Only a little polite?

A review and analysis on the use of the 'semi-polite' nai desu *in modern Japanese*

Nils Christian Gjesvold

Master's Thesis in East Asian Linguistics

60 Credits

Fall 2014

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages

November 14, 2014

Abstract

This thesis explores a rather new and somewhat colloquial style of polite language in Japanese, which will mostly be referred to as the 'semi-polite' or *nai desu* form. In most grammars and textbooks we are usually taught that the negative plain form of the verb *taberu* 'eat' is *tabenai* 'not eat' and the negative polite form is *tabemasen*. For the 'semi-polite' form we add the politeness marker *desu* to the negative plain form of the verb, giving us *tabenai desu*.

The 'semi-polite' or *nai desu* form is thus a grammaticalized hybrid of the plain and polite forms, where the politeness marker *desu*, which was originally used to make adjectives polite, has spread to verbal negatives. It is 'semi-polite' in that it is less polite than the standard polite form used in more formal settings or between strangers, yet more polite than the plain form of speech generally used at home or with one's close friends etc. The 'semi-polite' *nai desu* form seems to have been gaining popularity in the last decades. This study thus investigates the distribution of *masen* and *nai desu* forms in verbs, adjectives and copula.

Previous studies and my corpus analysis show that there are some general tendencies that affect the choice of *masen* or *nai desu* forms. In written materials, *masen* is preferred, however in natural speech materials; *nai desu* forms are more used. Other general tendencies found in these studies include: *nai desu* is preferred with verbs when sentence final particles are used, but *masen* is still preferred when not followed by these particles; declarative sentences will have more *nai desu* forms, while interrogative sentences have more *masen* forms; *nai desu* is preferred when negation is emphasized, whereas *masen* is preferred with modality and other fixed expressions. Levels of formality, and possibly age, also seem to play a role, e.g. there are more *nai desu* forms in conversations between university students, while in circumstances with higher levels of formality, e.g. in the workplace, *masen* is preferred.

The grammaticalization process of the polite auxiliary verb *desu*, which has hitherto developed into a 'semi-polite' form of verbal negatives (e.g. *tabenai desu*), could theoretically spread even further and could possibly someday become a variant form for affirmatives as well (e.g. *taberu desu* instead of *tabemasu*). Thus, *desu* might either replace the *masu*/*masen* (affirmative/negative) polite verb endings, or become a variant form on par with *masu*/*masen*, or become an established 'semi-polite' level of politeness between polite and plain forms.

2014

Only a little polite?: A review and analysis on the use of the ‘semi-polite’ *nai desu* in modern Japanese

Nils Christian Gjesvold

http://www.duo.uio.no/

Print: Reprosentralen, University of Oslo

Acknowledgements

My most heartfelt gratitude goes to my supervisor, Tomoko Okazaki Hansen, who has been utmost availiable and patient with me from the beginning to the end of my thesis. I am very grateful for her good suggestions and helpful nature, and for having steadily led me through this.

Table of Contents

1 Chapter 1: Introduction

When I first started learning Japanese it was my first meeting with a completely *different* language. I was aware of the fact that writing and reading it would be troublesome, and to my surprise the writing system consisted not only of what looked like an unsurmountable amount of unnecessarily complicated little characters, but also two different sets of less complicated characters which luckily only represented syllables. This would however not be the only surprise this language would throw at me. In the following years of studying I came to accept, but not always understand, the different nature of the Japanese language, especially in terms of grammar and politeness.

I would consider myself a polite person. I would even consider most of my friends and family polite, but there is one problem most of these people, including myself, share, and that is that we are Norwegian. There is nothing wrong with that, but our language is not very polite. Two or three generations ago this might have been somewhat different, in that we would use *De* (polite, 'you') instead of *du* (neutral, 'you') when addressing people of social status or strangers, much like in German, but in today's society this is considered archaic. Studying German in high school reminded me of this distinction, and even though it seemed like an unnecessary hassle, it was not a big one. Embarking on the mission of learning Japanese, however, made the German distinction between *Sie* (polite, 'you') and *du* (neutral 'you') seem like a trivial thing.

In Japanese, politeness is something that needs to be considered in every sentence, and the correct use of polite language is of utmost importance in everyday interaction in all parts of society. Because of this, introductory textbooks in Japanese all teach the polite forms first, to make sure that these students don't come off as rude when they eventually go to Japan to study. When thy come to Japan, however, they soon get new friends and partake in different social activities where polite language is less used and plain, intimate speech is preferred. Back in the classroom they thus often forget to use the polite forms when talking to the teacher, and quickly come off as rude, although unintentionally.

The language taught in textbooks and the language we meet in everyday life is often quite different. One of these small differences that I noticed after some time was that I heard a lot of the word *desu* in environments where I would not expect it. The textbooks had taught me that *desu* is the polite copula e.g. *kore wa hon desu* 'This is a book', but also served to make

adjectives more polite e.g. *samui* '(It) is cold' versus *samui desu* '(It) is cold' (polite). This new environment in which I would now often hear *desu* was with plain verbal negatives.

Let us take the verb 'to eat', *taberu*. To say 'not eat' in Japanese you say either *tabe-masen* (polite) or *tabe-nai* (plain), but what I had started noticing was that many people, especially young people, would say *tabe-nai desu*. What had happened here was that someone had taken the plain negative *tabe-nai* and made it polite by adding *desu*, just like with adjectives. At first I thought of it as cheating and hesitated to use it, but hearing it every day I soon began to use it myself. If I was in a polite setting forgetting for an instant to add the more correct *–masen* after verbal negatives, and instead uttering the plain form, I could save myself from being rude by quickly adding *desu* instead, giving what I said a polite tone.

This *nai desu* form has received some attention among scholars, and Hudson (2008) calls it a 'semi-polite' form, meaning that it is more polite than plain forms, yet not as polite as the more correct polite form with verbs ending in *–masen*. It is furthermore a fairly recent phenomenon that shows how a language changes in only a few decades.

1.1 Thesis aims

In this thesis I want to show what the 'semi-polite' form is and how it is used in the real world, as a contrast to what is considered correct in grammars and textbooks. I will review the available previous research in both Japanese and English, but also do my own corpus analysis to test certain findings from the previous studies.

1.2 Structure

After this introduction, in Chapter 2, I will present theories concerning linguistic politeness in order to give a better understanding of how expressing politeness in Japanese in some cases differs from that of European languages with a focus on English. I will also present the Japanese system of polite language and honorifics and lastly the so-called 'semi-polite' *nai desu* forms. In Chapter 3 I will review previous studies on this subject, most of which are in Japanese. I will look for general tendencies, similar findings and results, in order to make some hypotheses which will be tested on my own data. Chapter 4 introduces my corpus and results, and I will use the hypotheses gathered in Chapter 3 to check if these also hold for my

data. Chapter 5 will conclude the thesis with a review of my findings and attempt to describe the actual use of *nai desu* forms in today's Japanese language and society.

2 Chapter 2: Politeness

My thesis is about *nai desu* which, according to Hudson (2008), is a possibly emerging and rather recent form in everyday polite Japanese, a so-called 'semi-polite' form used with verbal negatives and other forms where the 'correct' *masen* is replaced by *nai desu*. Japanese is a language in which, to a much larger extent than in European languages, 'politeness' is expressed by means of different levels of polite language. In other words, not merely by saying 'please' and using other polite words such as addressing people as 'sir' or 'madam', but by changing into polite verbs and copula, using different pronouns and polite prefixes and using polite versions of auxiliary verbs. How this is done depends on many factors, most notably your rank in society in relation to others and whether the addressee is someone intimate to you or a stranger.

Since my study deals with which forms of the polite language people use in different formal settings, I wish to use this part to introduce the concept of linguistic politeness. As I will get into later, linguistic politeness as an object of study is somewhat controversial. Not only is it difficult to define completely in one language, it is even more difficult to define what politeness is in its universal sense when looking at different languages and cultures.

2.1 Linguistic politeness

Politeness, or in this case polite language is generally thought to be 'the language a person uses to avoid being too direct', 'language which displays respect towards or consideration for others' or even 'language that displays certain "polite" formulaic utterances like *please, thank you, excuse me* or *sorry*' (Watts 2003:1).

The study of politeness reached its heights in 1978 with Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson's "Politeness: Some universals in language.", and in this book, Brown and Levinson presented a theory of politeness which incorporated the concept of face. In their theory face is divided into positive and negative face, where positive face is defined as "the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others" or "the positive consistent self-image or 'personality' (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants", and negative face defined as "the want of every 'competent adult member' that his actions be unimpeded by others" or "the basic claim to

territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction – i.e. the freedom of action and freedom from imposition" (Brown and Levinson 1987:61). Positive face is thus referring to a person's self-esteem and the want to be approved of, while negative face deals with a person's freedom to act and the want to be unimpeded. The theory assumes that all people will strive to not threaten the face of the other person, or committing a 'face threatening act' (FTA). In order to avoid or minimize the FTA, the speaker must choose a strategy. Positive politeness strategies aims to avoid acts that can threaten the hearer's positive face, such as expressions of disapproval, contradictions, disagreement or challenges, while negative politeness strategies aims to avoid threatening the hearer's negative face by imposing on his or her freedom to act or by giving orders, requests, threats or warnings.

Brown and Levinson claim that their theory explained briefly above is universal across cultures (Brown and Levinson 1987:61-62). To support this claim they tested and confirmed the theory on three unrelated languages: English (from both sides of the Atlantic), Tzeltal (a Mayan language spoken in the community of Tenejapa in Chiapas, Mexico) and South Indian Tamil (from a village in the Coimbatore District of Tamilnadu) (Brown and Levinson 1987:59).

However, Matsumoto (1988) in her paper "Reexamination of the Universality of Face: Politeness Phenomena in Japanese" criticizes the theory claiming that it provides wrong predictions for Japanese politeness phenomena (Matsumoto 1988:403). She especially criticizes the notion of 'negative face', which covers an individual's wish to be unimpeded by others, as a typically western viewpoint.

> What is most alien to Japanese culture in the notion of face, […] is the concept of negative face wants as the desire to be unimpeded in one's action. […] [T]he desire to be unimpeded, presupposes that the basic unit of society is the *individual*. With such an assumption, however, it is almost impossible to understand behavior in the Japanese culture. A Japanese generally *must understand where s/he stands in relation to other members of the group or society, and must acknowledge his/her dependence on the others*. Acknowledgement and maintenance of the relative position of others, rather that preservation of an individual's proper territory, governs all social interaction. (italics are mine, Matsumoto 1988:405)

Let me first explain what Matsumoto means by *individuals* in Indo-European languages versus the importance of *where one stands relative to other members of the group* in Japanese. Deixis is the linguistic term that describes words that can only be understood when

contextual information is provided, such as personal pronouns (e.g. 'I', 'you') and demonstratives such as 'here' and 'there'.

The deictic center in Indo-European languages is the individual ego. However, the deictic center in Japanese is not the ego, but something called *uchi* 'in-group'. *Uchi* and *soto* (the opposite of *uchi*) refers to a notion in Japanese society that governs how people interact on the social level. A person's *uchi* 'in-group' refers to his or her family or close group of friends, but also his or her workplace. *Soto* 'out-group', on the other hand refers to the opposite, such as society at large, or for example a company other than one's place of work. However, the boundaries that define what is *uchi* 'in-group' and what is *soto* 'out-group' are fluid rather than static (Bachnik et. al 1994), meaning that who is *uchi* and who is *soto* can change from one situation to the next.

In the paper "A movable self: The linguistic indexing of *uchi* and *soto*" (1994), Patricia J. Wetzel argues that Japanese is better understood if *uchi* 'in-group' is treated as the deictic center, instead of the 'ego' or 'self' which is the deictic center in Indo-European languages. Here are two examples to illustrate this:

(1) *Sensei wa imooto ni hon wo kudasaimashita.*
Teacher TOP. sister DAT. book OBJ. give (from *soto* to *uchi*) VERB HON. PAST
"The teacher gave my sister a book."

In this sentence the deictic center is not 'I', but *uchi* 'in-group' which includes both 'I' and 'my sister'. 'My sister' is in other words treated *exactly* like 'I'.

(2) *Shachoo wa ima seki wo hazushite orimasu.*
Company president TOP. now seat OBJ. has left VERB HUM.
"The company president is currently not here." (humble)

Also in this sentence the deictic center is not 'I', but the company as a whole including the president. The speaker talks humbly on behalf of his or her *uchi* (including the president) to the *soto* group, in this case possibly represented by a customer. If this utterance was said to someone in the speaker's company or workplace, however, the speaker would use *irasshaimasu* which is the honorific verb instead of *orimasu* which is humble.

Returning to Brown and Levinson, however, in their theory Japanese culture falls under the category of a 'negative politeness culture' (Brown and Levinson 1987:245). Cultures in this

category emphasize politeness directed at the negative face (i.e. not imposing, being indirect and apologizing), more so than politeness directed at the positive face (i.e. giving compliments, offering and promising, friendly joking). Furthermore, Japan is described as a typical "deference culture", and "'give deference' is, according to Brown and Levinson, a strategy of negative politeness, in that it gives redress to the negative face wants of the addressee." (Matsumoto 1988:409).

Matsumoto presents some examples of conventionalized expressions showing deference in Japanese which "cannot be considered as deriving from the negative politeness strategy of minimizing the imposition on the addressee's action" (ibid. 1988:409), but rather as what she coins 'relation-acknowledging devices':

(1) *Doozo yoroshiku onegaishimasu*

lit. 'I ask you to please treat me well/take care of me.'

(2a) *Musume wo doozo yoroshiku onegaishimasu*

lit. 'I ask you to please treat/take care of my daughter well'

(2b) *Shujin wo doozo yoroshiku onegaishimasu*

lit. 'I ask you to please treat/take care of my husband well '

Matsumoto claims that these examples are typical of deferential behavior in Japanese society. They are not, however, strategies of negative politeness, but rather requests and would thus classify as impositions. She claims that "If we analyze this in terms of negative face, it seems contradictory. If, however, we abandon the universality of negative face as a primary motivation for politeness, then the contradiction disappears (ibid. 1988:410)". With this example she highlights the fact that "in Japanese society acknowledgement of interdependence is encouraged", and that:

> Since this is what is expected in the society, it is an honor to be asked to take care of someone in that it indicates that one is regarded as holding a higher position in the society. Thus, deferent impositions can enhance the good self-image (that is, the 'face') of the addressee (ibid. 1988:410)

Another point on which Matsumoto disagrees with Brown and Levinson is in their analysis of 'honorifics' (which I will explain later in this chapter). Again, Matsumoto would rather describe these as 'relation-acknowledging devices', than as a means of expressing negative politeness. Her argument is that every Japanese utterance in itself is potentially face-threatening because "[t]he mere choice of the form of a predicate in an utterance requires consideration of interactional factors. (ibid. 1988:418)" There is in other words no socially unmarked form in Japanese. Thus, treating the system of honorifics in Japanese merely as a means of expressing negative politeness is insufficient because the speaker must always convey an attitude towards the social relationship and, furthermore, acknowledge his or her relation to others in society in ever changing situations. Matsumoto uses this example to explain this (ibid. 1988:415):

(9a) *Kyoo wa doyoobi da.*

today TOPIC Saturday COPULA-PLAIN

(9b) *Kyoo wa doyoobi desu.*

today TOPIC Saturday COPULA-POLITE

(9c) *Kyoo wa doyoobi de gozai masu.*

today TOPIC Saturday COPULA-SUPER POLITE

The three example sentences listed above all mean "Today is Saturday". Her argument is that all utterances in Japanese require the speaker to consider the correct form based on "one's relative position in the communicative context" (ibid 1988:415), even if they cannot be considered to be face threatening acts.

