effect, and a difference of more than 0.20 a large effect.

The acceptance rate of the original utterances varied between 0.60 and 1, while the acceptance rate for all of the variations varied between 0.15 and 1. This suggests that there are indeed factors

that hinder the appearance of plus-level shifts in Japanese. In the following sections, I will take a look at each of those, and how they affected acceptance rates.

4.1 The effect of speaker gender on the acceptance rate of plus-level shifts

A total of 13 questions tested for a variations in speaker gender, consisting of 6 instances where a female speaker was changed to be male and 7 where a male speaker was changed to be female. Out of the total of 13 variations, 6 saw some kind of change in acceptance rate.

The average acceptance rate for female speakers was 0.96, while the average acceptance rate for male speakers was 0.88. These results were significant at $p < 0.10$ ($p = 0.014$, $Z = 2.449$). This seems to suggest that speaker gender has an effect on the possibility of the occurence of plus-level shifts, with a female speaker making it easier for a plus-level shift to appear.

Acceptance Rates (Gender)

Question	Original Speaker Gender	Acceptance Rate (Female)	Acceptance Rate (Male)
S-001	Female	**0.79**	0.46
S-005	Male	1	1
S-006	Male	1	1
S-010	Female	**1**	0.63
S-013	Female	**1**	0.92
S-018	Male	1	1
S-022	Male	1	1
S-026	Female	0.83	0.83
S-028	Female	**1**	0.83
S-029	Male	**1**	0.92
S-031	Male	**1**	0.92
S-036	Female	1	1
S-037	Male	0.92	0.92

4.2 The effect of speaker age on the acceptance rate of plus-level shifts

A total of 11 questions tested for variations in speaker age, consisting of 10 instances where a young speaker was changed to be old and 1 instance where an old speaker was changed to be young. Out of the total of 11 variations, 5 saw some kind of change in acceptance rate.

22

The average acceptance rate for young speakers was 0.90, while the average acceptance rate for old speakers was 0.88. These results were not significant ($p = 0.655$, $Z = 0.447$). This seems to suggest that speaker age has no effect on the possibility of the occurence of plus-level shifts.

Acceptance Rates (Age)

Question	Original Speaker Age	Acceptance Rate (Young)	Acceptance Rate (Old)
S-001	Young	0.79	**0.82**
S-002	Young	**1**	0.73
S-007	Young	0.65	**0.75**
S-008	Young	1	1
S-013	Young	1	1
S-024	Young	0.66	0.66
S-025	Young	1	1
S-026	Young	0.84	0.84
S-031	Young	0.92	**1**
S-034	Old	1	1
S-035	Young	**1**	0.84

4.3 The effect of relationship on the acceptance rate of plus-level shifts

A total of 15 questions tested for variations in the relationship between interlocutors, as determined by the speech style of the interactant not performing the style shift, consisting of 8 instances where the interactant's speech style was changed to include *keigo*, and 6 instances where the interactant's speech style was changed to not include *keigo*. Additionally, utterance S-009, whose style shift included referent honorifics exclusively was tested for variations regarding the relationship between the speaker and the listeners (S-009A) in addition to variations regarding the relationship between the speaker and the referent (S-009B and S-009C). Out of the total of 17 variations, 5 saw some kind of change in acceptance rate.

The average acceptance rate for equal relationships was 0.83, while the average acceptance rate for inequal relationships was 0.86. These results were not significant ($p = 0.564$, $Z = 0.577$). This seems to suggest that the relationship between interactants, as signified by the speech style of the listener, has no effect on the possibility of the occurence of plus-level shifts.

		Acceptance Rates (Relation)	
Question	Original Listener Speech Style	Acceptance Rate (Plain Form)	Acceptance Rate (Honorifics)
S-004	Plain form	0.60	0.60
S-006	Honorifics	1	1
S-007	Plain form	0.65	0.65
S-009A	Honorifics	0.63	0.63
S-011	Plain form	1	1
S-015	Plain form	1	1
S-017	Plain form	**1**	0.92
S-018	Plain form	1	1
S-019	Honorifics	0.50	**0.84**
S-020	Plain form	0.84	0.84
S-023	Honorifics	0.84	**1**
S-026	Honorifics	0.84	0.84
S-033	Honorifics	0.66	0.66
S-034	Honorifics	1	1
S-037	Plain form	0.92	0.92
Question	Original Relation to Referent	Acceptance Rate (Original)	Acceptance Rate (Variation)
S-009B	Speaker Lower (Formerly)	0.63	**0.75**
S-009C	Speaker Higher (Formerly)	**0.63**	0.44

4.4 The effect of type of *keigo* on the acceptance rate of plus-level shifts

A total of 14 questions tested for variations in the type of *keigo* used in the plus-level shifts, consisting of 10 instances where a shift was changed to use referent honorifics, 3 instances where a shift was changed to use addressee honorifics, and 3 instances where a shift using addressee honorifics was changed to use a different set of addressee honorifics. In addition, question S-008, which contained two style shifts tested both shifts individually for variations including referent honorifics (S-008A and S-008B), as well as both combined (S-008); meanwhile S-003 tested variations where its use of referent honorifics was replaced by addressee honorifics (S-003A) and where it was replaced by no honorifics (S-003B). Out of the total of 18 variations, 16 saw some kind of change in acceptance rate.

Acceptance Rates (Type)			
Question	**Original Honorifics**	**Acceptance Rate (AH)**	**Acceptance Rate (RH)**
S-001	Addressee Honorifics	**0.79**	0.25
S-003A	Referent Honorifics	0.45	**0.85**
S-005	Addressee Honorifics	**1**	0.15
S-007	Referent Honorifics	0.30	**0.65**
S-008	Addressee Honorifics	**1**	0.28
S-008A	Addressee Honorifics	**1**	0.72
S-008B	Addressee Honorifics	**1**	0.33
S-021	Addressee Honorifics	**0.75**	0.33
S-027	Addressee Honorifics	**0.92**	0.42
S-029	Addressee Honorifics	**0.92**	0.42
S-032	Addressee Honorifics	**0.83**	0.42
S-033	Referent Honorifics	0.58	**0.66**
S-036	Addressee Honorifics	1	1
S-038	Addressee Honorifics	**0.83**	0.33
Question	**Original Honorifics**	**Acceptance Rate (Plain Form)**	**Acceptance Rate (RH)**
S-003B	Referent Honorifics	**1**	0.85
Question	**Original Honorifics**	**Acceptance Rate (*desu*)**	**Acceptance Rate (*masu*)**
S-012	*desu*	0.83	0.83
S-029	*-masu*	**1**	0.92
S-031	*-masu*	0.83	**0.92**

The average acceptance rate for style shifts containing addressee honorifics was 0.75, while the average acceptance rate for style shifts containing referent honorifics was 0.49. These results were significant at $p < 0.10$ ($p = 0.052$, $Z = 1.941$). This seems to suggest that the type of *keigo* used in style shifts has an effect on the possibility of the occurence of plus-level shifts, with addressee honorifics making it easier for shifts to occur. Further discussion of these results will follow in chapter 5, as well as an in-depth look at the questions with the highest change in acceptance rate, and variations whose acceptance rate went against the general trends.

5. Conclusion

In this chapter I will take a closer look at the results of the survey, including interpretations of the results regarding the four influencing factors that were tested, an in-depth look at the questions whose acceptance rates either varied drastically from their original versions or those that went against observed trends, and finally the implications that these results have — what can they tell us about plus-level style shifts?

5.1 Overall results

This survey tested for four types of variations on plus-level shifts; the gender of the speaker, either male or female; the age of the speaker, either young or old; the relationship between interactants, as signified by the speech style used by the interactant not performing the style shift; either using honorifics or not; and the type of *keigo* used in the style shift, either addressee honorifics or referent honorifics.

5.1.1 The effect of speaker gender on plus-level style shifts

Coming back to the initial research questions, the answer to the question: "What is the effect of speaker gender on the acceptance rate of plus-level shifts?" can be formulated in the following way: "Speaker gender has a small effect on the acceptance rate of plus-level shifts; female speakers were considered somewhat more likely to produce plus-level shifts in natural speech." In this case, the hypothesis was correct. This effect was largely seen in questions S-001 and S-010 (difference in acceptance rate > 0.30), both style shifts that were originally performed by female speakers, and to a smaller degree in questions S-007, S-013, S-028, S-029, and S-031 (difference in acceptance rate < 0.20), with varying original speaker genders. Finally, no change was detected in questions S-005, S-006, S-018, S-022, S-026, S-036 and S-037, again with varying original speaker genders.

The question: "What caused these differences in effect between questions?" remaining, the first thing to look at for a possible answer is the categorization of different types of style shifts discussed in chapter two. Focussing on Obana's (2017) categorization system, as the newest and arguably the most comprehensive one, the style shifts in this part of the study can be placed as follows: group A, 'creating a psychological barrier', contains S-001, S-005, S-010, S-022, S-031 and the first style shift in S-037; meanwhile, group B, 'placing oneself on a public stage', contains S-007, S-018, S-026, S-028, and S-036; finally, group C, 'careful, tentative approach to the other interactant', contains S-006, S-013, S-029, and the second style shift in S-037. In this categorization, one aspect jumps out instantly: the only two style shifts in group A that were originally performed by female speakers are S-001 and S-010, both of the style shifts that showed the largest effect of

26

speaker gender. This could be interpreted to say that within group A, speakers being female has a large positive effect on the possibility of style shifts occuring. However, questions S-005, S-022 and S-037 are all included in group A as well, being originally spoken by male speakers. None of these saw an effect of speaker gender, leading to the conclusion that there must be more to these results. Both of the conversations in S-001 and S-010 showed the speaker getting angry or otherwise fed up with their interactant. Although this is the case in other group A conversations as well, S-001 and S-010 share the factor that these were written with the intention of being said by female speakers, and thus it might be possible that something about the specific way these speakers utilize style shifts to show their negative emotions is something that is generally viewed as feminine, while the way the male speakers in questions S-005, S-022 and S-037 do so is considered more gender neutral. More research would need to be done to confirm this hypothesis.