Matsumoto states, in the end of her paper, that:

> In the Japanese culture, as we have seen, people are expected to act properly according to *their relative position* or rank with regard to other members of the group, and it is that relative position that they want to maintain when they employ politeness strategies. Since a person's self-image in Japan is not as an independent *individual* but as a *group member* having certain relations to others, his concept of 'face' is understandably fundamentally different from that of, say, Europeans, who define

themselves as individuals, with certain rights and a certain domain of independence (italics are mine, Matsumoto 1988:423)

The criticism of Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness done by Matsumoto has, however, since been challenged by Pizziconi (2003). Pizziconi especially points to Matsumoto's claim that individual territories is a concept "alien" to Japanese people and cites a study by Kamio (1997) where this is proven wrong (Pizziconi 2003:1478). Pizziconi further claims that "The Japanese data do not provide evidence that this language behaves any differently from those treated by Brown and Levinson, at least with respect to the criteria proposed by Ide and Matsumoto (Pizziconi 2003:1497)".

I will leave this topic for now since it is beyond the scope of my study, although I think it serves the purpose of explaining the use of honorifics in the Japanese language and the debate concerning its relation to politeness.

2.2 Linguistic politeness in Japanese

As I briefly mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, one way in which the Japanese language differs from Indo-European languages (e.g. English) is that linguistic politeness to a much higher degree is encoded lexically, i.e. in verbs, auxiliary verbs, pronouns, prefixes, in relation to verbs of giving and receiving etc. Contrarily, in Indo-European languages, lexicalized manifestations of linguistic politeness are for the most part limited to formulaic utterances like 'please', 'thank you', 'excuse me', or respectful forms of address such as 'sir' or 'madam'. Furthermore, in some languages like German, French and Russian etc. one must use polite pronouns and their corresponding verb form when addressing strangers, seniors and superiors (e.g. *Sie/du*, *Vous*/*tu*, *vy/ty*).

Watts (2003) gives some examples of how politeness is expressed in English based on categories suggested by House and Kasper (1981). I will list a few of these categories and examples taken from Watts (2003:183-184):

- *Politeness markers* are expressions added to the utterance to "show deference to the addressee and bid for cooperative behavior". An example of this is 'please', but Watts

also mentions adding of the modal verb 'will/would' as in "Close the door, would you?"

- *Consultative devices* defined as "structures which seek to involve the addressee and bid for his/her cooperation" such as "Would you mind…", "Could you…".
- *Hedges,* defined as "the avoidance of giving a precise propositional content and leaving an option open to the addressee to impose his/her own intent" by use of phrases like 'kind of', 'sort of', 'somehow', 'more or less', 'rather' and 'what have you'
- *Forewarning*, defined as "a strategy that could be realized by a wide range of different structures in which the speaker makes some kind of metacomment on an FTA or invokes a generally accepted principle which s/he is about to flout, etc." (e.g. 'you might find this a bit boring, but…'
- *Agent avoiders*, defined as "propositional utterances in which the agent is suppressed or impersonalized, thereby deflecting the criticism from the addressee to some generalized agent" (e.g. 'people don't do …')

On the other hand, the way in which politeness is expressed in Japanese is through *keigo* 'honorific speech', which can be divided into three classes: honorific, humble and polite. These stand in contrast to the plain speech, used between intimates. Honorific forms are used when talking about a person who is higher in social rank than the speaker, or when describing that individual's actions, in order to honor said person. Contrarily, humble forms are used when describing one's own actions when the addressee is of higher social rank. If there is no difference in social rank between two people but the conversational situation still is formal, polite forms are used reciprocally (Tsujimura 1996). Honorific forms, then, are used by the speaker to exalt the hearer, while humble forms are used by the speaker to humble him or herself and thus showing respect to the hearer. I will borrow an example from Tsujimura which shows all forms being used in a short conversation (adopted from Tsujimura 1996:363):

Tanaka: *Sensei, ashita no kaigi ni <u>irasshaimasu</u> ka?* (Honorific)

"Are you <u>going</u> to the conference tomorrow?"

Prof.: *Ee, <u>ikimasu</u>. Tanaka-kun wa?* (Polite)

"Yes, I will (<u>go</u>). How about you, Mr. Tanaka?"

Tanaka: *Hai, watashi mo mairimasu.* (Humble)

"Yes, I will go, too."

In this example where Tanaka asks the professor if he will be going to tomorrow's conference, the verb *iku* 'to go' (plain) is used three times, but as we can see from the underlined forms, the word is manifested in three different ways, however, they all mean 'to go'. When Tanaka asks the professor if he will go to the conference, he uses the honorific form of *iku*, *irassharu*, with the polite ending *masu*, thus *irasshaimasu*. This is because the professor is of higher social status than Tanaka, and Tanaka is asking whether or not the professor will do the action of going, requiring Tanaka to use the honorific form *irasshaimasu*. When the professor answers, however, he does not have to show Tanaka any particular respect, but uses the polite form *ikimasu*. Again, when Tanaka answers that he also will go, he is describing his own action (i.e. that he will go), and this requires him to use the humble form *mairimasu*.

Another noteworthy detail from the above example is that the verb *iku* (plain, 'go') is manifested as three different lexical items: *irasshaimasu* (honorific), *mairimasu* (humble) and *ikimasu* (polite) where only the polite *ik-(i)masu* derives from the same stem as the plain form *ik-u*. Only a few verbs have synonym verbs which are honorific or humble by default.[1] When this is not the case, however, as for example with the verb *kiku* 'ask, listen to', different means must be taken to make the honorific and humble form. This is done by taking the verbal stem, in this case *kiki-* (from the polite *kiki-masu*) and adding for honorific forms: *o-*(verb stem)-*ni naru/narimasu*, and for humble forms: *o-*(verb stem)-*suru/shimasu*.[2]

Table 2.1: Honorific and humble verbs

Verb (plain)	**Polite**	**Honorific**	**Humble**
iku 'go' (irregular)	*iki-masu*	*irasshaimasu*	*mairimasu*
kiku 'ask'(regular)	*kiki-masu*	*o-kiki-ni-narimasu*	*o-kiki-shimasu*

Now, let us take another look at an example from Tsujimura (1996:364):

Tanaka: *Sensei, hisho ni sono hon no namae wo o-kiki-ni-narimasu ka?* (Honorific)

"Are you going to ask the secretary the name of that book?"

[1] e.g. taberu 'eat' has a synonymous verb *meshiagarimasu* 'eat (honorific)' and *itadakimasu* 'eat (humble)'
[2] A verb can also be honorific by using the passive morpheme *(r)areru*, as in *ikaremasu* and *kikaremasu*.

Prof.: *Iie, kiki-masen.* (Polite)

"No, I'm not going to."

Tanaka: *Jaa, watashi ga o-kiki-shimasu.* (Humble)

"Then, I will ask (her for you)"

In this example, as in the previous one, Tanaka uses the honorific form *o-kiki-ni-narimasu* when asking if the professor will be going to ask about the name of the book, because the verbs describes the professor's action. The professor answers Tanaka in the polite form *kiki-masen* (negative), and Tanaka decides to do the asking for the professor, describing his own actions in the humble form *o-kiki-shimasu* to exalt the professor.

2.3 The plain form and the polite form

Having treated the upper levels of polite language, let us now look at the language in more everyday terms. What is left now is the 'plain' form which is used most frequently in intimate relations (e.g. between family and friends). This 'plain' (also called 'short' or 'dictionary') form is characterized by verbs ending in *–u*, adjectives ending in *-i* and the copula *da*, and it is the form used in dictionaries, newspapers and other neutral written materials.

Table 2.2: endings of 'plain' and 'polite' forms (adopted from Hudson 2008:132)

		Plain form		**Polite form**	
Category	**Tense**	**Affirmative**	**Negative**	**Affirmative**	**Negative**
Copula	Nonpast	*-da*	*-ja nai*	*-desu*	*-ja arimasen*
	Past	*-datta*	*-ja na katta*	*-deshita*	*-ja arimasen deshita*
Adjective	Nonpast	*-i*	*-ku nai*	*-i desu*	*-ku arimasen*
	Past	*-katta*	*-ku na katta*	*-katta desu*	*-ku arimasen deshita*
Verb	Nonpast	*-u*	*-(a) nai*	*-(i) masu*	*-(i) masen*
	Past	*-ta*	*-(a) na katta*	*-(i) mashita*	*-(i) masen deshita*

Table 2.3: the verb *iku* 'go' in the plain and polite form (adopted from Hudson 2008:132)

Tense	Plain	Polite	Meaning
Nonpast, aff.	*iku*	*ikimasu*	'do/will go'
Nonpast, neg.	*ikanai*	*ikimasen*	'do/will not go'
Past, aff.	*itta*	*ikimashita*	'did go, went'
Past, neg.	*ikanakatta*	*ikimasen deshita*	'did not go'

Table 2.4: the adjective *atsui* 'warm' in the two forms[3]

Tense	Plain	Polite	Meaning
Nonpast, aff.	*atsui*	*atsui desu*	'is warm'
Nonpast, neg.	*atsukunai*	*atsuku arimasen*	'is not warm'
Past, aff.	*atsukatta*	*atsukatta desu*	'was warm'
Past, neg.	*atsukunakatta*	*atsuku arimasen deshita*	'was not warm'

What I want to highlight in these tables is that the plain negative form of verbs end in *–(a)nai* and past *–(a)nakatta*. This *-nai* (negative auxiliary) conjugates the same way as *i*-adjectives (e.g. *ikanai* > *ikanakatta*, *atsui* -> *atsukatta*). Adjectives in Japanese are, in fact, somewhat different from adjectives in English. While they function similarly in the attributive form (e.g. *takai kuruma* 'expensive car') they behave more like verbs when they are the predicate of a sentence.[4] For example if *takai* 'expensive' is used in a sentence as a predicate, e.g. *kuruma wa takai* 'the car is expensive', *takai* means 'is expensive' and not only 'expensive'. The polite equivalent to this sentence would be *kuruma wa takai desu* (same meaning), however the *desu* in the polite form of adjectives does not have copulative verb function (e.g. *kore wa hon desu* 'this is a book'), but is used to make the sentence more polite (McClain 1981:87)

2.4 The politeness markers *–desu* and *–masu*

The polite auxiliary verb *–masu* is used with verbs to make that verb polite. Little is known of its origins, but some believe it may come from おはす *ohasu* '(honorific) to be, to come, to go', ます *masu* 'to sit' or まゐらす *mairasu* '(humble) to give, to say', and its use as a politeness marker dates back to the end of the Muromachi period (1336-1537). In its current form *–masu* it can be found in writings dating back to the end of the Edo period (1603-1868)

[3] These are *i*-adjectives (verbal adjectives). So-called *na*-adjectives are not treated.
[4] Please see Frellesvig (2010:80-93) for more information

or the beginning of the Meiji period (1868-1912) (Matsumura et al. 1995:61-62). As a politeness marker it adds no lexical meaning, only politeness.

The word *desu*, however, has a much shorter history. It is believed to first have appeared in the mid-1800s as a copula used with nouns, and its use with adjectives started some time before World War II (Inoue 1998:154-157 cited in Hudson 2008:138). While it was possible to make verbs polite by adding *masu* (e.g. *taberu* (plain) vs *tabemasu* (polite)), it was not possible to make an adjective polite, except in a very lengthy and elaborate way of adding *gozaimasu* to the '*unobin*'[5] form of adjectives (Kyooiku Shuppan 2005). *Desu* as a polite auxiliary after adjectives was officially approved by the Japanese Language Council (国語審議会) on the 14th of April, 1952. The *desu* after adjectives was already used by the general public and replaced the old -*shuugozaimasu* as in *utsukushuugozaimasu* which is *utsukushii desu* '(is) beautiful'. Today *desu* is used as the polite form of the copula *da* (e.g. *kore wa hon desu* 'this is a book'), and as a polite auxiliary verb after adjectives (e.g. *atsui desu* 'it is hot' (polite)).

2.5 The 'semi-polite' form

Hudson (2008) defines *nai desu* as a semi-polite form, which is less polite than a polite form (e.g. *masu*) but more polite than a plain form. It is furthermore a fairly new phenomenon that according to Hudson (2008:131) is "reported to be on the rise in contemporary Japanese". The main characteristics of the form, in short, are that plain negative verbs (e.g. *ikanai* 'do/will not go' and past *ikanakatta* 'did not go'), take the politeness marker *desu* to form *ikanai desu* and *ikanakatta desu* instead of the more widely used and 'correct' *ikimasen* and *ikimasen deshita*. The same is done for negative adjectives, thus *atsukunai* '(is) not warm' and *atsukunakatta* '(was) not warm' become *atsukunai desu* and *atsukunakatta desu* instead of the 'correct' *atsuku arimasen* and *atsuku arimasen deshita*. Lastly, the negative plain copula *dewa/(ja) nai* (past: *nakatta*) becomes *dewa/(ja) nai desu / nakatta desu* instead of *dewa/(ja) arimasen*.

[5] *Unobin* means to drop [k] from the continuative (*renyoukei*) form of an adjective, e.g. *utsukushiku* 'beautiful' becomes *utsukushiu*, *oishiku* 'tasty' becomes *oishiu*. Adding *gozaimasu* produces the forms *utsukushuu gozaimasu* and *oishuu gozaimasu*.

Thus in short, *desu* is added to the negative plain form. Note, however, that affirmative 'semi-polite' forms are usually not used.

Table 2.5: Plain and 'semi-polite' forms for copula, adjectives and verbs

		Plain form		**Semi-polite form**	
Category	Tense	Affirmative	Negative	Affirmative	Negative
Copula: *da*	Nonpast	*-da*	*-ja nai*	*-desu*	*-ja nai desu*
	Past	*-datta*	*-ja na katta*	**-datta desu*	*-ja nakatta desu*
Adjective: *atsui* 'warm'	Nonpast	*atsui*	*atsukunai*	*atsui desu*	*atsukunai desu*
	Past	*atsukatta*	*atsukunakatta*	*atsukatta desu*	*atsukunakatta desu*
Verb: *iku* 'go'	Nonpast	*iku*	*ikanai*	**iku desu*	*ikanai desu*
	Past	*itta*	*ikanakatta*	**itta desu*	*ikanakatta desu*

*not considered correct, not used

As mentioned earlier, *desu* was first used with *i*-adjectives (e.g. *takai desu*) and since the negative auxiliary *nai* inflects like an *i*-adjective, the polite auxiliary *desu* may have spread to verbs in the negative (e.g. *ikanai desu* (Hudson 2008:139). This might also explain the reason why affirmative verbs with *desu* (e.g. *iku desu*) have not spread or are not considered correct grammatically, since they do not share this characteristic (i.e. end in *–i*). Another reason for the spread of *nai desu* is probably because of its ease of use. People generally use plain forms when speaking with close friends and family, and since *nai desu* or 'semi-polite' forms are made by simply adding *desu* to plain, negative forms (e.g. the plain *tabenai* versus the semi-polite *tabenai desu*), this is easier than switching to polite forms (e.g. *tabemasen*).

Although the 'semi-polite' style of speech is said to be spreading, it is generally not taught in textbooks for beginner learners of Japanese. In their study on *masen* and *nai desu* usage, Uehara and Fukushima (2008:163-164) investigated five popular textbooks and found that only *masen* forms were listed with verbs and copula, and in only two of the five textbooks *nai desu* was used with adjectives.

I was however recently made aware that the newest edition of "Genki" (Banno 2011) (an introductory level textbook used at the University of Oslo) includes a footnote that lists *nai desu* as a "much more colloquial sub-standard form" (ibid. 2011:88) while still teaching *masen* forms for verbs. As for copula and adjectives *nai desu* forms (e.g. adjective: *samukunai desu* '(is) not cold' and copula: X *ja nai desu* 'is not X') are taught first with their

masen counterparts in parenthesis (ibid. 2011:110 & 132). Contrary to the 2011 edition, the first edition from 1999 does not mention *nai desu* forms at all for verbs, while the *nai desu* forms for adjectives and copula are listed as a footnote (Banno 1999:101). This could indicate that the form is spreading and becoming more widely accepted since the editors have changed this in the years between 1999 and 2011.

A piece of evidence to support the claim that the *nai desu* or 'semi-polite' form is rather recent is an investigation conducted by Hudson (2008). She looked at the distribution of *nai desu* and *masen* forms in a modern crime novel, and compared her findings with two similar novels from the sixties and seventies and found no verb + *nai desu* forms at all (Hudson 2008:152). This study and others will be reviewed more in-depth in the next chapter.

In brief, verb + *nai desu* is a 'semi-polite' form which is regarded less polite than the polite verb + *masen*, but more polite than plain forms. It is spreading gradually in present-day Japanese although it is not always presented in textbooks for foreign learners of Japanese, where the *masen* form is viewed as the correct form and *nai desu*, if mentioned, is considered colloquial.

2.6 Summary

The aim of this chapter was to give some background information on the topic on linguistic politeness in general, and to point to differences in how politeness is expressed in Japanese contrary to how it is generally expressed in English. To further explain these differences I presented some contrasting arguments on whether or not linguistic politeness can be expressed in a universal theory represented by Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness, and criticism of this theory by Matsumoto (1988). To further explain this criticism I explained the Japanese notion of *uchi* and *soto*, 'in-group' and 'out-group', which is a system believed to govern all social interaction and linguistic utterances in Japanese language and society.

I also gave a brief introduction to the Japanese politeness system, represented by honorific language, polite language and the plain style of speech. Lastly the so-called 'semi-polite' style of speech was introduced, which is between the polite and plain style of speech. In short it is a style that adds the politeness marker *desu* to plain, negative predicates (copula, verbs and adjectives). The 'semi-polite' forms are believed to be on a rise in contemporary Japanese, but

have only recently been included in introductory level textbooks, regardless of their widespread use.

In the next chapter I will review some previous studies on this field ranging from 1994 to 2012. These studies are based on data from both written materials as well as materials taken from natural data, and some are in fact based on fictional materials such as television drama and novels.

3 Chapter 3: Previous studies

Research concerning the use of *masen* and *nai desu* in polite negative forms has produced various results, often depending on what sort of material and sources that have been used. Studies based on everything from newspaper articles (Tanomura 1994), to natural and spontaneous speech (Tanaka 2010) have yielded various results although some tendencies stay more or less the same.

3.1 Tanomura (1994)

Tanomura was among the first Japanese scholars to do a corpus based study of this phenomenon, using a digital corpus based on newspaper articles from Asahi Shimbun dating from 1989 to 1992 as his data. His results were overall greatly in favor of the *masen*-form (see Table 3.1), but also showed that the *nai desu*-form is preferred when followed by a sentence final particle. Furthermore, in existential expressions (i.e. negative copula) such as *dewa/ja* + *arimasen/nai desu* (e.g. *hon dewa arimasen*/*hon ja nai desu* '(It) is not a book') the findings indicate that the plain, informal *ja* (contracted form of *dewa*) is usually followed by *nai desu*, whereas *dewa*, which is the more correct form is followed by *masen*.

Table 3.1: Overall results of *masen* and *nai desu* in Tanomura's study (adopted from Tanomura 1994:55-56)

	masen	***nai desu***	**Total**
Present tense	7295 (82,2%)	1584 (17,8%)	8879
Past tense	523 (90,3%)	56 (9,7%)	579
Total	7818 (82,7)	1640 (17,3%)	9458

In the end of sentences, or when a statement is conclusive, Tanomura finds that the *masen* form is used 98,7% of the time. It is also the preferred form when followed by sentence binding particles like *ga* and *kara*. However, when followed by sentence final particles such as *yo*, *ne*, *na* etc., the preferred form is *nai desu*.

Tanomura also goes into great detail describing what he analyses as two categories of negative interrogative sentences. Category 1, or 甲種 *kooshu* ('first class') in his study, are questions that more or less expect a positive answer, with a falling intonation, e.g.: *yaa*,

yamada-san ja [arimasen ka / nai desu ka] (‘Isn’t that Yamada-san?’ / ‘That’s Yamada-san, isn’t it?’). Category 2, or 乙種 *otsushu* (‘second class’) are “real” questions that end with a rising intonation and can be followed by both *yes* and *no*, e.g.: *yoku mienai kedo, are wa yamada-san ja [arimasen ka / nai desu ka]* (‘I can’t really see, but is that Yamada-san?’).

Category 1 is further divided into category X and Y, where the aforementioned example with Yamada-san belongs to category 1X. The example sentence Tanomura gives for category 1Y is *yatte miyoo ja (arimasen ka / nai desu ka)* (‘Won’t you just try?’) which is similar in that it is a question that wants a positive answer, but the difference is that it is more of a request or an invitation to do something together, or a way to show determination to accomplish something. The interesting thing about these categories is that category 1X and 2 both yield favorable results for the *nai desu* form, but category 1Y is with 73 to 2 in favor of *masen*. Tanomura assumes that this is because when used as an invitation, *masen ka* is the standard as in *jaa, issho ni ikimasen ka?* (‘Wouldn’t you go together with me?’) versus *jaa, issho ni ikanai desu ka?* (same meaning), where the former is appropriate but the latter sounds unnatural.

3.2 Uehara and Fukushima (2008)

This study by Uehara and Fukushima is special in that it is one of the first if not the first study on the use of *masen* and *nai desu* forms using natural occurring speech data. In their article from 2001 they start out referring to a public opinion poll conducted by the Japanese government’s Agency for Cultural Affairs. This poll was concerned with many different aspects of the Japanese language, but also included four points concerning the use of *masen* or *nai desu* forms. The four sentences are as follows:

a. *Isshoni [iki<u>masen</u> ka / ika<u>nai desu</u> ka]* “Won’t you come along?” (invitation)
b. *Kyoo wa tokuni yotee ga [ari<u>masen</u> / <u>nai desu</u>]* “I have no particular plans for today.” (assertion)
c. *[Mikake<u>masen deshita</u> ka / Mikake<u>nakatta desu</u> ka]* “Didn’t you see (him)?” (question)
d. *(Kono hon,) muzukashii n ja [ari<u>masen</u> ka / <u>nai desu</u> ka]* “Isn’t it that (this book) is difficult?” (question)

The results from this poll were hard to make anything out of. The *masen* form was preferred for sentences a, b and c, while 70,6% of the respondents reported they would use the *nai desu*

form for sentence d[6]. However, as Uehara and Fukushima puts it, "[questionnaire based studies] are based on native speakers' out-of-context grammaticality judgments of the two forms in isolation or at best in a sentence." They thus see the need for an analysis on natural occurring speech data.

They sent out a flyer on the university campus (Tohoku University) asking for volunteers to join a session to discuss some topics concerning cross-cultural communication after viewing some video clips on these topics. The volunteers would then be paired together, not knowing the other person. They knew they were being observed (audio recording), but the aim of the research was kept secret in order to not affect the results. For every pair of participants, one would take the role of the "interviewer", who would be starting and stopping the video clips and initiating discussions. The recordings took place in two different sessions; the first in January and February in 1999, and a second session in July and August in 2001.

The results of the first session was that among 124 total instances of *masen* or *nai desu* found, there were 32 *masen* forms and 92 *nai desu* forms[7]. Additionally, out of the 124 in total, 44 were verbs with 20 *masen* forms and 24 *nai desu* forms. These were all in the present tense, and no past tense negative forms were found. Among the 14 informants in the first session there was obviously some individual variation, and although the *nai desu* form was overall the most used even with verbs, four students favored the *masen* form at least for verbs.

Table 3.2 (adopted from Uehara and Fukushima 2008:167)

Speaker	***masen***	***nai desu***	**Speaker**	***masen***	***nai desu***
IM01	8 (6)	40 (7)	IF01	3 (0)	11 (3)
M04	0 (0)	4 (1)	F01	2 (2)	2 (0)
M06	3 (1)	1 (0)	F02	0 (0)	2 (0)
M07	6 (3)	2 (0)	F03	0 (0)	5 (4)
M08	1 (1)	9 (4)	F05	3 (3)	2 (1)
M10	1 (1)	2 (1)	F09	0 (0)	2 (1)
M11	1 (1)	1 (1)			
M12	4 (2)	9 (1)	**Total**	**32 (20)**	**92 (24)**

I = interviewer, M = male, F = female, ( ) = verb forms only (U&F 2008)

[6] Uehara and Fukushima do not give any explanation for the difference in c and d, but I believe that it might be related to whether a question has 'bias' (i.e. it expects a positive answer), which is the case with d, but not c.

[7] Hudson (2008:142) argues: "It turns out that the numbers are actually skewed; almost a quarter (8 tokens; 24%) of the total 33 *masen* tokens and nearly half (41 tokens; 44,6%) of the total 92 *nai desu* tokens are attributed to a single (male) individual."

As mentioned in footnote 7 above, Hudson argues that the data collected from one male individual (IM01 with 41 of the total 92 *nai desu* tokens) to some extent skews and is disproportionate to the rest of the data, but even by excluding these data *nai desu* tokens would still more than double the numbers of *masen* tokens.

Further into the analysis, they categorize their findings of *masen* and *nai desu* forms according to word classes, and find that there are only two categories in which *masen* or *nai desu* are used exclusively. For *masen* it is the phrase "*sumimasen*" (Pardon me/Excuse me), and for *nai desu* the modality expression "*(n/wake) ja nai desu ka"* (Isn't it (the case) that?). The interesting point here is "*n/wake ja nai desu ka"/"n/wake ja/dewa arimasen ka"*; both forms are grammatical and natural sounding, whereas "*sumanai desu*" which is rarely even used in its plain form, would sound a bit rude, and since it is an apology it ought to be polite and not only "semi polite".

However, in the case of "*(n/wake) ja nai desu ka"*, Uehara and Fukushima give one possible explanation as to why the *nai desu* form seems to be favored (and used exclusively in these data). They speculate that this *ja nai*, being used in the modality expression "*n/wake ja nai desu ka"* (Isn't it (the case) that…?) can be thought of as a "modality *janai*" which they contrast both structurally and functionally to "propositional/negative *janai*". In other words, "modality *janai*" is *ja nai* having become one lexeme (*janai*) and also having lost its negative and interrogative sense. Thus, since "*(n/wake) ja nai desu ka*" is a modality expression which is grammatically negative, but not really negating anything, *ja nai desu* is favored over *ja arimasen* in this case. Furthermore, according to their results, there was a tendency for *nai desu* also with other modality expressions such as 'maybe' (*kamoshiremasen* 4 vs. 21 *kamoshirenai desu*) and 'must/have to' (*nai to ikemasen* 0 vs. 1 *nai to ikenai desu*).

Their analysis of word classes showed that for inanimate existential verbs (i.e. copula: "this is a book"/"this is not a book"), *nai desu* was favored by 21 to 3 *masen*, and for "maybe" modality expressions (*kamoshirenai desu / kamoshiremasen*) 21 to 4 *masen*. For verbs, however, the results were closer with 20 Verb-*masen* to 24 Verb-*nai desu*. To find out what determines the use of *masen* or *nai desu* in verbs, they had to look at data from one single person who used both forms during the interview. What they found after analyzing interviews where one of the participants used both forms, was that the appearance order of the two forms seemed to have a pattern. What this pattern seemed to suggest was that:

> The *masen* forms are used at the beginning of one's speech and/or when resuming one's talk with the same interlocutor after a break in the conversation, provided a new topic is introduced. The *nai desu* forms are used otherwise. Once the speaker starts using the latter, therefore, she keeps using it and does not switch (back) to the former except for some instances when the conversation resumes with a new topic after a break. (Uehara & Fukushima 2008:176)

They illustrate this schematically where "X"=*masen*, "x"=*nai desu* and "/" = a new video viewing break. The numbers 13 and 22 are the numbers of two of the dialogues in which a speaker used both forms. For example:

Table 3.3 (adopted from Uehara and Fukushima 2008:174)

Dialogue	Speaker	Appearance order
13	F13	X/xxxxxx
22	M22	xxxxx/Xx/xxx

Although this pattern generally seems to give a good explanation as to which of the two forms are used, there are some exceptions, and Uehara and Fukushima discusses two of them. First, given that the *masen* form is the more formal of the two, a speaker might favor *masen* when he or she wants to create some psychological distance to the partner. This can happen if a topic that makes the speaker uncomfortable arises. Uehara and Fukushima gives an example from their interview data where two students, male and female, are talking about the subject of parent-child relationship in the United States. The male retracts to the *masen* form when talking about the topic of how it is completely normal for parents in the United States to talk to their children about sex, most likely because he doesn't feel comfortable discussing it with an unacquainted female. While sounding relaxed and secure up until this topic was introduced, he proceeds to shift to the more formal *masen style* to keep some distance.

The other factor determining the use of *masen* or *nai desu* can happen in interrogative sentences that do not end with *ka*. In Japanese, questions are usually expressed by adding the sentence final particle *ka* to the end of the sentence making it a question. In spoken Japanese this can also be done without the *ka*, but by ending the sentence with a raising intonation. This, however, is only applicable to the *masen* form (and the plain form of verbs), but not the *nai desu* form. Thus, one can say *iimaseN?* ('to say', neg.) and *iwaNAI?*, but not **iwanai desu?*. So if a speaker omits the use of *ka*, the only natural sounding way to make it a question is to choose the *masen* form if it is in a polite setting.

Uehara and Fukushima wanted to study a relatively new phenomenon in the Japanese language – a shift in the language that seems to not be restricted by either age or gender differences, although most prominently observable in the younger generations. On this point there are a couple of things to say, concerning their study. First of all, the data for the study was gathered from the everyday polite language of university students – in other words from the younger generation where the use of the *nai desu* form is considered to be the most wide spread. While some then might say that the data do not give a clear picture of the population as a whole, others might say that this is justifiable because this phenomenon is in a young but growing stage, and that the young people using this new form today will be the older people using it in the future. Another possibility is that this "semi-polite" *nai desu* style is more of a 'fad', either for a specific age group, or simply a prominent contemporary feature of today's Japanese language. Either way, the fact that Uehara and Fukushima choose to investigate this phenomenon in naturally occurring speech spoken by the group that arguably uses this style the most, is in my opinion an advantage over other previous studies.