Meanwhile, both groups B and C contained a mix of variations that saw a small effect of speaker gender and variations that saw no effect of speaker gender, neither being restricted to style shifts that were originally performed by a single speaker gender, so it can be assumed that within these groups, there is no effect of speaker gender beyond the general effect; whose significance, disregarding the results in group A, comes out as $p = 0.083$, $Z = 1.732$, meaning that, though weaker and only present at the $p < 0.10$ level, this effect can still be measured.

5.1.2 The effect of speaker age on plus-level style shifts

The next factor that was tested for in this study, was the effect of speaker age on the occurence of plus-level shifts. Looking at the results, the research question: "What is the effect of speaker age on the acceptance rate of plus-level shifts?" can be answered as: "No significant effect of speaker age was found, although young speakers were rated minimally more acceptable on average." This is in line with the hypothesis.

Placing these questions in Obana's (2017) categorization system yields the following results: group A contains S-001, S-031 and S-034; group B contains S-007, S-024, S-025 and S-026; and group C contains S-002, S-008, S-013 and S-035. This categorization places both questions that found young speakers more acceptable, S-002 and S-035, in group C, which leads to the possibility that young speakers performing style shifts being viewed as more acceptable is an effect inherent to group C. With such a small number of questions seeing a change, however, such a conclusion cannot be made without looking at the individual questions for possible explanations.

The largest difference in acceptance rate was found in S-002, where an old speaker performing a style shift was rated less acceptable than a young speaker. However, this question originally featured a nephew and his uncle, whose roles were switched in the variant testing for

speaker age. It may be that rather than speaker age, the change in hierarchical relationship between the two caused the change in acceptance rate.

S-035 featured two classmates gaming, with the speaker performing the style shift making a goofy comment before being shot down by the other interactant and performing a style shift in his apology. The variant testing for age presented the two as colleagues rather than classmates. Both the fact that the two were gaming and the fact that the speaker made a goofy comment before are possible explanations for the discrepency in acceptance rate, besides an inherent effect of being a group C type style shift.

Group A featured two questions where the variant with an old speaker resulted in a higher acceptance rate. Here, however, the differences are all small (<0.10), so no conclusions can be drawn with such a small sample size.

5.1.3 The effect of the relationship between interactants on plus-level style shifts

Continuing to the next research question: "What is the effect of the relationship between interactants, as determined by the speech style of the interactant not performing the style shift, on the acceptance rate of plus-level shifts?", its answer can be formulated as follows: "No significant effect of relationship was found, although style shifts in conversations with interactants who used *keigo* were rated minimally more acceptable on average." In this case, though the averages did match up with the hypothesis, the lack of a significant effect means the hypothesis cannot be confirmed as correct. In fact, this effect is largely due to the change in acceptance rate of question S-019, followed by the change in acceptance rate of question S-023. On the other hand, the style shift in S-017 was rated more acceptable when the other interactant used no *keigo*.

When we seperate these questions by type of style shift, we get the following line-up: group A contained S-009, S-015, S-017, S-020, S-033 and S-034; group B contained S-007, S-018, S-023 and S-026; and finally, group C contained S-004, S-006, S-011, S-019, and S-037. This puts all of the questions that saw a change in different groups, which leads to the conclusion that, like with speaker age, individual effects within these questions are more likely to be the cause of the change, rather than a group effect.

Starting with S-017, the only variation where an interactant using the plain form was rated more acceptable, one possible explanation is that, in the original version of the conversation, interactant A used the suffix *-san* to refer to interactant B, even though he did not use any *keigo*. The variation where interactant A did use keigo could have been interpreted as solving this perceived discrepency.

Next, S-019 showed the largest difference in acceptance rate within this list. The original conversation was between a noble and a friendly maid, who were changed to be just friends in order to change the maid's speech style to one without *keigo*. This is a large shift in the hierarchical relationship between these two, akin to the one seen in S-002, and more than likely the source of the change in acceptance rate.

S-023 was also rated more acceptable when interactant B used *keigo* rather than the plain form. In this example, interactant A, a younger child, is proudly presenting herself as looking like 'a big girl' with her hair tied together, utilizing a style shift to do so. Interactant B then confirms this, either by using *keigo* in the original conversation or in the plain form in the variation. It's possible that interactant B using *keigo* here is perceived to 'match up' with the situation of interactant A being 'a big girl', making her someone worthy of respect. However, more research would need to be done to confirm this hypothesis.

Finally in this category are the second and third variations for S-009, where not the relationship between the speaker and the listeners, but the one between him and the third-party referent were tested. In the original version, there was no defined relationship between the speaker and the referent; in the variations, the referent was defined as the speaker's former superior (S-009B), or his former inferior (S-009C). In the latter case, it is of no surprise that the speaker's style shift, which contained *sonkeigo*, was rated as less acceptable. In the former case, despite the style shift being used to mock the referent, it was rated as more acceptable when the referent was the speaker's former superior. It is possible that this change resulted from the style shift not being seen as a shift, but rather as the speaker continuing to use referent honorifics when referring to his former superior, even when mocking him.

5.1.4 The effect of type of *keigo* on plus-level style shifts

The most interesting of all the factors in this study, with the most effect on acceptance rates, was the type of *keigo* utilized in style shifts. The research question here: "What is the effect of the type of *keigo* utilized in style shifts on the acceptance rate of plus-level shifts?" can be answered as "The type of *keigo* utilized has a large effect on the acceptance of plus-level shifts; addressee honorifics were considered far more likely to appear in plus-level shifts in natural speech in the majority of questions." This is in line with the hypothesis. This effect was most strongly seen in S-005, where the acceptance rate dropped down to 0.15 — the lowest in the entire survey — when the type of *keigo* was changed to referent honorifics. However, considering that this variation contained referent honorifics without addressee honorifics in an independent clause, while the target of the honorifics was the listener (as opposed to a third-party referent), the reason for this low result

is more likely to come from the unconventional nature of the *keigo* itself, rather than from the nature of the style shift, and as such, will be excluded from further discussion in this section. If we also remove S-005 from the overall acceptance rates, the final results will look like this; variations containing addressee honorifics had an average acceptance rate of 0.73, while variations containing referent honorifics had an average acceptance rate of 0.51.

Dividing these questions into groups A, B and C types shifts, group A will contain S-001, S-021, S-033, and S-038. Group B will contain S-007, S-027, S-032, and S-036. Lastly, group C will contain S-003, S-008 and S-029. Within group A, all but S-033, which contained referent honorifics to begin with, lost more than 0.4 in acceptance rate for referent honorifics as compared to addressee honorifics. What sets S-033 apart from its counterparts in this subset is believed to be the extent of anger expressed with the style shift. The speaker is shouting angrily at the listener to the point where he noticably mocks him for what he suggested — this is much more extreme than the frustrations expressed in S-001 and S-021, both of which are much milder. Meanwhile, S-038, where the speaker makes fun of the listener, fared surprisingly bad as well. Okushi (1997) observed that making jokes was a valid reason for a plus-level shift to occur. This result seems to suggest this does not include jokes made at the expense of the target of honorifics. More research would however be necessary to confirm this hypothesis. As for the rest of group A, it seems to be that referent honorifics will only be acceptable in cases where the negative emotions expressed are very extreme.

Looking at the results of group B, acceptance rates for referent honorifics are much higher than those for group A, containing the two results with the highest acceptance rates for referent honorifics, without any result's acceptance rate below 0.40. Starting with S-007, this is the only variation in the group where referent honorifics scored better than addressee honorifics. This is believed to be because the style shift was followed by a form of the copula *da* in *janai ka*, which appears in the plain form — the speaker's default speech style. In this case, a verb containing addressee honorifics will be a greater grammatical mismatch than one that does not. Next, we have S-036, the only question in this category that obtained an acceptance rate of 1 for both versions, and the only one testing for referent honorifics where there was no effect of type of *keigo*. The speaker is proudly presenting her magic box, using the copula with addressee honorifics, *desu*, in one version, and with referent honorifics, *de gozaimasu*, in the other. One possible explanation for this result is that, outside of plus-level shifts, presenting something using *de gozaimasu* is fairly common in the Japanese language. Finally, both S-027 and S-032 had an acceptance rate of 0.42 for their variations including referent honorifics. While neither is higher than 0.5, when considering

only questions that were changed from addressee honorifics to referent honorifics, their scores come quite close to the newly calculated average of 0.45. With no acceptance rates lower than this, it can be hypothesized that group B is in general more forgiving of usage of referent honorifics in plus-level shifts.

Group C contained the largest positive difference in acceptance rates between referent honorifics and addressee honorifics in S-003. This is likely due to the fact that its relevant style shift appeared in a dependent clause. When compared to its variation that removed the first style shift altogether, the acceptance rate for referent honorifics is slightly lower. S-008 contained style shifts by both interactants, each of which were tested for individually, as well as combined for an effect of type of *keigo*. In this case, the style shift utilized by interactant A to show her embarrassment was received quite well even as referent honorifics, while interactant B's style shift was not. I had hypothesized that combining the two style shifts as referent honorifics might have yielded a higher acceptance rate, as both participants were matching each other's speech style, but this does not appear to be the case — at least not for referent honorifics, or in this specific conversation. Lastly, S-029 contained a style shift showing feelings of embarrassment as well. This one, however, was not received as well as the other two, at an acceptance rate of 0.42 for referent honorifics, similarly to S-027 and S-032 in group B.

5.2 Individually interesting results

A number of noteworthy patterns can be observed in the results, outside of the four factors tested for. These include the effects of hierarchical relations between interactants, as signified by social position, the difference between using honorifics in independent clauses and dependent clauses, and the difference between using *desu* and *-masu*, both types of addressee honorifics.

5.2.1 Hierarchical relationships

Both questions S-002 and S-019 stood out within the categories of questions testing for age and relationship between interactants as variations that saw a relatively large change in acceptance rate, when no effect of either age of relationship was found. Both of these questions also inadvertently featured a shift in hierarchy between interactants in their variations. If this is what caused the change in acceptance rates, it would mean that style shifts occur more easily when the listener is below the speaker in hierarchical terms. This would, however, be contradicted by the results of S-009, where the style shift when deemed more likely to occur when the target of the honorifics was hierarchically above the speaker, and less likely when he was below him. An obvious counterargument here would be that the trend would be true for style shifts utilizing

addressee honorifics, or where the target is honorifics is the listener; neither of which is the case in S-009. To determine which, if any, is true, I will analyze other conversations where interlocutors were in a hierarchical relationship.

Questions S-007, S-033 and S-034 all featured a boss utilizing a style shift when talking to their employee. In the case of S-007, the employee usually talked using the plain form, while in S-033 and S-034, the employee used honorifics; in the latter two cases, their relationship was changed to be collegial instead. Neither of these saw a change in acceptance rate with these variations. This leads to the conlcusion that, when the listener is the target of honorifics in a style shift, there is no evidence of an inherent effect of social status on the possibility of plus-level shifts occurring.

This begs the question — what caused the change in acceptance rate in questions S-002 and S-019? While an inherent effect of change in hierarchical relationship has not been observed in the rest of the data, I would still conclude that the change in hierarchical relationship is responsible for the change in acceptance rate — not necessarily because a difference in social status makes it inherently harder for style shifts to occur, but because this difference interacted with the circumstances surrounding the usage of a plus-level shift. In the case of S-002, perhaps a nephew pulling his uncle by the ear was considered unrealistic by many participants, or they deemed that even in that situation, it would not be reason enough for the uncle to resort to style shifts in apologizing to his nephew. In the case of S-019, where the maid teasingly suggested to the noble that since he was cold, they should warm each other naked — the noble, completely flustered, used a style shift in telling her that they could not. This makes sense, as it is generally not accepted for nobles and maids to be together in a sexual relationship. When the two are friends, this prejudice becomes much more vague, potentially no longer reason enough to resort to a style shift. In this way, a change in hierarchical relationship can still influence the possibility of style shifts occurring.

5.2.2 Referent honorifics in independent and dependent clauses

As mentioned in section 5.2.4, when considering the possibility of a specific type of style shift occuring, its position in either an independent clause or a dependent clause cannot be ignored. S-003 contained two verbs that underwent a plus-level shift; referent honorifics without addressee honorifics in the dependent clause, and addressee honorifics without referent honorifics in the independent clause. This is no coincidence: referent honorifics without addressee honorifics can only be used in the independent clause when the target of deference is not the listener, as demonstrated by questions S-005, the acceptance rate of which dropped significantly when inlcuding referent honorifics without addressee honorifics targeting the listener, and S-009, which

included referent honorifics without addressee honorifics targeting a third-party referent, and saw a relatively high acceptance rate. Meanwhile, using addressee honorifics in dependent clauses is usually only seen in combination with a highly formal speech style, something that was lacking in S-003. It seems that *keigo* used in plus-level shifts is bound to these same rules.

The style shifts in S-007 falls into a similar category, containing a style shift in a dependent clause while the main verb in the independent clause remains without honorifics. In this case, the usage of addressee honorifics in a dependent clause yielded an even lower acceptance rate than S-003, as the speaker's speech style was otherwise highly informal. These factors suggest that the answer to the fourth research question needs an addendum: "The type of *keigo* utilized has a large effect on the acceptance of plus-level shifts; addressee honorifics were considered far more likely to appear in plus-level shifts in natural speech when used in independent clauses, while referent honorifics were considered more likely to appear in plus-level shifts in natural speech when used in dependent clauses." If we also recalculate the *p*- and *Z*-values to only include style shifts found in independent clauses, we get values of $p = 0.007$, $Z = 2.714$.

5.2.3 The different types of addressee honorifics

Within the variations testing for different types of honorifics, three questions tested for different types of addressee honorifics — questions S-012, S-029 and S-031. The results were scattered, with S-012 not showing a change in acceptance rate, S-029 showing a change in favor of *desu* forms, and S-031 showing a change in favor of *-masu* forms. This, combined with the small size of the changes, makes it difficult to draw any conclusions from this data alone.

In a case study by Uehara & Fukushima (2008), researching the differences between the two expressions in their negative, nonpast forms — *-masen* and *nai desu* — it was found that *nai desu*, compared to *-masen*, was used in less formal contexts and as a 'semi-polite' expression, when conveying meaning was more important than showing formality. On the other hand, *-masen* was used "when "politeness" is foregrounded, i.e., when the speaker becomes keenly aware of the necessity of using polite speech toward the listener" (Uehara & Fukushima, 2008). It was also used less often than *nai desu*. This gives us a possible explanation for the results for S-029, as a conversation between two classmates and friends where polite speech is usually not necessary — however, the style shift in S-031 has almost the exact same circumstances, save for its categorization as a group A style shift, while S-029 is group C. There is, however, far too little evidence to suggest that the different acceptance rates originate in these group distinctions. More research is necessary to draw any conclusions from this data.

5.3 Implications of the results

In this study, I have attempted to determine the effect that several factors — namely, speaker gender, speaker age, the speech style of the other interactant and the type of *keigo* used — have on the possibility of a plus-level shift occurring. First, being female was determined to have a small positive effect on the possibility of plus-level shifts occurring, which was seen mostly in style shifts in group A. This is assumed to have a connection with *onna-kotoba* — also *joseigo*, or 'women's language — a subtype of *yakuwarigo*, or 'role language', defined by Kinsui (2003) as 'language that, when heard, brings up a certain image of a type of person in the listener, or language that, when given a certain type of person, seems like it naturally fits that type of person' as female speakers are regarded by many Japanese speakers to use more honorifics (Kinsui, 2007). Next, neither speaker age nor the speech style used by the other interactant was determined to have a significant effect on the possibility of plus-level shifts occurring, though a change in the social hierarchy that accompanies either of these changes might have an influence. Finally, the type of *keigo* used in plus-level shifts was determined to have a large effect on the possibility of plus-level shifts occurring, with addressee honorifics having a positive effect on occurrence in independent clauses, and referent honorifics having a positive effect on occurrence in dependent clauses.

What does this mean for *keigo* research from now on? First of all, a positive effect of speaker gender on acceptance rates means any research attempting to study the overall occurence rate of plus-level shifts will have to be mindful not to only include participants of a single gender, lest their results might prove to be inaccurate. This is not the case for speaker age, or the speech style of the other interactant, so these do not have to be selected with the same amount of care. Furthermore, any research attempting to create example sentences with plus-level shifts, or that attempts to explain why an observed style shift contains the type of *keigo* that it does, will have to be mindful of the type of *keigo* that appears in a style shift. For example, referent honorifics were only found to be acceptable in group A-type style shifts in extreme cases — any example sentence including such a shift would need circumstances justifying the speaker's extreme emotions. At the same time, any type A-type style shift found to use referent honorifics can be interpreted as conveying the speaker's extreme negative emotions.

6. Discussion

This results of this study create a number of possibilities for future research. Some of these are because of limitations with the current study, which was complicated in several ways, as described in the section below. Meanwhile, there are also a number of ways research into this topic

could be expanded upon, or applied to different fields of study, such as the inclusion of other factors into the study, a similar study for minus-level shifts, and applications into the broader field of linguistics — for example, a clear and concise idea of exactly how, why, and under what circumstances style shifts occur can be helpful in teaching L2 speakers how to utilize these shifts effectively. In this section I will expand upon these limitations and possibilities for this study, as well as others like it.

6.1 Complications of the study

One of the ways in which this study was complicated were the travel restrictions put into place as a result of the pandemic caused by the covid-19 outbreak. This meant that I was not able to go to Japan to conduct this study, which led to a number of features being scrapped from the survey. One of these was the inclusion of sound in the conversation excerpts. This inclusion would have allowed for testing of intonation in plus-level shifts, as Okushi (1997) noted was key in her study of shifts. Unfortunatey, however, working remotely made it too challenging to find volunteers to record conversations. Furthermore, as the travel restrictions meant the survey had to be conducted online, including sound fragments would have placed a large burden on the design of the survey, so ultimately this feature was forced to be scrapped.

Another way in which the survey was complicated by the travel restrictions was the search for participants. Even remotely, a number of participants could be reached through apps such as LINE, but unfortunately this restricted the number of available participants to my acquaintances. Several efforts were made to increase the number of participants, but all with little to no effect. On top of this, as the survey was conducted anonymously, I was not able to conduct any follow-up interviews with the participants. Finally, there was the issue of participants dropping out before the end of the survey — though not quite unexpected, given the length of the survey, this was still a major setback.