Secondly, this study also serves as a contrast to other studies on the same topic, e.g. Tanomura (1994) and Taguchi (2010). These two use the written language as their data, and their results concur with the 'conservative' norm that sees the *masen* form as more correct than *nai desu*, especially with verbs. While the results of both Tanomura and Taguchi's studies of this phenomenon in written material greatly favor the *masen* form, Uehara and Fukushima's study gives the unexpected result of *nai desu* overall surpassing *masen*. This can either mean that Uehara and Fukushima chose a too narrow spectrum of informants for their study, but even more likely, the differing results tell us that as a relatively new phenomenon, the semi-polite *nai desu* style is still too young to be implemented in the realm of written Japanese. This is also a point that Hudson (2008) briefly discusses in her study. She found a fair amount of *nai desu* tokens in her study based on a modern crime mystery novel, but when looking for *nai desu* in older novels (two novels from the 60s and 70s), she found none, supporting that this is a contemporary phenomenon.

Uehara and Fukushima's study might in a sense be a bit biased, considering that all of its informants are of the same age group and are from the same university, something that probably could change the way young people speak. It is also reasonable to assume that the conversation between university students, even though they do not know each other, will be less formal than the conversation between people of different ages and different social status.

Hudson (2008) also noted that the results were skewed to some extent, because one of the individuals (see Table 3.2, IM01) contributed with a large amount both *nai desu* and *masen* forms. Uehara and Fukushima also later[8] points out that their results differs from Tanomura (1994) and Hudson (2008), where the *masen* form is favored overall and especially with verbs. All this aside, however, their study gives great insight in why this relatively new phenomenon is used and also when it is used.

While both *masen* and *nai desu* forms are used between people talking to each other for the first time, their analysis shows us that *masen* is typically used in the beginning of a conversation and also when beginning talking about new topics. *Nai desu*, however, is used following the *masen* forms, when the topic is set and further explanation is required. The "appearance order" of the two forms seemed to be regular and is following this pattern.

Another factor affecting the use of either form is the level of politeness, or in other words, what takes more precedence; politeness or the conveyance of information. Especially when apologizing for something, the *masen* form of *sumimasen* ("Pardon me", "Sorry") was used in all instances, while when the informants were eagerly talking and exchanging information, *nai desu* forms were often used, and in some instances the *desu* part of the expressions would often be ignored by the other person as if it did not matter. An example of this was when a speaker would say "*Sore wa iwanai // desu ne*", and the other speaker would follow up even before *desu ne* because information took precedence over politeness.

Uehara and Fukushima's study gives some good insights on this matter, maybe exactly because they chose to limit their data to individuals using the semi-polite forms regularly. Contrary to many other studies, it deals with this phenomenon in the natural surroundings, spoken by ordinary people. Furthermore, this study shows us how different types of corpus can give very different results (see Table 3.4 below); in this case Uehara and Fukushima with their data consisting of everyday authentic oral speech, contrary to Tanomura (1994) using written material from newspapers and Hudson (2008) using the dialogue parts of written fiction.

[8] In a footnote in the revised edition of their study, published in the book "Style Shifting in Japanese".

Table 3.4: rates of *masen* and *nai desu* forms in three different studies

Study	Corpus type	*masen*	*nai desu*
Tanomura[9]	Written	93,1%	6,9%
Hudson	Oral fiction	68,5%	31,5%
Fukushima & Uehara	Oral authentic	25,8%	74,2%

3.3 Noda (2004)

In this study, Noda researches *masen* and *nai desu* forms in natural speech, and materials that are close to natural speech (e.g. dialogues and scripts from books and drama), by trying to answer the following questions:

1 What is the usage ratio between *masen* and *nai desu* forms in the spoken language?

2 Whether or not verb + *masen* and verb + *nai desu* usage has to do with types of verbs.

3 Tanomura (1994) points out that in cases where a phrase is followed by a sentence final particle such as *yo* and *ne*, the *nai desu* form is preferred, but that the usage ratio of verb + *nai desu* is rather low even when verb + *nai desu* is followed by a sentence final particle. Is this a valid claim?

To answer these questions, Noda conducts a corpus analysis based on transcribed natural conversation and other materials close to natural speech. Additionally, he makes a nationwide questionnaire where informants (university students) are asked to decide whether given sentences are unnatural, a bit unnatural or natural.

In the corpus analysis the overall results are 2524 *masen* to 1121 *nai desu*. There is, however, a difference when looking at the different corpora (see Table 3.5). In what Noda calls シナリオ *shinario* (scripts from TV drama etc.) the results are with over 80% in favor of *masen*. In 対談 *taidan* (dialogues gathered from books) the results are about even with approximately 55% in favor of *masen*, and lastly in the category for 自然談話 *shizen danwa* (‘natural speech’) the results favor *nai desu* with close to 60% of the results.

[9] Tanomura’s numbers were divided into two separate categories:
1. *aru*(copula): (*arimasen* and *nai desu*)
2. verb + (*masen* or *nai desu*). I then combined the totals of these.

Table 3.5: analysis of the three different corpora (adapted from Noda 2004:231)

Type of corpus	*masen*	*nai desu*
Scripts (TV, drama etc.)	1663 (84,3%)	310 (15,7%)
Dialogue (books)	667 (54,9%)	547 (45,1%)
Natural speech	184 (41,1%)	264 (58,9%)
Total	2514 (69,2%)	1121 (30,8%)

Noda sorts his data by the predicate's part of speech (noun, na-adjective, i-adjective, verb). Furthermore, he makes special categories for the *shiteiru* form of verbs, "*nai*-adjectives" and verbs of "non-existence" (非存在), (e.g. *arimasen* and *nai desu*).

Table 3.6: nai desu / masen ratios for different parts of speech (adapted from Noda 2004:234)

Part of speech	*masen*	*nai desu*
Noun[10]	53,1%	46,9%
i-adjective	25,0%	75,0%
nai-adjective[11]	72,6%	24,7%
Non-existential verbs[12]	49,6%	50,4%
Verbs	83,6%	16,4%
Verb+*teiru*[13]	71,6%	28,4%
Kamoshirenai[14]	84,2%	15,8%
Sumimasen[15]	100,0%	0,0%
Dewa nai ka[16]	21,2%	78,8%
No dewa nai ka[17]	3%	97%

Noda notes from these results that *dewa nai ka* and *no dewa nai ka* both have a high ratio for *nai desu*, and their counterparts, especially *no dewa arimasen ka*, is rarely even used. Furthermore, i-adjectives favor the *nai desu* form in 75% of the results, and as for nouns and non-existential verbs the ratios are about even. For verbs the tendency is that they usually

[10] Meaning 'noun + copula verb' e.g. *X wa Y dewa arimasen* / *X wa Y ja nai desu* ('X is not Y')
[11] Adjectives ending in *nai* that are set phrases more than negative. (e.g. *tsumaranai* 'boring', *shikata nai* 'it can't be helped', *moushiwake nai* 'there is no excuse'
[12] 非存在 (non-existence), the negative form of existence (e.g. *arimasen* and *nai desu*)
[13] Verb + *teiru* is the progressive form of the verb meaning 'to be V-ing', (e.g. *taberu* 'to eat', *tabete iru* 'to be eating')
[14] Modality expression meaning 'may be', 'perhaps'
[15] Polite expression meaning 'sorry', 'excuse me'
[16] Expression with the function of *requesting confirmation* of some fact, e.g. (isn't it?)
[17] Expression dealing with the hope, chance, likelihood of the speaker

follow the "mainstream" *masen* form, however verbs that denounce possibility (e.g. *korareru* (potential form of *kuru* 'to come')) or are stative (e.g. *dekiru* 'be able to' and *wakaru* 'to understand', 'become clear') have a higher ratio of *nai desu* forms compared to other verbs (see research question 2).

Further on in the study the effect of sentence final particles (e.g. *ka*, *yo*, *ne* etc.) and binding particles (e.g. *kedo*, *ga* etc.) are mentioned.

Table 3.7: The effect of particles on the use of *masen*/*nai desu* (adopted from Noda 2004:237)

	Without any particles	**With final particles**	**With binding particles[18]**
Part of speech	*masen/nai desu*	*masen/nai desu*	*masen/nai desu*
Noun	75,3%/**24,7%**	42,6%/**57,4%**	41,5%/**58,5%**
nai-adjective	86,3%/**13,7%**	57,1%/**42,9%**	73,9%/**26,1%**
Non-existential verbs	67,2%/**32,8%**	30,7%/**69,3%**	50,8%/**49,2%**
Verbs	93%/**7%**	62%/**38%**	87,6%/**12,4%**
Verb+*teiru*	78,3%/**21,7%**	56,6%/**43,4%**	77,1%/**22,9%**
kamoshirenai	96,5%/**3,5%**	84,1%/**15,9%**	72,4%/**27,6%**

As we can see here, the rate of *nai desu* forms greatly increase when followed by sentence final particles. The same can be said when binding particles are used. Thus, although used by itself to some extent, the *nai desu* form is generally more likely to be found when used in conjunction with binding or sentence final particles. This is contrary to Tanomura's analysis that claims that the usage ratio of verb + *nai desu* is low even if verb + *nai desu* is followed by a sentence final particle (see research question 3). Noda's data show that verbs with *nai desu* without any particles occur at a ratio of only 7%, while the ratio is 38% with sentence final particles and 12,4% with binding particles. Noda assumes that the reason why the ratio of *nai desu* with especially sentence final particles is so high, is that these particles are very often used between people who are close friends (Noda 2004:237), and this implies that *nai desu*, which is less formal than *masen*, combines more easily with sentence final particles that indicate relative closeness.

The second part of Noda's analysis is a questionnaire aimed at university students and is based on the results from the corpus analysis, and the main focus of the questionnaire was to investigate the 'tolerability' (許容度 *kyoyoodo*) of the *nai desu* form. The questionnaire was

[18] Particles that serve as conjunctions (e.g. *kara* 'because, from', *ga*, *kedo* 'but' etc.)

answered during December 2002 and January 2003. Informants were simply asked to rate sentences where the *masen* form, *nai desu* form or both were underlined, deciding if the sentence was "unnatural", "a bit unnatural" or "natural". The total number of entries to judge was 21 (Noda 2004:238).

The sentences in which the tolerability of *nai desu* forms was high (surpassing 80%) were in sentences with non-existential verbs, nouns and i-adjectives. These results of the questionnaire are in accordance with the results of the corpus study. Contrarily, with verbs the tolerability was comparably lower. Among the many verb cases, however, there were a few differences. Action verbs (e.g. *benkyoo suru* 'to study', *iku* 'to go') had lower rates of tolerability than stative verbs (e.g. *iru* 'to be'), verbs in the potential form (e.g. *ieru* 'to (be able to) say'), and the verb *wakaru* 'to be understood, to become clear'. However, when action verbs were used with the *te iru* form, their *nai desu* counterparts' tolerability became higher. In other words, stative verbs including potential verbs (e.g. *wakaru*, *ieru*), together with *shite iru* forms are easier to combine with *nai desu*. This is again consistent with the results of the corpus study. Types of verbs do in fact play a role for the use of *nai desu* forms (see research question 2).

The results also clearly show that sentence final particles play a role when used with nouns, i-adjectives and verbs. To exemplify: "*watashi ja arimasen yo*" (It isn't me) sounded 'natural' to 71,5% of the respondents, compared to "*watashi ja nai desu yo*" at 81,8%. Furthermore, the results of the corpus analysis had made it clear that the tolerability of *nai desu* forms became higher with sentence final particles, and while the results of the questionnaire confirm this, they also seem to indicate that the tolerability of *masen* forms is in fact weakened by the same particles. To exemplify: "*omoshiroku arimasen*" (It is not fun/interesting) was natural to 71,7%, while "*omoshiroku arimasen ne*" became a lower score at 60,5%.

The last point Noda highlights about the results from the questionnaire is about interrogative sentences. There are two in the questionnaire, and they share the same syntactic structure. The first is "*Saikin, nanka, tsukarete nai desu ka?*" (Have you (seemingly) been tired lately?) with 67,5% tolerability, and the second "*Ne, hidoi hanashi da to omowanai desu ka?*" ((Lit.) Don't you think that is terrible?) at 35,8%. Although similar, Noda explains the difference between the two by referring to their *katamuki* (i.e. bias, tendency, inclination). The first sentence has a weak bias; in other words the speaker does not necessarily expect a positive or negative answer. The other sentence, however, has a strong sense of bias in that the speaker probably

feels strongly that something was terrible and ‘wants’ or expects the hearer to agree. Noda speculates that the low tolerability of sentence two is caused by a tendency of using the *masen ka* form when one wants the hearer to agree to the statement in an encouraging manner.

Looking back at the research questions stated in the beginning, Noda summarizes as follows:

1 While the *masen* form seems to be the model or standard in constructed spoken language, the ratio of the *nai desu* form in natural conversation is rather high at close to 60%. Thus, even if the *masen* form has a sense of being the model or norm, the *nai desu* form is widely used in actual everyday speech.

2 The usage of *nai desu* forms is comparatively high in the case of i-adjectives, nouns and expressions of non-existence. The *masen* ratio is high with verbs, but in expressions that deal with possibility, the verb *wakaru* and in the *shiteiru* form, the *nai desu* ratio is relatively high.

3 When sentence final particles are used, the *nai desu* form is preferred (it is easier to use). Among the young, the *masen* form is used less with sentence final particles.

To summarize, Noda gathered data in form of a corpus analysis of three different sources. The results from these were then analyzed to serve as the source material for a questionnaire that was given to university students. The results from the corpus analysis seemed to agree with what the university students considered natural and tolerable with regards to the *nai desu* form and its usage.

3.4 Taguchi (2005)

While Tanomura (1994) is based on language used in newspaper articles, and Tanaka (2010) (which will be reviewed later) uses spontaneous spoken language, Taguchi (2005) bases her study on written materials gathered from fiction. She uses examples from fiction that closely resembles spoken language taken from the scripts of TV drama, film and play. As to what constitutes the data, some exclusions are made: i-adjectives that do not take the *masen*-ending such as *nasakenai*, ‘miserable’, *abunai*, ‘dangerous’, *mottainai*, ‘wasteful’, expressions using

gozaimasen, very polite verb for 'to be, to exist'[19], and expressions that are believed to be from dialects. The analysis of 2578 tokens result in an overall 2062 *masen* and 516 *nai desu*.

Taguchi also aims to use her data to answer some research questions, some of which are found in previous studies. Kobayashi (2004) states that sentences in citation form 「」("…") more often use *masen* forms than *nai desu* form, and this fits well with Taguchi's own data; she did not find even one account of *nai desu* inside brackets.

Next she tries to find out whether the *nai desu* form is difficult to use in question phrases, and how the two forms are used within these phrases. Her findings are that the *nai desu* form is mostly used when preceded by a *dewa* (or rather *ja*), and that the *masen* form is mostly used in the absence of *dewa/ja*. In other words, that a form is preceded by *dewa/ja* means that the word is a noun or a *na*-adjective, while an absence of *dewa/ja* would indicate that the word is a verb. Furthermore she finds that the *masen* form is favorable in question phrases that are of a requesting nature. This might be in accordance with Tanomura's findings from his categories 1X/Y and 2, which said that when negative interrogative sentences are either an invitation or a request, *masen* is preferred.

She also investigates if her data supports Noda's claim that *nai desu* is the preferred form when followed by sentence final particles, and her data seems to agree.