The design of the study itself was also met with several complications, mainly regarding the factor of relation between interactants. In order to cleanly categorize these into two groups with clear distinctions, the speech style of the other interactant was chosen as the measuring factor — a speech style including *keigo* would be used to signify that the speaker performing the style shift was above them in social standing, while a speech style not including *keigo* would be used to signify that the speaker performing the style shift was their social equal. In real life, however, these distinctions will not always be so clear-cut. Some speakers will prefer to use *keigo* when talking to their social equals, such as classmates, while others will not. This is further complicated by phenomena such as *onna-kotoba*, or *joseigo*, where women are often perceived to include more

keigo in their speech — regardless of who they are talking to — than men (Kinsui, 2007). On the other end of the spectrum, speakers might not always use *keigo* when talking to their social superiors. Okamoto (2011) discussed a number of blog posts where several native speakers argued about whether nurses should use *keigo* when talking to elderly patients, as they are younger than them, or should use the plain form, to create a more casual, friendly atmosphere. Data for this survey also included a case of a speaker talking to his boss — who, quite unambiguously, is his superior — without using *keigo*.

Raw data for this study included an additional three questions — labelled S-014, S-016 and S-030. All of these featured excerpts containing plus-level shifts made to tell a joke, a function of plus-level shifts that was found in Okushi (1997). Unfortunately, these did not fit anywhere in Obana's (2017) model of categorization. To include these questions would, therefore, require an original categorization system, containing a fourth category for 'jokes'. This was beyond the scope of this research, which led to the decision to not include the questions at all for the sake of analysis. It would be very interesting to include this category in a future variation of this research — although this would require more than three excerpts to yield useful data.

6.2 Where to go from here

A number of trends that were seen in the results of this study require further research to confirm. These trends include: a possible effect of speaker age — where being young has a positive effect on the possibility of style shifts occurring — isolated to group C style shifts; another possible effect of speaker age — where being old has a positive effect on the possibility of style shifts occurring — isolated to group A style shifts; a possible addendum to Okushi's (1997) observed trend of plus-level shifts being used to tell jokes, stating that this does not include jokes made at the expense of the target of honorifics; the hypothesis that group B is more forgiving of utilizing referent honorifics in plus-level shifts within an independent clause, compared to groups A and C. Additionally, the theory that S-023 was rated more acceptable when the interactant not performing the style shift used *keigo*, because this type of speech matched up with the reason the style shift occurred in the first place — the other speaker feeling like a 'big girl' — remains to be confirmed as well. Other effects that could not be confirmed, and do not yet show a trend toward any particular interpretation of effect, include: the effect of using either the *desu* or *-masu* forms of addressee honorifics in different types of plus-level shifts; the possibility that the way the female speakers in S-001 and S-010 reacted and utilized style shifts is something that is more acceptable because they were done by female speakers; and the question whether speakers matching each other's speech

style is indeed a factor with a positive effect on the possibility of plus-level shifts occurring, but which did not apply to S-008, either because it utilized referent honorifics, or for some other reason.

In addition, this study did not test for any interactions between factors, such as if the effect of type of *keigo* changes for different speaker genders, or if the effect of relationship between interactants would have been different depending on speaker age. This type of research would have exponentially increased the scale of an already ambitious study — if such a study were to be done in the future, it would likely need a vastly different design, building upon the foundations laid out by the current study, or a future version of it.

In a future version of this study, testing for the effect of the relationship between interactants will likely need to rely on background information telling the participants the social positions of the interactants, rather than their own speech styles. In order to do this in an objective manner, style shifts will need to be carefully selected to find those that will still be possible even in a different context. Other factors that will also need to be decided on before designing the study would be the amount of vertical distance tested for (for example, a boss and employee have a larger amount of vertical distance than a student and his *senpai*, or upperclassman), and whether this will be a set amount or will vary between questions.

There are also several other factors that would be interesting to test for. One of these, intonation, was already mentioned in the previous section — as Okushi (1997) noted it was of importance in her findings, this is hypothesized to have a large effect on the possibility of plus-level shifts occurring, even more so in group A, where Okushi herself noted that intonation was key, than in both other groups. Another factor, that has of yet not been named before, is the inclusion of sentence-ending particles, as well as the choice of what specific type of particles. For example, the sentence-ending particles *yo* and *ne,* though neither has an equivalent in English, have different functions in conversation. While *yo* is used to mark information that is "expected to be new or controversial to the listener", *ne* is used to mark information that is "either already known to the listener or readily acceptable, and thus directs the addressee's acceptance" (Saigo, 2006). This type of factor is hypothesized to have a significant effect on most individual conversations, as the interpretation of an utterance can change significantly with different sentence-ending particles, or with none at all — whether or not a more general effect is present would be the object of this future study.

7. Bibliography

Agha, Asif. (2007). *Language and Social Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barke, Andrew. (2010). "Manipulating honorifics in the construction of social identities in Japanese television drama." *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 14(4), 456–476.

Brown, Penelope, & Stephen C. Levinson. (1989). *Politeness : some universals in language usage* (Reiss., with corr., new introd. and new bibliography.). Cambridge [etc.]: Cambridge University Press.

Bunkachō. (2004). *Heisei 15 nendo kokugo ni kansuru yoronchōsa no kekka ni tsuite*. http://www.bunka.go.jp/tokei_hakusho_shuppan/tokeichosa/kokugo_yoronchosa/h15/

Cook, Haruko Minegishi. (1997). "The Role of the Japanese Masu Form in Caregiver-child Conversation." *Journal of Pragmatics* 28, no. 6: 695-718.

Cook, Haruko Minegishi. (2008). *Socializing Identities Through Speech Style : Learners of Japanese As a Foreign Language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Dunn, Cynthia Dickel. (2005). "Pragmatic functions of humble forms in Japanese ceremonial discourse." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15(2), 218–238.

Hasegawa, Yoko. (2015). "Politeness and Honorifics I." In *Japanese: A linguistic introduction*, edited by Yoko Hasegawa, 255-68. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hudson, Mutsuko Endo. (2011). "Student honorifics usage in conversations with professors." *Journal of pragmatics* 43, no. 15: 3689-706.

Ide, Sachiko. (2006). Wakimae no goyōron [Pragmatics of discernment]. Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.

Isaka, Yukiko. (2010). "Using plain forms but still being polite: Speech style shifting as an interactional phenomenon in Japanese native and non-native talk." PhD diss., University of Alberta (Canada). ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

Jones, Kimberly, & Ono, Tsuyoshi (2008). Style shifting in Japanese. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub.

Kinsui, Satoshi. (2003). *Vācharu Nihongo: Yakuwarigo no Nazo*. Tokyo: Iwanami-shoten.

Kinsui, Satoshi. (2007). "Kindai nihon manga no gengo." In *Yakuwarigo kenkyuu no chihei*, edited by Satoshi Kinsui, 97-108. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.

Markus, Hazel. R., & Shinobu Kitayama. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological review*, 98(2), 224.

Nakamura, Keiko. (2002). Pragmatic development in Japanese monolingual children. *Studies in Language Sciences*, 2, 23-41.

Obana, Yasuko. (2016). "Nihongo no keigo sai-saikō: yakuwari aidentiti no kanten kara." *Gengo to bunka*, 19, 31–46.

Obana, Yasuko. (2017). "Japanese honorifics re-re-visited." *Journal of Politeness Research* 13(2): 281-311.

Obana, Yasuko. (2021). "Politeness." In Routledge Handbook of Japanese Sociolinguistics (1st ed., Vol. 1, pp. 248–263). Routledge.

Okamoto, Shigeko. (2011). "The use and interpretation of addressee honorifics and plain forms in Japanese: Diversity, multiplicity, and ambiguity." *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, no. 15: 3673-688.

Okamoto, Shigeko, and Janet S. Shibamoto-Smith. (2016). "Keigo: Diversity in attitudes and practice." In *The Social Life of the Japanese Language: Cultural Discourse and Situated Practice*, 154–200. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Okushi, Yoshiko. (1997). "Patterns of honorific use in the everyday speech of four Japanese women." PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

Pizziconi, Barbara. (2011). "Honorifics: The cultural specificity of a universal mechanism in Japanese." In *Politeness in East Asia*, 45-70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saigo, Hideki. (2006). "The Pragmatic Properties and Sequential Functions of the Japanese Sentence -Final Particles *Ne, Yo* and *Yone*." ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Takiura, Masato. (2007). "Kaiwa no "ba" o kiritoru keigo—keii to sogai no daikushisu." *Keisaishi: Gengo* 36(2): 48-55.

Takeuchi, Jae. (2021). "Language ideologies among Japanese foreign language teachers: Keigo and L2 speakers." *Foreign Language Annals*, 54(3), 589–606. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12575

Uehara, Satoshi and Etsuko Fukushima. (2008). "Masen or Nai Desu — That is the question." In *Style shifting in Japanese*, edited by Kimberly Jones and Tsuyoshi Ono.

Wetzel, Patricia J. (1994). Chapter 3. "A MOVABLE SELF: THE LINGUISTIC INDEXING OF UCHI AND SOTO." In Bachnik, Jane M. & Quinn, Charles J. (Ed.), Situated Meaning: Inside and Outside in Japanese Self, Society, and Language (pp. 73-87). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Yoshida, Megumi, and Chikako Sakurai. (2005). "Japanese Honorifics as a Marker of Sociocultural Identity: A View from Non-Western Perspective." In *BROADENING THE HORIZON OF LINGUISTIC POLITENESS, Lakoff, Robin T. [Ed], Ide, Sachiko [Ed], Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins*, 2005, pp 197-215.

Appendix A: The questionnaire

Q1

本調査では敬語に関する喋り方の揺れを研究しております。

普段タメ口を使って喋っている話者が敬語に切り替わる現象を敬語への「スタイル・シフト」と呼びます。本調査では、スタイル・シフトが含まれる例文をお見せします。スタイル・シフトが起こっている部分を**このように**記します。例文はそれぞれ２〜４種お見せします。変わった部分を赤で記します。

回答時間は３０分程度です。途中でやめた場合は回答が保存されますので、後で続けられます。

「わかりました」を押すと、調査が始まります。

○ わかりました

Q2

あなたの性別は何ですか。

○ 男性
○ 女性
○ 言いたくありません

Q3

あなたの年齢は何ですか。

○ ２０未満
○ ２０〜２９
○ ３０〜３９
○ ４０〜４９
○ ５０〜５９
○ ６０〜

S-001A

友達のA助くんとB子ちゃんは話しています。A助くんの仕事に、ちょっと危険が伴っていますので、B子ちゃんは手伝うと申し出ました。

A助：それじゃ、手伝ってもらっていいかな？
危ないことしないって条件付きで。
B子：危ないことしないって、それはA助でしょ？
私よりずっと無鉄砲なくせに。
A助：それ言われると弱いけど、
でも、B子たんだって、相当だぜ？
B子：もう、そんなこと**ありません**。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る
○ あり得ない
○ どちらとも言えない

S-001B

友達のA助くんとB子ちゃんは話しています。A助くんの仕事に、ちょっと危険が伴っていますので、B子ちゃんは手伝う
と申し出ました。

A助：それじゃ、手伝ってもらっていいかな？
危ないことしないって条件付きで。
B子：危ないことしないって、それはA助でしょ？
私よりずっと無鉄砲なくせに。
A助：それ言われると弱いけど、
でも、B子たんだって、相当だぜ？
B子：もう、そんなこと**ございません**。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-001C

同僚で友達のA助さんとB子さんは話しています。A助さんの仕事に、ちょっと危険が伴っていますので、B子さんは手伝
うと申し出ました。

A助：それじゃ、手伝ってもらっていいかな？
危ないことしないって条件付きで。
B子：危ないことしないって、それはA助でしょ？
私よりずっと無鉄砲なくせに。
A助：それ言われると弱いけど、
でも、B子さんだって、相当だぜ？
B子：もう、そんなこと**ありません**。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-001D

友達のA助くんとB助くんは話しています。A助くんの仕事に、ちょっと危険が伴っていますので、B助くんは手伝うと申
し出ました。

A助：それじゃ、手伝ってもらっていいかな？
危ないことしないって条件付きで。
B助：危ないことしないって、それはA助でしょ？
僕よりずっと無鉄砲なくせに。
A助：それ言われると弱いけど、
でも、B助くんだって、相当だぜ？
B助：もう、そんなこと**ありません**。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-002A

A助くんが叔父と話していると、A助くんの冗談で怒った叔父がA助くんの耳を引っ張ります。引っ張られると、A助くんはこう言います。

A助： 痛い、痛い、**_ごめんなさい_**！お願い、耳引っ張んないで！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-003A

A助くんとB助くんは訓練しています。A助くんはB助くんを教えていますが、B助くんはすぐ疲れます。弱音を言うB助くんに、A助くんはこう言います。

A助：でも、頑張った方じゃない？
今日はこの辺にしよっか？
ゲーゲーされても困るしね。
B助：そ、そうして**_いただける_**と、大変**_助かります_**…。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-002B

A助さんが甥と話していると、A助くんの冗談で怒った甥がA助さんの耳を引っ張ります。引っ張られると、A助さんはこう言います。

A助： 痛い、痛い、**_ごめんなさい_**！お願い、耳引っ張んないで！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

42

S-003B

A助くんとB助くんは訓練しています。A助くんはB助くんを教えていますが、B助くんはすぐ疲れます。弱音を言うB助くんに、A助くんはこう言います。

A助：でも、頑張った方じゃない？
今日はこの辺にしよっか？
ゲーゲーされても困るしね。
B助：そ、そうして**もらえます**と、大変**助かります**…。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-003C

A助くんとB助くんは訓練しています。A助くんはB助くんを教えていますが、B助くんはすぐ疲れます。弱音を言うB助くんに、A助くんはこう言います。

A助：でも、頑張った方じゃない？
今日はこの辺にしよっか？
ゲーゲーされても困るしね。
B助：そ、そうして**もらえる**と、大変**助かります**…。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-004A

友達のA助くんとB助くんが、A助くんの友達であるC助くんについて話しています。B助くんとC助くんは仲が悪いため、A助くんはB助くんに二人で話す機会を作るよう頼んでいる。

A助：話してみれば彼の人柄もわかるはずだ。
どうだろう。
機会を作ってみてはくれないかい？
B助：あー、機会があれば前向きに善処**します**。
あんまり、仲良しこよしってわけにもいかないだろ。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-004B

後輩のA助くんと先輩のB助くんが、A助くんの友達であるC助くんについて話しています。B助くんとC助くんは仲が悪いため、A助くんはB助くんに二人で話す機会を作るよう頼んでいる。

A助：話してみれば彼の人柄もわかるはずです。
どうだろう。
機会を作ってみてはくれませんか？
B助：あー、機会があれば前向きに善処します。
あんまり、仲良しこよしってわけにもいかないだろ。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-005A

知り合いのA助くんとB子さんは話しています。B子さんの冗談に、A助くんは照れくさくなり、顔を赤くしてこう言います。

A助：しないよ！しません！
どういう発想の飛躍だよ！？

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-005B

知り合いのA子さんとB子さんは話しています。B子さんの冗談に、A子さんは照れくさくなり、顔を赤くしてこう言います。

A子：しないよ！しません！
どういう発想の飛躍だよ！？

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-005C

知り合いのA助くんとB子さんは話しています。B子さんの冗談に、A助くんは照れくさくなり、顔を赤くしてこう言います。

A助：しないよ！**いたさない**！
どういう発想の飛躍だよ！？

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○　あり得る

○　あり得ない

○　どちらとも言えない

S-006A

知り合いのA助さんとB助くんが話しています。B助くんはA助さんの家で泊まり、起きたばかりです。

A助：B助どの、昨夜はよく眠れましたか？
B助：恥ずかしながら、爆睡**しちゃいました**。
ちょっと寝不足だったもんで…。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○　あり得る

○　あり得ない

○　どちらとも言えない

S-006B

知り合いのA助さんとB助くんが話しています。B助くんはA助さんの家で泊まり、起きたばかりです。

A助：B助くん、昨夜はよく眠れたかい？
B助：恥ずかしながら、爆睡**しちゃいました**。
ちょっと寝不足だったもんで…。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○　あり得る

○　あり得ない

○　どちらとも言えない

S-006C

知り合いのA助さんとB子ちゃんが話しています。B子ちゃんはA助さんの家で泊まり、起きたばかりです。

A助：B子どの、昨夜はよく眠れましたか？
B子：恥ずかしながら、爆睡**しちゃいました**。
ちょっと寝不足だったもんで…。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○　あり得る

○　あり得ない

○　どちらとも言えない

S-007A

A助くんとB助さんは話しています。A助くんは、雇い主であるB助さんに頼みたいことがありますので、B助さんに声か
けしました。

A助：だけど、警戒してしすぎることはない。
だから、頼みたいことがある。
B助：ほう、君から私にかね。
それはぜひ、**お聞きしよう**じゃないか。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-007B

A助さんとB助さんは話しています。A助さんは、雇い主であるB助さんに頼みたいことがありますので、B助さんに声か
けしました。

A助：だけど、警戒してしすぎることはない。
だから、頼みたいことがある。
B助：ほう、お前から私にかね。
それはぜひ、**お聞きしよう**じゃないか。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-007C

A助くんとB助さんは話しています。A助くんは、雇い主であるB助さんに頼みたいことがありますので、B助さんに声か
けしました。

A助：ですが、警戒してしすぎることはありません。
なので、頼みたいことがあるんです。
B助：ほう、君から私にかね。
それはぜひ、**お聞きしよう**じゃないか。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-007D

A助くんとB助さんは話しています。A助くんは、雇い主であるB助さんに頼みたいことがありますので、B助さんに声か
けしました。

A助：だけど、警戒してしすぎることはない。
だから、頼みたいことがある。
B助：ほう、君から私にかね。
それはぜひ、**聞きましょう**じゃないか。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-008A

友達のA子ちゃんとB助くんが話しています。B助くんはこの前、A子ちゃんに告白しました。

A子：（赤くなって）ところで、B助...あのね...
B助：え？なんかすごい勢いで顔赤くなってるけど、ダイジョウビー？
A子：だ、ダイジョウビー。全然平気**です**。
それより、その...大事なお話が**あります**！
B助：ん、なんか、**畏まってますね**。
A子：あのね、B助が、その...
私のこと、す、好きだって言ってくれたでしょ？
B助：え？あ、はい！**言いました！好きです！**超好き！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-008B

友達のA子ちゃんとB助くんが話しています。B助くんはこの前、A子ちゃんに告白しました。

A子：（赤くなって）ところで、B助...あのね...
B助：え？なんかすごい勢いで顔赤くなってるけど、ダイジョウビー？
A子：だ、ダイジョウビー。全然平気**です**。
それより、その...大事なお話が**ございます**！
B助：ん、なんか、**畏まってますね**。
A子：あのね、B助が、その...
私のこと、す、好きだって言ってくれたでしょ？
B助：え？あ、はい！**言いました！好きです！**超好き！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-008C