Table 3.8: *masen* and *nai desu* with sentence final particles (adopted from Taguchi 2005:26-27)

	masen* + *masen deshita	***nai desu* + *nakatta desu***
Total	1894 + 168 = 2062	492 + 24 = 516
Followed by sentence final particle	237 + 12 = 249 (12,1%)	108 + 9 = 117 (22,7%)

3.5 Hudson (2008)

In the article "Riyuu *'reason' for* nai desu *and other semi-polite forms*" Hudson examines what she calls the 'semi-polite' style in Japanese, focusing on verbal negatives. The term semi-polite style is used because of the style's positioning in the Japanese language in relation

[19] *Gozaimasu* is very polite, and is thus not used in its plain form and thus also not with the 'semi-polite' *nai desu*.

to politeness. Originally – and still taught in most textbooks – there are two main levels of politeness in everyday Japanese; the plain style which is used in private when talking to friends and family, and the polite form which is used in more formal contexts such as at work and when interacting with strangers. A third style is on the rise, however, and that is the so called 'semi-polite' style.

Table 3.9: polite inflectional endings (adopted from Hudson 2008:132)

Category	Tense	Affirmative	Negative
Copula	Nonpast	-des-u	-ja-arimas-en
	Past	-deshi-ta	-ja-arimas-en-deshi-ta
Adjective	Nonpast	-i-des-u	-ku-arimas-en
	Past	-kat-ta-des-u	-ku-arimas-en-deshi-ta
Verb	Nonpast	-(i)-mas-u	-(i)-mas-en
	Past	-(i)-mashi-ta	-(i)-mas-en-deshi-ta

Table 3.10: semi-polite inflectional endings (adopted from Hudson 2008:132)

Category	Tense	Affirmative	Negative
Copula	Nonpast	-des-u	-ja-na-i-des-u
	Past	*-dat-ta-des-u	-ja-na-kat-ta-des-u
Adjective	Nonpast	-i-des-u	-ku-na-i-des-u
	Past	-kat-ta-des-u	-ku-na-kat-ta-des-u
Verb	Nonpast	*-u-des-u	-(a)-na-i-des-u
	Past	*-ta-des-u	-(a)-na-kat-ta-des-u

(*) = semi-polite forms are generally not used in the affirmative and are considered incorrect

The polite style in Japanese (Table 3.9) is used in more formal contexts and is characterized by the adding of *masu* and *masen* to verb stems (e.g. *tabe-ru* 'to eat' becomes *tabe-masu* and *tabe-masen*), and using *desu* 'to be' instead of the plain *da* for copulas. The auxiliary verb *masu* used to mean 'to sit', but in modern Japanese it is only used as a politeness marker. Because of these two reasons, the polite style is often called *desu/masu* style. The contemporary 'semi-polite' style (Table 3.10), however, still uses *desu* for copulas, but verbal negatives are treated differently. Verbal negatives in the semi-polite style are basically the plain negative form of a verb plus *desu* (e.g. *taberu* 'to eat' (plain), *tabenai* ('not eat' (plain),

tabenai desu (semi-polite), *tabemasen* (polite)). It is also worth mentioning that the *nai desu* form was first (and still mainly) used with *i*-adjectives and that the form spread to other parts of speech, in this case to negative verbs in the plain form, as these resemble *i*-adjectives because they end with *(na)i*. Hudson also briefly mentions the affirmative forms of the semi-polite style (e.g. *taberu desu* 'to eat'), but notes that these forms are used extremely seldom, and sounds incorrect to most people. She does however find some examples of affirmative semi-polite style in her data (e.g. *omotta desu* 'thought'), spoken by an elderly male individual.

Hudson's interest in the topic came from reading a book titled "*Riyuu*" 'Reason' by Miyabe Miyuki, in which *nai desu* forms were ubiquitous. The book is a murder mystery novel where the story is told mainly through interviews between people who do not know each other, and because of this formal setting, semi-polite and polite forms are to be expected. She decided to gather and analyze all of the negative forms used in the dialogue portions of the book, totaling 308 tokens. The data were then sorted by predicate type;

Table 3.11: *Riyuu* tokens by predicate types (adopted from Hudson 2008:147)

	masen / nai desu	***masen deshita / nakatta desu***	**Total**
Existential Verbs	8 (50%) / 8 (50%)	6 (60%) / 4 (40%)	14 (53.8%) / 12 (46.2%)
(Other) Verbs	38 (76%) / 12 (24%)	42 (84%) / 8 (16%)	80 (80%) / 20 (20%)
Auxiliary Verbs	14 (93.3%) / 1 (6.7%)	11 (73.9%) / 4 (26.7%)	25 (83.3%) / 5 (16.7%)
Modalities	56 (66.7%) / 28 (33.4%)	16 (61.5%) / 10 (38.5%)	72 (65.5%) / 38 (34.5%)
Idioms	3 (25%) / 9 (75%)	4 (80%) / 1 (20%)	7 (41.2%) / 10 (58.8%)
Copula	9 (56.3%) / 7 (43.7%)	2 (33.3%) / 4 (66.7%)	11 (50%) / 11 (50%)
Adjectives	1 (100%) / 0 (0%)	1 (50%) / 1 (50%)	2 (66.7%) / 1 (33.3%)
Overall	129 (66.5%) / 65 (33.5%)	82 (71.9%) / 32 (28.1%)	211 (68.5%) / 97 (31.5%)

As we can see here, the distribution is fairly even for existential verbs. This is also true for copulas, and Hudson speculates that this is because the negative forms of the copula, *ja arimasen* and *ja nai desu* contain the existential predicates *arimasen* and *nai desu*, respectively. However, *masen* was four times more frequent than *nai desu* with (Other) verbs (verbs other than *iru/aru*, normal verbs), five times more frequent with auxiliary verbs (attached verb forms such as the potential, passives, *te iru* and *te kureru*), and almost twice as frequent with modals such as *kamoshiremasen* / *kamoshirenai* (Hudson 2008:147). She also

shows that tense does not affect the choice of form significantly, except for idioms, where the present tense (non-past) favors *nai desu* while *masen* is preferred in the past tense, although the number of tokens is relatively low. We also see that the overall frequency is in favor of the *masen* form, and also that tense does not affect the choice of forms significantly.

In the article, Hudson puts emphasis on four main questions;

1. At what rate various predicates appear in the *nai desu* form, as compared to the *masen* form. (This is answered in the table above.)
2. What types of predicates commonly occur with *nai desu*?
3. What functions does the *nai desu* form serve?
4. Who uses *nai desu*?

As to which predicate types occurring frequently with *nai desu* forms (question 2), 'idioms' (e.g. *mooshi wake nai / mooshi wake arimasen*) rank first with 10 (58.8%) tokens for *nai desu* and 7 (41.2%) tokens for *masen*. Especially in the present tense (non-past) *nai desu* holds 9 tokens (75%) against the 3 tokens (25%) for *masen*. Hudson speculates that one reason for why *nai desu* is preferred with idioms is that negative idioms such as *machigai nai desu* 'no mistake about it' and *muri wa/mo nai desu* 'not unreasonable' are interpreted as 'adjectives containing *nai*' - and when that is the case, making it polite is simply done by adding *desu* as with other *i*-adjectives. Other predicate types that frequently appear with *nai desu* are 'copula' 50%, and 'existential verbs' 46.2%. Hudson also notes (p. 149) that her ranking of what predicate types frequently occurs with *nai desu* yield the same results as the study done by Uehara and Fukushima (2001) which uses natural data. This can in a way also confirm the fact that even the language in novels is able to reflect the actual language of the real world.

Regarding question 3, Hudson analyzes the *desu* in semi-polite style in two ways. First, *desu* serves as a means to keep a psychological distance to the hearer when the sentence itself in only its plain form would sound too familiar or intimate. Secondly, another function of *desu* is that it turns the sentence into a stative one, adding a sense of "…, and that's how it is", rather than expressing actions and events, and in this way creating distance. This makes the phrase *mooshiwake nai desu* have the literal meaning of "There is no excuse, and that's how it is", which can sound a bit brusque since this expression is generally used when apologizing for oneself, and should then as with *sumimasen* ("Excuse me", "Sorry") preferably not take the semi-polite style.

As to question 4, Hudson finds no support for any difference in usage based on gender. Her data is categorized by gender, and for all the *nai desu* / *masen* tokens (308 in total) 156 were from male characters and 152 were from female characters. The gender isolated results for *masen* to *nai desu* were similar at 66% to 34% for males and 71.1% to 28.9% for females.

Age, however, is a factor and supports the idea that this phenomenon is a contemporary one. Even though it is used by people of all ages, it is still most prominently in use by the younger generations. Hudson also investigated the 'contemporariness' of the phenomenon by looking for semi-polite forms in novels of similar type written in different periods of time. The books were "*Aoi Byooten*" 'Blue Point' (1960) and "*Joohatsu*" 'Evaporation' (1977). Hudson found that there were far fewer *desu/masu* style exchanges, and not a single *nai desu* form was found in these books, supporting the claim of this phenomenon being contemporary. In conclusion, Hudson notes that "[t]here is no denying that the *nai desu* form is here to stay". It is a form used especially by the younger generation in situations where the speaker does not want to sound too familiar.

Hudson also mentions that an individual's sociocultural background plays a role when choosing between the polite or semi-polite forms. The more a person is educated and sophisticated, the less the person is likely to use *ja nai desu*. Another factor is that the medium of communication (i.e. written or spoken) may play a role, and in general the more formal the text or presentation is, the less likely semi-polite forms will be used irrespective of the medium of communication (Hudson 2008:154).

In this study Hudson analyzed all the polite and semi-polite verbal negatives in the novel '*Riyuu*'. While *masen* tokens outnumbered *nai desu* at a rate of two to one, Hudson showed us that the *nai desu* form is frequently used with some verbs such as *aru* 'excist, be', *shiru* 'know' and *wakaru* 'know, understand', and furthermore in idiomatic expressions such as *machigai nai* 'there is no mistake about it'. Gender plays little to no role concerning the choice between the two, while age can be a factor; the semi-polite *nai desu* – though used in every age group – is used the most among younger people speaking to each other. Hudson also finds support for the notion that the semi-polite *nai desu* is a contemporary phenomenon, by citing historical research on *desu* and by showing a complete lack of *nai desu* in two similar books from the 60s and 70s.

Hudson's study also supports and validates one of the few similar studies done with natural data, Uehara and Fukushima's study from 2001. Both their and Hudson's lists ranking the predicates occurring with *nai desu* were almost identical, giving credibility to both. Furthermore, this also shows us that the language of fiction can reflect that of actual everyday language. In this case, even though Hudson based her study on a novel, both sets of data are conversations between people who do not know each other and thus choose to speak in a polite or semi-polite style.

3.6 Tanaka (2010)

Tanaka did a study with the aim of analyzing the frequency of *masen* and *nai desu* in natural conversation, and also finding the differences between the two. She used audio recordings of natural polite speech from a television show called "*Waratteiitomo*" on Fuji Television, and a show called "*Oshare-ism*" on Nippon Television. Both programs feature a section where listeners phone in and talk with the host, speaking naturally but polite. From 104 different interviews she found 519 examples of negative polite speech (*masen* or *nai desu*). For verbs there were 254 *nai desu* versus 84 *masen*, and for nouns, adjectives etc. the results were 180 *nai desu* versus only one *masen*.

She also discusses the differences of the two forms, and argues that *masen* has a strong sense of politeness, formality, and expresses strong negation. It is also the more conclusive of the two forms, and is often found at the end of sentences. Furthermore, she argues that when using *masen*, it is negation more than politeness that is expressed. *Nai desu* is thus the opposite; it is used in non-conclusive negation, and the emphasis is on politeness. The reasoning behind this lies on the morphology level, and is decided by what comes last. The negation in *maseN* is the *n* at the end, while *mase* is the part making it polite. On the other hand we have *NAI desu*, where *nai* is the negation marker and *desu* is the polite marker. Her conclusion that *masen* is used when negation is in focus is in strong contrast to Kawaguchi's results which will be shown in the following section.

3.7 Kawaguchi (2010)

In "On the main causes of the shift from the *masen* form to the *nai desu* form", Kawaguchi studies the main causes for the 'shift' from *masen* to *nai desu* forms. Contrary to other studies on this field, this study tries to find the causes by looking at mood and modality instead of word classes, and it only deals with verbs. Where other studies have shown us the *masen* and *nai desu* usage ratios for different parts of speech (e.g. nouns, verbs, adjectives), this study sheds light on the differences in use in different moods (e.g. declarative, interrogative, imperative, directive etc.). Kawaguchi especially focuses on the differences between 情報提供 ('*joohooteikyoo*' providing information, declarative sentence) and 情報要求 ('*joohooyookyuu'* requesting information, interrogative sentence), or in other words how people speak differently when they are the information provider of the discussion, and when they are the information seeking part of the discussion.

Kawaguchi looks at previous studies and notices some tendencies about when and in which situations the *masen* forms are often replaced by *nai desu* forms:

Table 3.12: environments where *masen* or *nai desu* tend to be used (adopted from Kawaguchi 2010:123)

	masen	***nai desu***
Sentence structure	inside quotational clauses	outside quotational clauses
Before *masen/nai desu*	verbs of action, movement （動作性）	stative verbs （状態性）
After *masen/nai desu*	none	followed by particles
Modality	action/performance （実行系）	Narrative （叙述系）
Level of politeness	high	low

The study is based on the spoken language taken from four different corpora, and as mentioned only verbs are treated. Furthermore, the verbs are only counted if they can be used in both *masen* and *nai desu* forms, thus excluding *keigo* (polite language) verbs that can only be used with *masu* and *masen* endings, such as *gozaimasu* which is a very polite verb that means 'to be, to exist'. The overall results are presented by Kawaguchi as follows, sorted in two groups:

Table 3.13: *masen* and *nai desu* forms in declarative and interrogative sentences (Adapted from Kawaguchi 2010:124)

	masen	***nai desu***	**total**
Declarative	268 (54,0%)	228 (46,0%)	496 (100%)
Interrogative	53 (74,6%)	18 (25,4%)	71 (100%)
Total	321 (56,6%)	246 (43,4%)	567 (100%)

These results clearly show that there is a difference in the use of *masen* and *nai desu* forms in declarative and interrogative sentences. Although *masen* appears more frequently in both declarative and interrogative sentences, the ratio of *nai desu* is much higher in declarative sentences (46,0%) than in interrogative sentences (25,4%). As for why this is the case, Kawaguchi assumes it has to do with certain traits in these two categories of sentences. Declarative sentences often have an abundance of sentence final particles and binding particles (conjunctions). When these are used the tendency is that *nai desu* forms are more tolerated.

After looking at the two categories and seeing that declarative sentences are more likely to contain *nai desu* forms, Kawaguchi proceeds to investigate differences in negation within declarative sentences. The declarative sentences are divided into two groups: negation as in the opposite of the affirmative, and what he calls 非否定 (‘un-negation, non-negation’). This last group contains negatives that are not negations per se, but modality expressions like *kamoshire-nai* (‘maybe’, perhaps’), *nakutewa ikenai* (‘if not, then no go’, meaning ‘must’) and *tewa ikenai* (not allowed).

Table 3.14: Negation versus non-negation in declarative sentences (adopted from Kawaguchi 2010:125)

	masen	***nai desu***	**total**
Negation	154 (49,7%)	156 (50,3%)	310 (100%)
Non-negation (modality)	114 (61,3%)	72 (38,7%)	186 (100%)

These results show that within declarative sentences, the shift from *masen* to *nai desu* forms is more prominent in negation (50,3%) than in modality expressions (38,7%).