友達のA子ちゃんとB助くんが話しています。B助くんはこの前、A子ちゃんに告白しました。

A子：（赤くなって）ところで、B助...あのね...
B助：え？なんかすごい勢いで顔赤くなってるけど、ダイジョウビー？
A子：だ、ダイジョウビー。全然平気**です**。
それより、その...大事なお話が**あります**！
B助：ん、なんか、**畏まられてます**ね。
A子：あのね、B助が、その...
私のこと、す、好きだって言ってくれたでしょ？
B助：え？あ、はい！**言いました！好きです！**超好き！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-008D

友達のA子ちゃんとB助くんが話しています。B助くんはこの前、A子ちゃんに告白しました。

A子：（赤くなって）ところで、B助...あのね...
B助：え？なんかすごい勢いで顔赤くなってるけど、ダイジョウビー？
A子：だ、ダイジョウビー。全然平気**です**。
それより、その...大事なお話が**ございます**！
B助：ん、なんか、**畏まられてます**ね。
A子：あのね、B助が、その...
私のこと、す、好きだって言ってくれたでしょ？
B助：え？あ、はい！**言いました！好きです！**超好き！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-008E

昔からの友達のA子さんとB助さんが話しています。B助さんはこの前、A子さんに告白しました。

A子：（赤くなって）ところで、B助...あのね...
B助：え？なんかすごい勢いで顔赤くなってるけど、ダイジョウビー？
A子：だ、ダイジョウビー。全然平気**です**。
それより、その...大事なお話が**あります**！
B助：ん、なんか、**畏まってます**ね。
A子：あのね、B助が、その...
私のこと、す、好きだって言ってくれたでしょ？
B助：え？あ、はい！**言いました！好きです！**超好き！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-009A

A国軍の指揮官であるA助さんが部下へ話しています。B国軍の有名な指揮官であるB助さんが戦場へ登場した今、勝ち目がないと思っているA国軍兵士がたくさんいます。そこで、A助さんは銃を放ち、こう告げます。

A助：豆鉄砲だが...
A国軍反撃の口火は今を持って切られた。
まさか...ここまで派手に登場するとはな...
...それも、あの特徴からしてB助**ご本人がお越し**だ。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○　あり得る

○　あり得ない

○　どちらとも言えない

S-009B

A国軍の指揮官であるA助さんが同僚の指揮官へ話しています。B国軍の有名な指揮官であるB助さんが戦場へ登場した今、勝ち目がないと思っているA国軍兵士がたくさんいます。そこで、A助さんは銃を放ち、こう告げます。

A助：豆鉄砲だが...
A国軍反撃の口火は今を持って切られた。
まさか...ここまで派手に登場するとはな...
...それも、あの特徴からしてB助**ご本人がお越し**だ。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○　あり得る

○　あり得ない

○　どちらとも言えない

S-009C

A国軍の指揮官であるA助さんが部下へ話しています。B国軍のスパイだとバレた元A助さんの上司のB助さんが戦場へ登場した今、勝ち目がないと思っているA国軍兵士がたくさんいます。そこで、A助さんは銃を放ち、こう告げます。

A助：豆鉄砲だが...
A国軍反撃の口火は今を持って切られた。
まさか...ここまで派手に登場するとはな...
...それも、あの特徴からしてB助**ご本人がお越し**だ。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○　あり得る

○　あり得ない

○　どちらとも言えない

49

S-009D

A国軍の指揮官であるA助さんが部下へ話しています。B国軍のスパイだとバレた元A助さんの部下のB助さんが戦場へ登場した今、勝ち目がないと思っているA国軍兵士がたくさんいます。そこで、A助さんは銃を放ち、こう告げます。

A助： 豆鉄砲だが...
A国軍反撃の口火は今を持って切られた。
まさか...ここまで派手に登場するとはな...
...それも、あの特徴からしてB助**ご本人がお越し**だ。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-010A

友達のA子ちゃんとB子ちゃんが山登りをしています。休憩のあと、立ち上がったA子ちゃんがこう言います。

A子：あ、腰痛い！
B子：A子おばあちゃんみたい。
A子：おばっ？**悪かったですね**！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-010B

友達のA助くんとB助くんが山登りをしています。休憩のあと、立ち上がったA助くんがこう言います。

A助：あ、腰痛い！
B助：A助おじいちゃんみたい。
A助：おじっ？**悪かったですね**！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-011A

友達のA子ちゃんとB子ちゃんは不思議な森で歩いています。この不思議な森には、触れると危険なところがあります。どこにあるかは見えないので、A子ちゃんとB子ちゃんは石を投げながら歩いています。B子ちゃんが疲れるというと、A子ちゃんはこう言います。

A子：疲れるなら、こんなしょっちゅう投げなくてもいいんじゃない？
よいしょ。（A子が石を投げると、石が爆発する）
A子：あぶなっ！
B子：ほらね？やっぱり必要なんだよ、これ...
A子：よく**わかりました**...

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-011B

先輩のA子ちゃんと後輩B子ちゃんは不思議な森で歩いています。この不思議な森には、触れると危険なところがあります。どこにあるかは見えないので、A子ちゃんとB子ちゃんは石を投げながら歩いています。B子ちゃんが疲れるというと、A子ちゃんはこう言います。

A子：疲れるなら、こんなしょっちゅう投げなくてもいいんじゃない？
よいしょ。（A子が石を投げると、石が爆発する）
A子：あぶなっ！
B子：ほらね？やっぱり必要なんですよ、これ...
A子：よく**わかりました**...

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-012A

友達のA子ちゃんとB子ちゃんは祭りで互いを見失いました。A子ちゃんがB子ちゃんを見つけると、こう言います。

A子：どこ行ってたの？
B子：こっちのセリフだよ。
いきなりいなくなって焦らさないでよ！
A子：はぁ？何言ってんの？私がどれだけ探したか...
B子：（微笑む）探してくれたんだ。
A子：え、いや...（目をそらす）まあ、そこまで**探してないですけど**...

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-012B

友達のA子ちゃんとB子ちゃんは祭りで互いを見失いました。A子ちゃんがB子ちゃんを見つけると、こう言います。

A子：どこ行ってたの？
B子：こっちのセリフだよ。
いきなりいなくなって焦らさないでよ！
A子：はぁ？何言ってんの？私がどれだけ探したか...
B子：（微笑む）探してくれたんだ。
A子：え、いや...（目をそらす））まあ、そこまで**探してません**けど...

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-013A

友達のA子ちゃんとB子ちゃんは妖怪を調べています。妖怪に出くわしたA子ちゃんがその妖怪に誘われるところを、B子ちゃんは助けに来て、妖怪を追っ払います。我に返ると、A子ちゃんはこう言います。

A子：あの、B子**さん**？私、何しようと**してました**？
B子：化け物につられてどっか行こうと**してました**ね。
A子：う...マジでごめん。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-013B

昔からの友達のA子さんとB子さんは妖怪を調べています。妖怪に出くわしたA子さんがその妖怪に誘われるところを、B子さんは助けに来て、妖怪を追っ払います。我に返ると、A子さんはこう言います。

A子：あの、B子**さん**？私、何しようと**してました**？
B子：化け物につられてどっか行こうと**してました**ね。
A子：う...ホントにごめん。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-013C

友達のA助くんとB助くんは妖怪を調べています。妖怪に出くわしたA助くんがその妖怪に誘われるところを、B助くんは助けに来て、妖怪を追っ払います。我に返ると、A助くんはこう言います。

A助：あの、B助さん？俺、何しようとしてました？
B助：化け物につられてどっか行こうとしてましたね。
A助：う…マジでごめん。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○　あり得る

○　あり得ない

○　どちらとも言えない

S-015A

友達のA子ちゃんとB助くんは話しています。A子ちゃんが持っている薬を、B助くんは譲ってくれと頼むと、A子ちゃんはいつも断ります。しかし、今回聞かれると、こう答えます。

A子：薬、あげてもいいわよ。
B助：ホントか！
A子：ただし、私の言いつけはしっかり守ること。わかった？
B助：（ひとり言）へいへい。わぁーってますよ…

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○　あり得る

○　あり得ない

○　どちらとも言えない

S-015B

後輩のA子ちゃんと先輩のB助くんは話しています。A子ちゃんが持っている薬を、B助くんは譲ってくれと頼むと、A子ちゃんはいつも断ります。しかし、今回聞かれると、こう答えます。

A子：薬、あげてもいいんですよ。
B助：ホントか！
A子：ただし、私の言いつけはしっかり守ること。わかってます？
B助：（ひとり言）へいへい。わぁーってますよ…

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○　あり得る

○　あり得ない

○　どちらとも言えない

S-017A

仲間のA助くんとB助さんは魔王と戦っています。魔王を倒すために、A助くんは策を考えました。

A助：あいつの魔力を飲み込むよ！B助さん！
B助：おう！
って、おいおいおいおい！
A助：え？
B助：飲む、あの量を？**聞いてません**けれども！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-017B

仲間のA助くんとB助さんは魔王と戦っています。魔王を倒すために、A助くんは策を考えました。

A助：あいつの魔力を飲み込みますよ！B助さん！
B助：おう！
って、おいおいおいおい！
A助：え？
B助：飲む、あの量を？**聞いてません**けれども！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-018A

仲間のA助くんとB助さんは話しています。A助くんはB助さんにお願いしたけど、B助さんは無理だと言って断りました。そこで、A助くんはこう言います。

A助：で、でも…B助さんなら、できるかなって…
む、無理かな？
B助：それはまあ、**出来ます**けど！
A助：B助さん！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-018B

仲間のA助くんとB助さんは話しています。A助くんはB助さんにお願いしたけど、B助さんは無理だと言って断りました。そこで、A助くんはこう言います。

A助：で、でも…B助さんなら、できるかなって…
む、無理ですか？
B助：それはまあ、**出来ます**けど！
A助：B助さん！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-018C