Having covered the category of declarative sentences, Kawaguchi proceeds to do an analysis of the interrogative sentences. He uses four different subcategories to do this. First of all there is a category for 'biased' questions (Kawaguchi uses the word 傾き *katamuki* 'tendency, bias'), in other words questions to which you would expect a positive answer (e.g. *anata, muri shite nai?* 'Aren't you pushing yourself a bit hard?' ('Yes, I probably am')). Secondly, questions without 'bias', in other words a normal question where the answer is not obvious (e.g. *sumimasen, dareka imasen ka?* 'Excuse me, isn't there anyone here?'). The third category is called 'negative proposition', and focuses on the negative in the question. While the two first categories use the negative form more as a token of politeness than negation itself, and would have the same meaning in the positive form (e.g. *anata, muri shite iru?* 'Are you pushing yourself a bit hard?', *dareka imasu ka?* 'Is there anyone here?), this third category emphasizes the negation of the statement (e.g. *koo iu arubaito wa zettai shinai desu ka?* 'You *don't* do this kind of work?). The fourth category is modality expressions (e.g. *kamoshirenai* 'maybe') in interrogative sentences.

Table 3.15 different interrogative sentence types (adopted from Kawaguchi 2010:128)

Type of negative interrogative sentence	Masen	Nai desu	Total
With bias	31 (86,1%)	5 (13,9%)	36
Without bias	12 (75,0%)	4 (25,0%)	16
Negative proposition	7 (43,7%)	9 (56,3%)	16
Modality expression	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	3
Total	53 (74,6%)	18 (25,4%)	71

Out of these four categories, only 'Negative proposition' has a *nai desu* ratio higher than the *masen* form. While all of these four are grammatically negative but not necessary negative in meaning, the 'Negative proposition' category is the one that emphasizes the *negation function* (e.g. *dareka imasen ka?* 'Isn't there anyone here?' vs. *koo iu arubaito wa zettai shinai desu ka?* 'You *don't* do this kind of work?'). He thus concludes that in both declarative and interrogative sentences, the *shift* from *masen* to *nai desu* forms is more likely to occur when negation is emphasized.

In the last part of the study Kawaguchi investigates the different types of modality in negative interrogative sentences (e.g. questioning, verification) and in 'performative' sentences, such as invitations and requests.

Table 3.16: Different types of modality used in interrogative sentences (adopted from Kawaguchi 2010:129)

Modality		***masen***	***nai desu***	**Total**
Questions about news and information 情報系（疑問）	Question質問	22 (62,9%)	13 (37,1%)	35
	Verification 確認要求	31 (86,1%)	5 (13,9%)	36
	Total	53 (74,6%)	18 (25,4%)	71
Performative (invitations, requests) 行為系（実行）	Invitation勧誘	7 (87,5%)	1 (12,5%)	8
	Request依頼	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	6
	Total	13 (92,9%)	1 (7,1%)	14

The category for 'performative' is dominated by *masen* endings, while regular questions seem to tolerate the *nai desu* form to a greater extent. It seems like the appearance of *nai desu* forms dwindles going from question to verification to invitation to requests. Kawaguchi assumes this to be caused by a rise in consideration and politeness for the addressee when inviting or requesting something. In other words, *masen* is used more often than *nai desu* in invitations and requests.

To summarize, Kawaguchi showed that the shift from *masen* to *nai desu* forms occurs more in declarative sentences than in interrogative sentences by using natural speech material. In the case of declarative sentences, the shift to *nai desu* forms is more likely if the emphasis is on negation. This also seems to be true in interrogative sentences, especially for 'negative proposition' type sentences where negation takes emphasis. Kawaguchi further speculates that in cases where negation is emphasized, the *nai desu* form is used to make it easier to understand for the listener, by having the negation (*nai*) next to what is being negated and the politeness marker (*desu*) at the end. This could, as Kawaguchi also speculates, result in two

different branches used with negative polite sentences: *nai desu* forms used with negations (否定) and *masen* forms used with non-negation (非否定) such as *kamoshirenai* 'maybe' and *nakutewa ikenai* (Lit.: 'if you don't do…, it will not go') meaning 'must'.

3.8 Banno (2012)

Banno's investigation on the subject is interesting in that it uses three different corpora, namely "*Kokkai Gijiroku* (Proceedings of the Diet)" which is supposed to be the most formal corpus, "*Yahoo Chiebukuro* (online message board)" which is taken to be the least formal corpus, and "*Shoseki* (books)" in which the level of formality is unknown. Using these different corpora she examines the way in which *masen* and *nai desu* forms are used, and under which circumstances. As many of the other researchers on this topic have found, Banno also finds that the *masen* form is most widely used, but the *nai desu* form is more prominent after nouns, adjectives and existential verbs (ある 'aru'), and when sentence final particles are used. Banno also suggests that the deciding factor for *masen* versus *nai desu* is not necessarily "explained by the difference between spoken and written language, but is decided by levels of formality" (Banno, 2012, 133). Here are the results of her analysis:

Table 3.17: Proceedings of the Diet (adopted from Banno 2012:136)

	i-adjective	**na-adjective**	**noun**	**verb**	**total**
masen	4 (100%)	7 (87.5%)	92 (79.3%)	1041 (93.6%)	1144 (92.3%)
nai desu	0 (0%)	1 (12.5%)	24 (20.7%)	71 (6.4%)	96 (7.7%)
total	4	8	116	1112	1240

Table 3.18: Yahoo Chiebukuro (Internet message board) (adopted from Banno 2012:136)

	i-adjective	**na-adjective**	**noun**	**verb**	**total**
masen	161 (41.5%	126 (67.7%)	917 (68.7%)	19553 (90%)	20757 (87.9%)
nai desu	227 (58.5%)	60 (32.3%)	418 (31.3%)	2165 (10%)	2870 (12.1%)
total	388	186	1335	21718	23627

Table 3.19: "Books" (adopted from Banno 2012:136)

	i-adjective	**na-adjective**	**noun**	**verb**	**total**
masen	214 (92.6%)	150 (95.5%)	1246 (94.3%)	11476 (97.4%)	13086 (97%)
nai desu	17 (7.4%)	7 (4.5%)	76 (5.7%)	307 (2.6%)	407 (3%)
total	231	157	1322	11783	13493

The use of three different corpora greatly supports her claim about formality, seeing that the presumably least formal of the three – Yahoo Chiebukuro – has the most *nai desu* forms (12,8% compared to 7,7% in "Proceedings of the Diet" and 3% in "Books"). However, the inclusion of *Shoseki* ("Books") is questionable because it is a mix of different books and it is thus difficult to know the level of in formality of these books. The type of books is also not mentioned.

3.9 Summary and discussion

I have reviewed and summarized 8 different studies on the use of the 'semi-polite' *nai desu* in Japanese. The results are varied, and in many cases it is clear that the *masen* form is not only preferred, but is still considered the correct form, especially with verbs. Furthermore, according to many textbooks and grammars, the only correct way to use *nai desu* is with i-adjectives (e.g. *atsu-ku-nai-desu* '(It) is not hot').

Nevertheless, the *nai desu* form has spread to other parts of speech – most likely because of its ease of use, which is: "simply add *desu* to the plain negative form" (e.g. *ikanai-desu*). Perhaps because of its ease of use the form thrives in less formal but still polite settings, especially among the younger generations. This can also be seen from the results of the studies that use authentic spoken materials as their source (e.g. Fukushima & Uehara, Tanaka, Noda)

The following table is an overview of the 8 previous studies. They are sorted according to *masen* and *nai desu* ratios, and types of corpora are specified.

Table 3.20: *masen* and *nai desu* ratios for 8 previous studies

Author	Year	Corpus type	*Masen*-%	*Nai desu*-%
Banno	2012	Books (Novels and 'how-to books')	97.0	3.0
Tanomura	1994	Newspaper	93,1	6,9
Banno	2012	国会議事録 Diet proceedings	92.3	7.7
Banno	2012	Message board for questions and answers	87.9	12.1
Noda	2004	TV drama scripts, fiction	84,3	15.7
Taguchi	2005	Dialogue, fiction	80.0	20.0
Hudson	2008	Dialogue, fiction	62,7	37,8
Kawaguchi	2010	Natural speech, workplace, interview data	56,6	43,4
Noda	2004	Books dialogue, fiction	54.9	45.1
Noda	2004	Natural speech Adults at work	41.1	58.9
Uehara & Fukushima	2008	Natural speech Students/interview	25.8	74,2[20]
Tanaka	2010	Natural speech Age?	16.4	83.6

(Sorted by *nai desu*/*masen* ratios)

Looking at the results of the reviewed studies, what is striking is the difference between the studies based on authentic, oral material (e.g. Uehara & Fukushima, and Tanaka), and those based primarily on written materials (e.g. Tanomura and Banno). The characteristics of the first group are that they use naturally occurring speech and their results are in favor of the *nai desu* form. The other category is characterized by being based on written materials, and their results favoring the *masen* form. For example, Tanomura's study is based on newspaper articles and the results are that the *masen* form outnumbers *nai desu* forms at about 9 to 1. Taguchi and Hudson, however, both have a higher rate of *nai desu* forms, while their results are still favoring the *masen* form. This can be attributed to the fact that in both Hudson and Taguchi, and including Noda's results for "TV drama scripts", the fictional dialogue is in fact *written* material trying to *mimic* natural speech, and by looking at the results it is clear that fictional dialogues are somewhere in between the written material and natural speech.

[20] Hudson (2008) noted that one of the individuals in this study made up approximately a quarter of the *masen* tokens and nearly half of the *nai desu* tokens, in part explaining the high *nai desu* ratio (see footnote 7).

As for the differences in the results of the studies using naturally occurring dialogues as their material, I can suggest of some factors as to why that is. First of all, both Noda (natural speech) and Kawaguchi used some of the same corpora for their analysis, namely *Josei no kotoba – Shokuba hen* ("Women's language, at the workplace") and *Otoko no kotoba – Shokuba hen* ("Men's language, at the workplace"). However, Kawaguchi uses two additional but similar corpora in his study, and we have to assume that those have a higher degree of formality. Additionally, Kawaguchi's study only treats verbs. This leads to the higher frequency of *masen* in the data by Kawaguchi than by Noda. Furthermore, we have the differences between the studies done by Noda (natural speech) and Kawaguchi on one side, with *nai desu* ratios around 40-60%, and Uehara & Fukushima and Tanaka on the other side with *nai desu* ratios around 70-90%. As for Uehara & Fukushima, we have to assume that it has to do with students in their early 20s being a group that uses *nai desu* forms to a greater extent than those who are older (e.g. men and women in the workplace). Tanaka's study, however, has the highest ratio for *nai desu* forms, and the material is gathered from the section of entertainment radio and TV shows where the audience talks with the host on telephone. In Tanaka's two examples, the hosts are in their 60s and the people calling are a woman in her 30s and a man in his 50s. Since this is not attributable to young age, we have to assume these high ratios of *nai desu* forms are because of the presumably low levels of formality in TV and radio focusing on entertainment.

Although the results of these studies are somewhat different, there are some tendencies that seem to hold true. Many of the studies analyzed *masen* and *nai desu* ratios according to word class and the general tendency is that i-adjectives usually have the highest *nai desu* ratios, something that isn't too surprising considering that most grammars and textbooks only allow *nai desu* to be used with i-adjectives. Following i-adjectives are nouns, existential verb and copulas in no particular order. Verbs seem to be the word class that is the most conservative, with the lowest *nai desu* ratios. However, verbs that denounce possibility (e.g. *korareru* (potential form of *kuru*, 'to come')) or are stative (e.g. *dekiru* 'be able to' and *wakaru* 'to understand', 'become clear') have a higher ratio of *nai desu* forms compared to other verbs. This might be because these verbs in many cases are more like adjectives in that they describe a state, a property or a trait.

Another tendency is that when sentence final particles (e.g. *yo*, *ne*), and also to some degree binding particles, are used, *nai desu* forms are more tolerated. Noda made a detailed analysis of this in Table 3.7, repeated here in Table 3.21:

Table 3.21: The effect of particles on the use of *masen*/*nai desu* (adopted from Noda 2004:237)

	Without any particles	**With final particles**	**With binding particles**[21]
Part of speech	*masen/nai desu*	*masen/nai desu*	*masen/nai desu*
Noun	75,3%/**24,7%**	42,6%/**57,4%**	41,5%/**58,5%**
nai-adjective	86,3%/**13,7%**	57,1%/**42,9%**	73,9%/**26,1%**
Non-existential verbs	67,2%/**32,8%**	30,7%/**69,3%**	50,8%/**49,2%**
Verbs	93%/**7%**	62%/**38%**	87,6%/**12,4%**
Verb+*teiru*	78,3%/**21,7%**	56,6%/**43,4%**	77,1%/**22,9%**
kamoshirenai	96,5%/**3,5%**	84,1%/**15,9%**	72,4%/**27,6%**

Not only did Noda's study show that sentence final particles has the effect of making the speaker use more *nai desu* forms, the results from his questionnaire also indicated that *masen* endings were less tolerated when used with particles. When respondents (university students) were asked to decide which of two sentences sounded more natural to them, '*watashi ja nai desu yo*' ('It's not me') had a higher acceptance rate than its *masen* counterpart '*watashi ja arimasen yo*' ('It's not me'). Contrarily, in sentences without sentence final particles it was the opposite.

Another tendency affecting the use of *nai desu* and *masen* forms is whether the sentence is declarative or interrogative. Kawaguchi's study found that *nai desu* forms were more used in the declarative than in interrogative sentences. As to why, Kawaguchi speculates that it has to do with the higher frequency of sentence final particles in declarative sentences. Furthermore, when investigating different types of (negative) declarative sentences, Kawaguchi found that actual negation yielded more *nai desu* forms than sentences in which the negation was used to form idiomatic modality expressions. This was also the case for interrogative sentences, where *nai desu* forms were more tolerated when negation was emphasized. Tanomura and Noda also analyzed interrogative sentences and found similar tendencies: when the negation was used as a politeness or modality marker but not emphasizing negation, the *masen* form

[21] Particles that serve as conjunctions (e.g. *kara* 'because, from', *ga*, *kedo* 'but' etc.)

was preferred. Their claim is in opposition to Tanaka who claimed that speakers use *masen* when it is negation (more so than politeness) that is emphasized.

Having read and summarized all of these studies, I intend to use the next chapter to analyze my own data to see if some of the findings from these 8 previous studies also hold for newer data. I have acquired a corpus called "BTSJ *ni yoru Nihongo hanashikotoba koopasu*" which is a collection of transcribed natural conversations at different levels of politeness and formality, spoken by different age groups, something that I hope will give me new insights on the distribution of *nai desu* and *masen* forms in natural speech data. I will use some of the findings from this chapter as hypotheses, so that I can investigate both similarities and differences in my own data compared to the studies mentioned in this chapter about previous studies.

4 Chapter 4: Corpus analysis

Having read and summarized many articles on this subject, I felt the need to see if the claims of these studies also hold in new and different data. The purpose of this chapter is thus to investigate and test the results and hypotheses presented in the chapter about previous studies. I chose to do a corpus analysis to gather data about the use and distribution of *nai desu* and *masen* forms, using what I have learned from previous studies as a base. The corpus I found is called "BTSJ *ni yoru Nihongo hanashikotoba koopasu*" which is a collection of Japanese conversations of different degrees of politeness, compiled by Mayumi Usami at Tokyo University of Foreign Languages in 2011.

The corpus is organized into 21 parts, of which I have used 5. The reason for not using the entire corpus is that in order to find semi-polite and polite forms, a setting for *masen* and *nai desu* forms to occur naturally is necessary. Thus, conversations between friends are excluded since we do not expect *masen* and *nai desu* forms to appear in those conversations, but rather the plain form. Furthermore, the materials that include speech from non-japanese speakers are also excluded. Last, I want to mention that *masen* forms that have no equal *nai desu* counterpart are excluded from my results. An example of this is the frequently used *sumimasen* 'pardon, sorry' vs *sumanai desu*, which is rarely if ever used. *Sumanai* in the plain form sees some use, but *sumanai desu*[22] in the semi polite form is not used. Another example is words that are used only as honorifics, and are thus only used in the *masu*/*masen* forms (e.g. *gozaimasen* vs **gozaranai desu*).

The 5 sub-corpora I have used in my analysis are:

- Part 2 (*first half): conversations between women who meet for the first time (*excluding the second half which is conversations between friends), 11 conversations, 237 minutes and 7 seconds
- Part 3: thesis guidance between teacher and student, 10 conversations, 311 minutes
- Part 13: 35 years old male talking to people of differing status/age/gender who met each other for the first time, 18 conversations, 295 minutes and 37 seconds

[22] Other examples are: *itashimasen* vs. ?? *itasanai desu*, *moushimasen* vs. ?? *mousanai desu*, *orimasen* vs. ?? *oranai desu*.

- Part 14: university and graduate students in their early 20s, same and mixed gender who met for the first time, 16 conversations, 272 minutes and 18 seconds
- Part 18: discussions between university students (female) who met each other for the first time, 4 conversations, 44 minutes and 33 seconds

First of all, the corpus fits the purpose of my investigation well because the sub-corpora give us different degrees of formality and politeness. As we understand from the previous studies on this subject, ratios of *masen* and *nai desu* forms are often affected by the setting of the conversation. In very formal settings the *masen* form ratios are higher, while in less formal but still polite conversations *nai desu* forms are used frequently. As we will see later, the conversations in Part 3 where a student is receiving thesis counseling from a teacher yield more *masen* forms than Part 2, where the individuals involved are strangers but still of the same age and status. The fact that this corpus showcases different settings of natural polite conversations will make it easier to analyze the data in relation to levels of formality.

The questions and hypotheses that I will be investigating in this corpus analysis are mostly based on the research by Kawaguchi (2010). The reason for choosing Kawaguchi over the other studies is because this study was focused on explaining the primary reasons as to why, and under which circumstances the *nai desu* form is used instead of *masen* forms. Thus, I have chosen my hypotheses based on Kawaguchi's findings, except for the last hypothesis about sentence final particles that was mentioned by almost all the researchers.

4.1 Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis is based on Kawaguchi's finding that claims that there are more *nai desu* forms in declarative sentences than in interrogative sentences.

Examples of declarative sentences (adopted from Kawaguchi 2010:124):

(自分の好みだけで言っちゃうと、こうあんま、)豆腐屋さんていうとめったに自分じゃ行かないですから面白そうですよねー。

(*Jibun no konomi dake de ittchau to, kooanma,*) *toofuyasan te iu to metta ni jibun ja ikanai desu kara omoshirosou desu yo ne.*

“Well, I never really go to Tofu shops, so that would be fun”

いや、もうやりません

Iya, moo yarimasen

“No, I don’t do that anymore”

Interrogative sentences (adopted from Kawaguchi 2010:124):

１０分でもいいから長く寝たいとは思わないですか？

Juppun de mo ii kara nagaku netai towa omowanai desu ka?

“(Lit.) Don’t you think that you want to sleep longer even if it is 10 (more) minutes?”

それって全然足りませんか？

Sore tte zenzen tarimasen ka?

“(Do you think that) it is not enough (money)?”

In Kawaguchi’s analysis, the results of *nai desu* and *masen* forms in declarative and interrogative sentences were as follows:

Table 4.1 (adopted from Kawaguchi 2010:124)

	Masen	***nai desu***	**total**
Declarative	268 (54,0%)	228 (46,0%)	496 (100%)
Interrogative	53 (74,6%)	18 (25,4%)	71 (100%)
Total	321 (56,6%)	246 (43,4%)	567 (100%)

As we can see here: *masen* is used more frequently than *nai desu* in both declarative sentences and interrogative sentences. However, *nai desu* is used more in declarative sentences (46%) than in interrogative sentences (25,4%).

The following tables show the results of my investigation.

Table 4.2 Declarative vs. Interrogative, Sub-corpus 2, women who meet for the first time

Sub-corpus 2	***Masen***	***nai desu***	**total**
Declarative	8 (8,2%)	90 (91,8%)	98
Interrogative	14 (15,2%)	78 (84,8%)	92
Total	22 (11,6%)	168 (88,4%)	190

Table 4.3 Sub-corpus 3, thesis guidance between student and teacher

Sub-corpus 3	***Masen***	***nai desu***	**total**
Declarative	38 (44,7%)	47 (55,3%)	85
Interrogative	3 (21,4%)	11 (78,6%)	14
Total	41 (41,4%)	58 (58,6%)	99

Table 4.4 Sub-corpus 13, age 35 male talking to people of mixed age/gender meeting for the first time

Sub-corpus 13	***Masen***	***nai desu***	**total**
Declarative	25 (18,7%)	109 (81,3%)	134
Interrogative	10 (13,7%)	63 (86,3%)	73
Total	35 (16,9%)	172 (83,1%)	207

Table 4.5 Sub-corpus 14, university students, early 20s, mixed gender meeting for the first time

Sub-corpus 14	***Masen***	***nai desu***	**total**
Declarative	7 (6,7%)	97 (93,3%)	104
Interrogative	6 (9,0%)	61 (91,0%)	67
Total	13 (7,6%)	158 (92,4%)	171

Table 4.6 Sub-corpus 18, university students, female, meeting for the first time

Sub-corpus 18	*Masen*	*nai desu*	total
Declarative	0 (0%)	5 (100%)	5
Interrogative	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	3
Total	0 (0%)	8 (100%)	8

Table 4.7 Declarative vs. Interrogative (my own data), Total

Total	*Masen*	*nai desu*	total
Declarative	78 (18,3%)	348 (81,7%)	426
Interrogative	33 (13,3%)	216 (86,7%)	249
Total	111 (16,4%)	564 (83,4%)	675

First of all, in my data *nai desu* is most frequently used both in declarative and interrogative sentences. Secondly, the ratios of *nai desu* in declarative and interrogative sentences are about the same (81,7% vs 86,7%). Indeed, there are slightly more occurrences[23] of *nai desu* in interrogative sentences if we consider the total data, and the hypothesis only (barely) holds for the data from sub-corpus 2 and 14 (see Table 4.2 and 4.5). Although the hypothesis holds for sub-corpus 18, there are not enough tokens for a valid answer. Sub-corpora 3, 13 and the total results contradict the finding by Kawaguchi.

This hypothesis was one that I expected to hold on my own data. Because of this I was surprised that it did not hold. However, I assume this is due to formality differences in the materials I have used contrary to the materials used in Kawaguchi. First of all, my data yielded higher ratios of *nai desu* forms overall because the levels of formality in the different sub-corpora seem to be much lower than that of Kawaguchi. While Kawaguchi's study used conversations from the workplace, where people of different age and of different status communicate in a company hierarchy, my data are gathered from many different settings and in most cases younger (university aged) people. Furthermore, out of the five sub-corpora I have used as my data, sub-corpus 3 (Table 4.3) seems to be the one with the highest level of formality, being conversations between student and teacher. The relatively high ratios of

[23] This may be explained by the large amount of *ja nai desu ka?* phrases. See the last paragraph of Hypothesis 4 for a possible explanation.

masen forms (41,4% vs 16,4% which is the average of all the 5 sub-corpora) also suggest higher levels of formality. Yet, the ratio of *nai desu* in interrogative sentences in sub-corpus 3 is higher (78,6%) than that of *nai desu* in declarative sentences (55, 3%) contrary to the hypothesis.

When the level of formality in the corpus is lower, *nai desu* ratios are higher in both declarative and interrogative sentences. One expression that was very frequent in my data was "X じゃないですか？" (*X ja nai desu ka*? = Isn't it X?) which is a question for seeking agreement or acknowledgement from the listener. In more formal settings, I assume this expression would rather be "X じゃありませんか" (*X ja arimasen ka?*). Had the frequency of this expression been lower, my corpus would probably fit the hypothesis, but this also shows that Kawaguchi's finding (Hypothesis 1) does not seem to hold true for all types of data. [24]

I therefore assume that the level of formality in the corpora plays a role for this hypothesis.

4.2 Hypothesis 2

The second finding in Kawaguchi (2010) that I use as a hypothesis is that in declarative sentences, *nai desu* forms appear more often when they denote negation, as opposed to when they are part of a modality/fixed expression that contains negation.

Examples of sentences where *nai desu* denotes negation (adopted from Kawaguchi 2010:125):

きっと行ったことあるっていう人もいませんよね、そんなにね。

Kitto itta koto aru tte iu hito mo imasen yo ne, sonna ni ne.

"(Lit.) There are certainly not so many people who have been there."

でもあのー、ポイントは変えられないですよね、やっぱり。

Demo ano…, pointo wa kaerarenai desu yo ne, yappari.

[24] Note, however, that we should take into consideration that the materials used by Kawaguchi stem from corpora dated 1997 and 2002, while my materials are from 2011. Since the use of *nai desu* seems to be a relatively new phenomenon, the time difference of about 10 years may mean something. Additionally, It is also worth mentioning that Kawaguchi's data was based only on verbs, while my data included all predicate forms.

“But, you cannot change the point (you know)”

Examples of sentences where *nai desu* denotes modality (adopted from Kawaguchi 2010:125):

ゼミ、には適してないかもしれませんねー。(* *kamoshire (masen/naidesu)* means ‘maybe’, ‘probably’)

Zemi, ni wa teki shite nai kamoshire masen nee.

“(That) probably won’t fit with the seminar.”

詰めないといけないですね。(*nai to ike(masen/naidesu)* means ‘must’. (Lit. “If not, then it won’t go”)

Tsumenai to ikenai desu ne.

“We’ll have to pack (the things in a box)” (There is no negation in the English sentence, only the modality of ‘must’ or in this case ‘have to’)

In Kawaguchi’s analysis the result of negation versus modality expressions was as follows:

Table 4.8 (adopted from Kawaguchi 2010:125)

	Masen	***Nai desu***	**Total**
Negation	154 (49,7%)	156 (50,3%)	310
Modality/Fixed expression	114 (61,3%)	72 (38,7%)	186

As we can see here, there are more *nai desu* forms when denoting negation (50,3%) than when denoting modality/fixed expressions (38,7%).

Applying this hypothesis on my own data gave these results:

Table 4.9 Sub-corpus 2

	Masen	***Nai desu***	**Total**
Negation	6 (7,1%)	78 (92,9%)	84
Modality/Fixed expression	2 (14,3%)	12 (85,7%)	14

Table 4.10 Sub-corpus 3

	Masen	***Nai desu***	**Total**
Negation	14 (27,5%)	37 (72,5%)	51
Modality/Fixed expression	23 (71,9%)	9 (28,1%)	32

Table 4.11 Sub-corpus 13

	Masen	***Nai desu***	**Total**
Negation	15 (15,6%)	81 (84,4%)	96
Modality/Fixed expression	10 (27%)	27 (73%)	37

Table 4.12 Sub-corpus 14

	Masen	***Nai desu***	**Total**
Negation	4 (4,7%)	81 (95,3%)	85
Modality/Fixed expression	3 (17,6%)	14 (82,4%)	17

Table 4.13 Sub-corpus 18

	Masen	***Nai desu***	**Total**
Negation	0	5 (100%)	5
Modality/Fixed expression	0	0	0

Table 4.14 Sub-corpus Total

	Masen	***Nai desu***	**Total**
Negation	39 (12,1%)	282 (87,9%)	321
Modality/Fixed expression	38 (38%)	62 (62%)	100

Hypothesis 2 which is taken from Kawaguchi's second finding that "*nai desu* ratios are higher when denoting *negation* than when it is part of a modality/fixed expression" holds well for all of my sub-corpora. Mentioned also by Tanomura (1994) and Noda (2004) is that when negation is emphasized, *nai desu* is preferred. The (grammatical) negation in modality/fixed expressions is probably not regarded as negation per se, but merely as part of a fixed expression. Since negation is *not* emphasized in modality and fixed expressions, *masen* is preferred and *nai desu* tends to be less used. Thus, the level of formality of data does not seem to affect the results for this hypothesis.

4.3 Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis I will investigate is based on Kawaguchi's finding that says: "The *nai desu* form is preferred when 1: answering a yes/no question in a negating manner, and 2: when repeating the previous (negative) statement to show agreement" In other words, this hypothesis builds on the previous finding that when negation is emphasized, *nai desu* is the preferred form.

An example showing a negative answer to an open question (adopted from Kawaguchi 2010:126):

A: そうですかー、そういうときは、何か注意したりするんですか？

B: は、しないです。

A: *Soo desu kaa, soo iu toki wa, nanika chuui shitari suru n desu ka?*

B: *Ha, shinai desu.*

A: "Is that so. When that happens, do you warn them (among other things)?"

B: “No, I don’t.”

An example of repeating the statement to show agreement (adopted from Kawaguchi 2010:126):

A: 車に乗らなければ、その排気ガスっていう問題はー、みんなが乗らなければ絶対出ないわけですよね。

B: 出ないですねー、でも車なくなったら、日本機能しないですねーはい。

A: *Kuruma ni noranakereba, sono haiki gasu tte iu mondai waa, minna ga noranakereba zettai denai wake desu yo ne.*

B: *Denai desu nee, demo kuruma nakunattara, nihon kinoo shinai desu nee hai.*

A: “If we don’t use cars, the problem with exhaust fumes.. If we didn’t use cars, those fumes wouldn’t come out, right.”

B: “(Yeah, you’re right) the fumes wouldn’t come out. But if we had no cars, Japan would not function:”

Kawaguchi used his *masen* and *nai desu* tokens used in negation (see Table 4.8), in total 310, where 154 were *masen* forms and 156 were *nai desu* forms. Out of the 154 *masen* forms, 86 (55,8%) were either answers to yes/no questions or the same phrase repeated to show agreement. For *nai desu* forms the ratio was 93 (59,6%) out of 156 tokens.

Table 4.15: Answer/agreement in relation to negative forms in declarative sentences, treated separately (adopted from Kawaguchi 2010:126)

Masen		***Nai desu***	
Negation	Answer/agreement	Negation	Answer/agreement
154	86 (55,8%)	156	93 (59,6%)

As we can see here, the ratio of *nai desu* forms (used as an answer or to show agreement) to the total of (declarative, negating) *nai desu* tokens (59,6%) is slightly higher than for *masen* forms (55,8%). Another way to look at these data would be to look at total tokens for “answer/agreement” (both *masen* and *nai desu* forms), in total 179, and then look at how many of these are *masen* and *nai desu* forms:

Table 4.16: Ratios for *masen* and *nai desu* tokens for answer/agreement in relation to total answer/agreement tokens (adopted from Kawaguchi 2010:126)

***Masen* answer/agreement**	***Nai desu* answer/agreement**	**Total answer/agreement**
86 (48,0%)	93 (52,0%)	179

As these data suggest, *nai desu* is the preferred form, although marginally, when giving a negative answer to a yes/no question, and also in cases where the previous statement is repeated to show agreement.