仲間のA助くんとB子さんは話しています。A助くんはB子さんにお願いしたけど、B子さんは無理だと言って断りました。そこで、A助くんはこう言います。

A助：で、でも…B子さんなら、できるかなって…
む、無理かな？
B子：それはまあ、**出来ます**けど！
A助：B子さん！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-019A

坊ちゃんのA助くんとメイドのB子ちゃんは話しています。B子ちゃんはよくA助くんをからかいます。

A助：なんか今、寒気がしたなぁ。
B子：まあ、それは大変！裸で温め合いますか？
A助：（赤くなって、目をそらす）**出来ません**って！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-019B

友達のA助くんとB子ちゃんは話しています。B子ちゃんはよくA助くんをからかいます。

A助：なんか今、寒気がしたなぁ。
B子：まあ、それは大変！裸で温め合う？
A助：（赤くなって、目をそらす）**出来ません**って！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○　あり得る

○　あり得ない

○　どちらとも言えない

S-020A

サッカー部部長のB助くんが練習していると、クラスメイトのA助くんと数人の仲間たちがやってきます。

A助：悪いが、この場所は今日から俺たち、
「ネオ剣道部」が使わせてもらうぜ！
B助：いや、誰も竹刀**持ってません**けど。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○　あり得る

○　あり得ない

○　どちらとも言えない

S-020B

サッカー部部長のB助くんが練習していると、後輩のA助くんと数人の仲間たちがやってきます。

A助：すみませんが、この場所は今日から僕たち、
「ネオ剣道部」が使わせていただきます！
B助：いや、誰も竹刀**持ってません**けど。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○　あり得る

○　あり得ない

○　どちらとも言えない

S-021A

剣道部部長のA助くんとサッカー部部長のB助くんは口喧嘩をしています。

A助：剣道をなめるな！
（A助が竹刀でサッカーボールを打つ）
B助：アンタもサッカーなめないで**くれます**か！？

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○　あり得る

○　あり得ない

○　どちらとも言えない

S-021B

剣道部部長のA助くんとサッカー部部長のB助くんは口喧嘩をしています。

A助：剣道をなめるな！
（A助が竹刀でサッカーボールを打つ）
B助：アンタもサッカーなめないで**くださいます**か！？

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○　あり得る

○　あり得ない

○　どちらとも言えない

S-022A

サッカー部部長のA助くんは生徒会長と口喧嘩をしています。

A助：　ずっと言いたかったんだけど、
アンタ達サッカー部を**敵視しすぎてません**か！？

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○　あり得る

○　あり得ない

○　どちらとも言えない

S-022B

サッカー部部長の**A子ちゃん**は生徒会長と口喧嘩をしています。

A子：　ずっと言いたかったんだけど、
アンタ達サッカー部を**敵視しすぎてません**か！？

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○　あり得る

○　あり得ない

○　どちらとも言えない

S-023A

A子ちゃんとB子ちゃんは同居しています。A子ちゃんは珍しく、髪を縛りましたので、B子ちゃんに見せています。

A子：B子！見て見て！ちょっと**縛ってみました**。
B子：おー！
A子：かっこいい？
B子：A子、ちょっとだけお姉さんぽく見えますよ！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-023B

A子ちゃんとB子ちゃんは同居しています。A子ちゃんは珍しく、髪を縛りましたので、B子ちゃんに見せています。

A子：B子！見て見て！ちょっと**縛ってみました**。
B子：おー！
A子：かっこいい？
B子：A子、ちょっとだけお姉さんぽく見えるよ！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-024A

A子ちゃんとB子ちゃんは同居しています。B子ちゃんは先ほど、A子ちゃんに「お姉さんぽく見える」と褒めました。

A子：ねえねえ！A子、どんぐらいお姉さんぽい？
B子：ええと、結構お姉さんぽいですよ。
A子：じゃあB子は？B子はどんなぐらい？
B子：え？あ、いや、私はそんなにお姉さんぽくないかもです。
A子：（笑う）
じゃあ、しょうがないからA子が**片付けます**。
（A子が食器を片付けます）

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-024B

A子さんとB子さんは同居しています。B子さんは先ほど、教師として仕事を始まったばかりのA子さんに「先生っぽく見える」と褒めました。

A子：ねえねえ！私、どんぐらい先生っぽい？
B子：ええと、結構先生っぽいですよ。
A子：じゃあB子は？B子はどんなぐらい？
B子：え？あ、いや、私はそんなに先生っぽくないかもです。
A子：（笑う）
じゃあ、しょうがないから私が**片付けます**。
（A子が資料を片付けます）

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-025A

A子ちゃんは大人ごっこをしています。喋る猫のB助さんが寝ているのを見て、こう言います。

A子：もう、B助もしょうがないなぁ…
B助：ん？おい、何してんだ？
A子：風邪**ひきます**よ。（A子が毛布をかぶせる）

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-025B

A子さんは仕事から帰ってきました。喋る猫のB助さんが寝ているのを見て、こう言います。

A子：もう、B助もしょうがないなぁ…
B助：ん？おい、何してんだ？
A子：風邪**ひきます**よ。（A子が毛布をかぶせる）

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-026A

A子ちゃんとB子ちゃんが同居しています。いつものように、A子ちゃんが家事を始めると、小学生のB子ちゃんが手伝いたくなります。

A子：私、洗濯してきますね。
B子：あ、B子が**します**！
（二人で洗濯をし始める）
A子：大丈夫ですよ、B子。もう、ダイヤル回すだけなので。
B子：もう、しょうがないな。じゃ、B子が**回します**。
A子：いや、本当にもう回すだけなので…
B子：（怒る）だからB子が回すからB子が回すの！
A子：え、ええと。じゃ、お願いしようかな。
（B子がダイヤルを回す。）
B子：へへ。困ったらB子を呼んで**ください**。
A子：は、はい！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-026B

A子ちゃんと**B助くん**が同居しています。いつものように、A子ちゃんが家事を始めると、小学生のB助くんが手伝いたくなります。

A子：私、洗濯してきますね。
B助：あ、B助が**します**！
（二人で洗濯をし始める）
A子：大丈夫ですよ、B助。もう、ダイヤル回すだけなので。
B助：もう、しょうがないな。じゃ、B助が**回します**。
A子：いや、本当にもう回すだけなので…
B助：（怒る）だからB助が回すからB助が回すの！
A子：え、ええと。じゃ、お願いしようかな。
（B助がダイヤルを回す。）
B助：へへ。困ったらB助を呼んで**ください**。
A子：は、はい！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-026C

大学生のA子さんとB子さんが同居しています。いつものように、A子さんが家事を始めると、B子さんが手伝いたくなります。

A子：私、洗濯してきますね。
B子：あ、私が**します**！
（二人で洗濯をし始める）
A子：大丈夫ですよ、B子。もう、ダイヤル回すだけなので。
B子：もう、しょうがないな。じゃ、私が**回します**。
A子：いや、本当にもう回すだけなので…
B子：（怒る）だから私が回すって言ってるの！
A子：え、ええと。じゃ、お願いしようかな。
（B子がダイヤルを回す。）
B子：へへ。困ったらB子を呼んで**ください**。
A子：は、はい！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-026D

A子ちゃんとB子ちゃんが同居しています。いつものように、A子ちゃんが家事を始めると、小学生のB子ちゃんが手伝いたくなります。

A子：私、洗濯して**くる**ね。
B子：あ、B子が**します**！
（二人で洗濯をし始める）
A子：大丈夫**だよ**、B子。もう、ダイヤル回すだけなので。
B子：もう、しょうがないな。じゃ、B子が**回します**。
A子：いや、本当にもう回すだけなので...
B子：（怒る）だからB子が回すからB子が回すの！
A子：え、ええと。じゃ、お願いしようかな。
（B子がダイヤルを回す。）
B子：へへ。困ったらB子を呼んで**ください**。
A子：は、はい！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-027A

A子ちゃんとB子ちゃんは同居しています。A子ちゃんの料理に、小学生のB子ちゃんは手伝っています。B子ちゃんの失敗で、一回めでは上手く作れませんでした。

A子：とりあえず、もう一回作り直そう。
B子：あ！じゃ、B子が**作ります**！
A子：あ、いや、他の具材が冷めちゃうので、
ちゃっちゃとやっちゃいますよ。
B子：もう、A子は...B子が**やります**から。
（B子が危なげに卵を扱う）
A子：ちょ、B子、危ないですよ！卵落ちちゃいますよ！
B子：大丈夫**です**からー。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得ると思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-027B

A子ちゃんとB子ちゃんは同居しています。A子ちゃんの料理に、小学生のB子ちゃんは手伝っています。B子ちゃんの失敗で、一回めでは上手く作れませんでした。

A子：とりあえず、もう一回作り直そう。
B子：あ！じゃ、B子が**お作りします**！
A子：あ、いや、他の具材が冷めちゃうので、
ちゃっちゃとやっちゃいますよ。
B子：もう、A子は...B子が**やります**から。
（B子が危なげに卵を扱う）
A子：ちょ、B子、危ないですよ！卵落ちちゃいますよ！
B子：大丈夫**です**からー。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得ると思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-028A

A助さんとB子ちゃんは、同居の小学生のC子ちゃんについて話しています。C子ちゃんは朝から、家事をなんでも手伝っています。

A助：どうしたんだ、今日のガキは？
B子：多分、お姉さんぽいことをしたいんだと...
C子：お姉さん**です**から。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-028B

A助さんとB子ちゃんは、同居の小学生の**C助くん**について話しています。C助くんは朝から、家事をなんでも手伝っています。

A助：どうしたんだ、今日のガキは？
B子：多分、お兄さんぽいことをしたいんだと...
C助：お兄さん**です**から。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-029A

クラスメイトで友達のA子ちゃんとB助くんは話しています。B助くんはA子ちゃんを避けていましたが、会うとびっくりします。A子ちゃんはびっくり顔について聞きます。

A子：ところでさっき変な顔してた？
B助：**してません**。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-029B

クラスメイトで友達のA子ちゃんと**B子ちゃん**は話しています。B子ちゃんはA子ちゃんを避けていましたが、会うとびっくりします。A子ちゃんはびっくり顔について聞きます。

A子：ところでさっき変な顔してた？
B子：<u>してません</u>。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○　あり得る

○　あり得ない

○　どちらとも言えない

S-029C

クラスメイトで友達のA子ちゃんとB助くんは話しています。B助くんはA子ちゃんを避けていましたが、会うとびっくりします。A子ちゃんはびっくり顔について聞きます。

A子：ところでさっき変な顔してた？
B助：<u>**してないです**</u>。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○　あり得る

○　あり得ない

○　どちらとも言えない

S-029D

クラスメイトで友達のA子ちゃんとB助くんは話しています。B助くんはA子ちゃんを避けていましたが、会うとびっくりします。A子ちゃんはびっくり顔について聞きます。

A子：ところでさっき変な顔してた？
B助：<u>**しておりません**</u>。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○　あり得る

○　あり得ない

○　どちらとも言えない

S-031A

友達のA助くん、B助くん、C助くんは話しています。A助くんとC助くんがやっているゲームに、B助くんは誘われます。

A助：馬鹿な俺らと勝負してもらおうじゃねえか！
B助：だ？
C助：え、まじで！？B助もやる！？
B助：**やりません**。
C助：お前もブレーカーの仲間になろう！
B助：**なりません**。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-031B

同僚のA助さん、B助さん、C助さんは話しています。A助さんとC助さんがやっているゲームに、B助さんは誘われます。

A助：馬鹿な俺らと勝負してもらおうじゃねえか！
B助：だ？
C助：え、まじで！？B助もやる！？
B助：**やりません**。
C助：お前もブレーカーの仲間になろう！
B助：**なりません**。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-031C

友達のA助くん、B助くん、C助くんは話しています。A助くんとC助くんがやっているゲームに、B助くんは誘われます。

A助：馬鹿な俺らと勝負してもらおうじゃねえか！
B助：だ？
C助：え、まじで！？B助もやる！？
B助：**やらないです**。
C助：お前もブレーカーの仲間になろう！
B助：**ならないです**。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-032A

A助くんはマンガの筋書きを書いて、今友達に話しています。

A助：あ、だがちょっと待ってくれ！この話はここで終わりじゃねえんだ！
実はこの後、衝撃の大どんでん返しが待ってんだよ！
B助：えー、どんな？
A助：さあ、何**でしょう**ねー！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-032B

A助くんはマンガの筋書きを書いて、今友達に話しています。

A助：あ、だがちょっと待ってくれ！この話はここで終わりじゃねえんだ！
実はこの後、衝撃の大どんでん返しが待ってんだよ！
B助：えー、どんな？
A助：さあ、何**でございましょう**ねー！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-033A

A助さんは上司であるB助さんに話しています。二人は詐欺師として働いています。A助さんの部下が失敗したと疑って、
B助さんはA助さんを叱っています。

A助：失敗した時は元々なかった金と思って諦める。
それが詐欺屋の鉄則です。
大体誰かにおっかぶせて詰めて、
そいつがケツまくってデコにたれたら、一網打尽ですから。
B助：（怒って）上等な美意識**でございますこと**！社会勉強に**なりますわ**！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-033B

A助さんは同僚であるB助さんに話しています。二人は詐欺師として働いています。A助さんの部下が失敗したと疑って、B助さんはA助さんを叱っています。

A助：失敗した時は元々なかった金と思って諦める。
それが詐欺屋の鉄則。
大体誰かにおっかぶせて詰めて、
そいつがケツまくってデコにたれたら、一網打尽だから。
B助：（怒って）上等な美意識でございますこと！社会勉強になりますわ！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-033C

A助さんは上司であるB助さんに話しています。二人は詐欺師として働いています。A助さんの部下が失敗したと疑って、B助さんはA助さんを叱っています。

A助：失敗した時は元々なかった金と思って諦める。
それが詐欺屋の鉄則です。
大体誰かにおっかぶせて詰めて、
そいつがケツまくってデコにたれたら、一網打尽ですから。
B助：（怒って）上等な美意識ですわ！社会勉強になりますわ！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-034A

A助さんは上司であるB助さんに話しています。二人は詐欺師として働いています。A助さんの部下が失敗したと疑って、B助さんはA助さんを叱っています。

A助：ありえません！ 店舗の人間は、そんな揉め事起こすより、 真面目に成績上げた方が儲かるし、安全だからです。
B助：なるほどなるほどなるほどです。 全く社会勉強になりますわ。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-034B

A助さんは同僚であるB助さんに話しています。二人は詐欺師として働いています。A助さんの部下が失敗したと疑って、B助さんはA助さんを叱っています。

A助：ありえん！ 店舗の人間は、そんな揉め事起こすより、 真面目に成績上げた方が儲かるし、安全だからだ。
B助：なるほどなるほどなるほど**です**。 全く社会勉強に**なります**わ。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る
○ あり得ない
○ どちらとも言えない

S-034C

大学生のA助くんは先輩であるB助くんに話しています。二人は詐欺師として働いています。A助くんの同僚が失敗したと疑って、B助くんはA助くんを叱っています。

A助：ありえません！ 店舗の人間は、そんな揉め事起こすより、 真面目に成績上げた方が儲かるし、安全だからです。
B助：なるほどなるほどなるほど**です**。 全く社会勉強に**なります**わ。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る
○ あり得ない
○ どちらとも言えない

S-035A

クラスメイトのA助くんとB助くんはゲームをしています。二人は友達ではありませんが、同じC助くんの友達ではあります。

A助：確率のいい倒し方教えてあげようか？
なんなら博士って呼んでもいいよ？
B助：（怒って）あぁ？
A助：あっ、いえ、**ごめんなさい**。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る
○ あり得ない
○ どちらとも言えない

S-035B

同僚のA助さんとB助さんはゲームをしています。二人は友達ではありませんが、同じC助さんの友達ではあります。

A助：確率のいい倒し方教えてあげようか？
なんなら博士って呼んでもいいよ？
B助：（怒って）あぁ？
A助：あっ、いえ、**ごめんなさい。**

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-036A

A子ちゃんは魔法の箱を持っています。A子ちゃんは今日、初めて友達を箱の中へ招待しました。

A子：ようこそ！ここは好きな物がなーんでも出せる
「A子のおもちゃ箱」**で一す**！！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-036B

A助くんは魔法の箱を持っています。A助くんは今日、初めて友達を箱の中へ招待しました。

A助：ようこそ！ここは好きな物がなーんでも出せる
「A助のおもちゃ箱」**で一す**！！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-036C

A子ちゃんは魔法の箱を持っています。A子ちゃんは今日、初めて友達を箱の中へ招待しました。

A子：ようこそ！ここは好きな物がなーんでも出せる
「A子のおもちゃ箱」**でございまーす**！！

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-037A

A助さんとB助くんは友達です。チームとして、ポイントを集めるゲームをしています。B助くんのせいで、ポイントが奪われたと知ると、A助さんはこう言います。

A助：ただでさえ誰かさんがへろへろメロメロになったせいで
魔力もポイントも奪われているというのに...
みんなが聞いたらカンカン**です**よ。
B助：それはその...
すみませんでした...

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-037B

A子さんとB助くんは友達です。チームとして、ポイントを集めるゲームをしています。B助くんのせいで、ポイントが奪われたと知ると、A子さんはこう言います。

A子：ただでさえ誰かさんがへろへろメロメロになったせいで
魔力もポイントも奪われているというのに...
みんなが聞いたらカンカン**です**よ。
B助：それはその...
すみませんでした...

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-037C

A助さんとB子ちゃんは友達です。チームとして、ポイントを集めるゲームをしています。B子ちゃんのせいで、ポイントが奪われたと知ると、A助さんはこう言います。

A助：ただでさえ誰かさんがへろへろメロメロになったせいで
魔力もポイントも奪われているというのに...
みんなが聞いたらカンカン**です**よ。
B子：それはその...
すみませんでした...

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-037D

後輩のA助くんと先輩のB助くんは友達です。チームとして、ポイントを集めるゲームをしています。B助くんのせいで、ポイントが奪われたと知ると、A助くんはこう言います。

A助：ただでさえ誰かさんがへろへろメロメロになったせいで
魔力もポイントも奪われているというのに…
みんなが聞いたらカンカンですよ。
B助：それはその…
すみませんでした…

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-038A

親子のA助さんとB助くんは知り合いの家へ遊びに来ました。A助さんは、いつものようにたくさんお酒を飲みます。知り合いによく飲みますか、と聞かれると、A助さんはこう答えます。

A助：まあ、なー、嗜む程度ですが。（笑う）
B助：（一人言）**嗜みます**ね、際限なく。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない

S-038B

親子のA助さんとB助くんは知り合いの家へ遊びに来ました。A助さんは、いつものようにたくさんお酒を飲みます。知り合いによく飲みますか、と聞かれると、A助さんはこう答えます。

A助：まあ、なー、嗜む程度ですが。（笑う）
B助：（一人言）**嗜まれます**ね、際限なく。

以上の敬語へのスタイル・シフトは、あり得たと思いますか。

○ あり得る

○ あり得ない

○ どちらとも言えない