In order to test my own data against this hypothesis I took every instance of *nai desu* and *masen* forms in declarative sentences, and counted the ones that were answers to yes/no questions or were used to agree with the previous statement:

Table 4.17: *masen* vs. *nai desu* forms used when answering yes/no questions (compares to Table 4.16)

Sub-corpus:	***Masen***	***Nai desu***	**Total answers**
2	1 (8,3%)	11 (91,7%)	12
3	2 (22,2%)	7 (77,8%)	9
13	0 (0%)	8 (100%)	8
14	0 (0%)	23 (100%)	23
18	0	0	0
Total	3 (5,8%)	49 (94,2%)	52

Because Kawaguchi chose to present his findings in two different ways, as shown above (see Table 4.15 and 4.16), I did this for my data as well:

Table 4.18: Answer/agreement in relation to negative forms in declarative sentences, treated separately (compares to Table 4.15)

Sub-corpus	***Masen***		***Nai desu***	
	Negation	Answer/agreement	Negation	Answer/agreement
2	6	1 (16,6%)	78	11 (14,1%)
3	14	2 (14,3%)	37	7 (18,9%)
13	15	0 (0%)	81	8 (9,9%)
14	4	0 (0%)	81	23 (23,4%)
18	0	0 (0%)	5	0 (0%)
Total	39	3 (7,7%)	282	49 (17,4%)

As we can see here, Hypothesis 3 holds very well for my data. I found in total 52 instances of either form being used as an answer or to show agreement, and 49 (94,2%) of these were *nai*

desu tokens. This way of looking at the data compares to Kawaguchi's results in Table 4.16, where out of 179 total tokens for answer/agreement, 93 (52,0%) were *nai desu*.

When *masen* and *nai desu* forms are treated separately (see Table 4.15), Kawaguchi shows that a *nai desu* form is more likely to be an answer (59,6%) than the *masen* form (55,8%). My results, however, have much lower ratios and show greater differences. Out of 39 *masen* tokens (declarative, used as negation) only 3 (7,7%) were used as an answer or to show agreement. For *nai desu* forms the ratio was more than double at 49 (17,4%) out of 282 tokens total.

As for why Kawaguchi's data overall yield higher ratios (>50%) than mine (<20%) is hard to answer since I am not familiar with Kawaguchi's corpora. However, his data are gathered from the work place where we have to assume that there is more "feedback communication" than in my corpora, resulting in *more questions being asked and answered*.

When looking at the results of each sub-corpus (Table 4.18) we see that even though the hypothesis holds for the total results, there is a slight advantage for *masen* in sub-corpus 2 (16,6% vs. 14,1%). While this contradicts the hypothesis, we have to remember that that those 16,6% stem from only *one* answer/agreement token out of 6 possible, and this number is so low that it might not be significant at all.

While Kawaguchi's data only show a slight difference in favor of the *nai desu* form, my data makes this difference more pronounced. This is again presumably because of the difference in levels of formality between Kawaguchi's corpora and my own. The fairly small difference of ratios in Kawaguchi's data also makes me wonder why the finding was presented as being a factor. However, using this finding as a hypothesis for my own investigation shows that Kawaguchi was right in his conclusion.

4.4 Hypothesis 4

While hypothesis 1-3 treated declarative sentences, I will now turn my attention to interrogative sentences. Kawaguchi analyzed four different categories of interrogative sentences to determine the distribution of *masen* and *nai desu* forms in these. His finding was

that “there are more *nai desu* forms in the ‘Negative proposition’ category”, and this is the finding I will use as Hypothesis 4. The four categories are:

1: Question with “bias” (adopted from Kawaguchi 2010:127):

A: 今全体にねー、岩波新書がね、ページが多く、多くなってんだよ、前に比べて。一冊だって、前はだって、２５０ページまである、てゆうのあんましなかったんだけど、今はもう、２５０とか３００、普通でしょう。

B: あっ、でも、行間は空いてません？

A: それだ、あの、あのー、読みやすいことは読みやすいんだけどー。

A: *Ima zentai ni nee, Iwanami Shinsho ga ne, peeji ga ooku, ooku natte n da yo, mae ni kurabete. Issatsu datte, mae wa datte, 250 peeji made aru, te yuu no anma shinakatta n da kedo, ima wa moo, 250 toka 300, futsuu deshoo.*

B: *Ah, demo, gyookan wa aite masen?*

A: *Sore da, ano, anoo, yomiyasui koto wa yomiyasui n da kedo.*

A: “Nowdays, the books from Iwanami Shinsho, there are so many pages compared to before. One book was never really more than 250 pages, but now, 250 – 300 pages seems to be normal.”

B: “Ah, but, isn’t there (more) line spacing?”

A: “Yes, that’s it! Well, it’s easier to read.”

In this conversation, B’s question is “biased”. In other words, B knows that there are more pages because there is more line spacing, thus asking the question expecting a positive answer, ‘yes’.

2: Question without “bias” (adopted from Kawaguchi 2010:128):

1A: アッコさんの番組知りませんか？

1B: あっ知らないです。

2A: あと自転車とかは乗らないですか？

2B: あ、えっとずっと乗ってます

1A: *Akko-san no bangumi shirimasen ka?*

1B: *Ah, shiranai desu.*

2A: *Ato jitensha toka noranai desu ka?*

2B: *Ah, etto zutto notte masu.*

1A: "You don't know Akko-san's program?"

1B: "Ah, no I don't."

2A: "You don't ride a bike?"

2B: "(No,) I do it all the time."

In these two conversations the questions are without "bias", which means that the questions are asked without expecting a yes or a no. In other words they are neutral questions.

3: "Negative proposition" (adopted from Kawaguchi 2010:128):

A: こういうアルバイトは絶対しないですか？

B: しないですよ。

A: *Koo iu arubaito wa zettai shinai desu ka?*

B: *Shinai desu yo.*

A: "You would never do this kind of work?"

B: "No."

This category is easiest to think of as the opposite or no-variant of the questions with "bias". They are similar because the person who is asking the question expects a specific answer. In this case a negative one[25]. I think the reason why Kawaguchi uses two very similar categories, as in this case, is that negation plays a role when choosing to use *masen* or *nai desu* forms.

4: Question with modality expression (adopted from Kawaguchi 2010:128):

A: ああ、そうですねー。ええとねー曜日がちょっとわたくしのほうがこれ土日月火、全部毎週出なければなりませんか？

[25] Negative in the sense that the verb is in the negative form. If a Japanese speaker is asked '*Hashi wo tsukaenai desu ka?*' "You cannot use chopsticks?" they would answer 'Hai, tsukaenai desu.' "(Lit.) Yes (I agree with your statement), I cannot use chopsticks." ("No, I cannot.")

B: そうですねー。

A: *Aa, soo desu nee. Eeto nee yoobi ga chotto watakushi no hoo ga kore do nichi getsu ka, zenbu maishuu denakereba narimasen ka?*

B: *Soo desu nee.*

A: "(Okay, yeah.) Hmm, well, some weekdays are a bit troublesome for me. Saturday, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday. Do we have to attend all of them every week?"

B: "Well, (let me see.)"

In this category, a modality expression is used in the question. In this case: *nakereba* 'if not..' *narimasen ka* 'does not become?' which together means 'must', and *nakereba naranai* is a fixed expression.

The results when analyzing *masen* and *nai desu* usage in four different categories of interrogative sentences were:

Table 4.19: Kawaguchi's results for interrogative sentences (adopted from Kawaguchi 2010:128)

Type of interrogative sentence	***Masen***	***Nai desu***	**Total**
With "bias"	31 (86,1%)	5 (13,9%)	36
Without "bias"	12 (75,0%)	4 (25,0%)	16
"Negative proposition"	7 (43,7%)	9 (56,3%)	16
With modality expression	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	3
Total	53 (74,6%)	18 (25,4%)	71

As was already clear from the first finding/hypothesis (see Table 4.1), Kawaguchi found less *nai desu* forms in interrogative sentences, but as the results above suggests: "In interrogative sentences, *nai desu* is most likely to be used in (negative) questions that expect a negative answer ("Negative proposition").". This is my fourth hypothesis, and I will now test this on my own data.

Table 4.20: My data, Sub-corpus 2

Type of interrogative sentence	***Masen***	***Nai desu***	**Total**
With "bias"	11 (13,6%)	70 (86,4%)	81
Without "bias"	3 (33,3%)	6 (66,7%)	9
"Negative proposition"	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	2
With modality expression	0	0	0
Total	14 (15,2%)	78 (84,8%)	92

Table 4.21: My data, Sub-corpus 3

Type of interrogative sentence	***Masen***	***Nai desu***	**Total**
With "bias"	1 (12,5%)	7 (87,5%)	8
Without "bias"	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1
"Negative proposition"	1 (20%)	4 (80%)	5
With modality expression	0	0	0
Total	3 (21,4%)	11 (78,6%)	14

Table 4.22: My data, Sub-corpus 13

Type of interrogative sentence	***Masen***	***Nai desu***	**Total**
With "bias"	3 (5,1%)	56 (94,9%)	59
Without "bias"	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	10
"Negative proposition"	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	3
With modality expression	0	0	0
Total	9 (12,5%)	63 (87,5%)	72

Table 4.23: My data, Sub-corpus 14

Type of interrogative sentence	***Masen***	***Nai desu***	**Total**
With "bias"	2 (3,4%)	57 (96,6%)	59
Without "bias"	4 (57,1%)	3 (42,9%)	7
"Negative proposition"	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1
With modality expression	0	0	0
Total	6 (8,96%)	61 (91,04%)	67

Table 4.24: My data, Sub-corpus 18

Type of interrogative sentence	***Masen***	***Nai desu***	**Total**
With "bias"	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	3
Without "bias"	0	0	0
"Negative proposition"	0	0	0
With modality expression	0	0	0
Total	0	3	3

Table 4.25: My data, total corpus

Type of interrogative sentence	***Masen***	***Nai desu***	**Total**
With "bias"	17 (8,1%)	193 (91,9%)	210
Without "bias"	14 (51,9%)	13 (48,1%)	27
"Negative proposition"	1 (9,1%)	10 (90,9%)	11
With modality expression	0	0	0
Total	32 (12,9%)	216 (87,1%)	248

For interrogative sentences of the "Negative proposition" type, the overall ratio for this category is *masen* (9,1%) and *nai desu* (90,9%). Thus, the hypothesis holds for my data, although there are only 11 tokens in total. This low number of tokens may not be enough to constitute a significant answer, so more research is probably needed.

An interesting finding in my own data is that neutral questions (i.e. questions without "bias") is in favor of the *masen* form with 14 (51,9%) versus 13 (48,1%) of the 27 in total. This is not surprising in itself, because Kawaguchi's data also confirms this (see Table 4.19), however it is interesting because my data contains many more *nai desu* forms (83,4%) than *masen* forms (16,4%) in general (see Table 4.7). In other words, the *masen* form still holds a strong position in this type of questions even if the level of formality is lower than Kawaguchi's corpora.

The last thing I want to comment on is the category for "Questions with bias". In Kawaguchi's analysis the *masen* form is preferred with 86,1% to 13,9% for *nai desu* (see Table 4.19). My results, however, differ significantly from this with 8,1% for *masen* and 91,9% for *nai desu*. This is partly explainable by the fact that the overall ratios for *nai desu* are considerably higher in my data at 84,3% compared to Kawaguchi's 43,4% (see Table 3.20 in 'Previous studies').

However, something I noticed while going through the corpus was that a large amount of these tokens (*nai desu* forms of "biased" questions) were instances of *ja nai desu ka* ('Isn't it/that (so)?'). To illustrate this, here is an example adopted from Uehara and Fukushima (2008:170-171):

(M (=Male) is talking about his experience of being surrounded by foreigners and spoken to in their language, (IF=Interviewer Female))

M: *Nani sareru n daroo tte*{laugh}*omot*[*te*], *sore de yappari hora, gaikokujin tte*

IF: *Sono mama* [*tachisatta no*{laugh}]

M: *Honto ni shaberu kikai tte nai ja nai // desu kaa.*

IF: *Soo, kamoshirenai desu nee.*

M: "I wondered what they were gonna do to me, and then… you know, you see… foreigners…"

IF: “So you just left them without even…”

M: “We hardly ever get a chance to talk with them, right?”

IF: “Yeah, I suppose maybe you’re right.”

Although these phrases grammatically form a “biased” question since they expect a positive answer, Uehara and Fukushima (2008:171) mentions that:

> Uehara and others (1998) call the *ja nai* part of the total expression (*n/wake*) *ja nai desu ka* “modality *janai*”, which they contrast to the “propositional/negative *janai*”. According to them, the former contrasts both structurally and functionally with the latter, and has lost its negative (and interrogative) sense in the process of developing into a grammatical (modality) marker of its own. If they are correct, they have developed a partial account of why, given the two composite structures, *ja nai desu ka* and *ja arimasen ka*, the former tends to be the default: in a discourse context where either composite expression is possible but where *janai*, a component of *ja nai desu ka*, is already lexicalized as the grammatical marker specific to that discourse function, that form is likely to be activated by default (Uehara and Fukushima 2008:171).

Perhaps because of this the logical counterpart *ja arimasen ka* is used less in situations where the speaker uses the phrase more like a tag question than as an actual question.

4.5 Hypothesis 5

The last hypothesis I will investigate is a tendency I have found in most of the previous studies, namely that *nai desu* is preferred when followed by sentence final particles.

Sentence final particles are small, one-syllable units of speech that are used especially in the spoken language to add emotion or assertiveness to what is being said. The most typical particles are *yo* (assertive) and *ne* (tag question, used like ‘…, you know?’, ‘right?’)[26].

Here are some examples taken from my corpus:

A:だからアメリカ人の友達っていうのは、いないですよねー。

B: あ、そうなんだ。

[26] Other examples are *wa* (feminine sentence final particle), *zo* (masculine, rough), *ze* (masculine, yet softer than *zo*, often used with the volitional form *ikoo ze!*), *sa* (similar to *yo* and *ne*), *na* (similar to *ne*)

A: ただ、会って、少し話するぐらいの友達はいますけど、ちょっと電話して、で“一緒に食事行こうか”とかー,

B: “一緒に買い物行こうか”とか、そういうふうに、(んー)するアメリカ人の友達はいないですね。

A: *Dakara amerika jin no tomodachi tte iu no wa, inai desu yo nee.*

B: *A, soo nan da.*

A: *Tada, atte, sukoshi hanashi suru gurai no tomodachi wa imasu kedo, chotto denwa shite, de "issho ni shokuji ikoo ka" toka…*

B: *"Issho ni kaimono ikoo ka" toka, soo iu fuu ni, (n-) suru amerika jin no tomodachi wa inai desu ne.*

A: "I don't really have any American friends, you see."

B: "Oh, is that so."

A: "Like, I have some that I meet and have a little chat, but not anyone who would call me and say things like 'Let's go and eat something'."

B "'Let's go shopping together', no, I don't have American friends like that either, you know."

And an example where *masen* is used:

A: あ、じゃ、もう、すごいベテランの域。

B: え、でも、まだ30年は行ってませんよね〈笑い〉。

A: *A, ja, moo, sugoi beteran no iki.*

B: *E, demo, mada san juu (30) nen wa itte masen yo ne [laugh].*

A: "Oh, well then, you're already quite the veteran."

B: "What? But, I've not even passed 30 you know, right?"

For this hypothesis, I will compare my data to the findings of Tanomura (1994:57) and Noda (2004:232-233). Tanomura found a total of 7295 *masen* tokens and 1584 *nai desu* tokens, and out of the *masen* tokens only 278 (3,8%) were followed by sentence final particles (*yo, ne, na,*

wa, *zo*). However, of the 1584 *nai desu* tokens, 393 (24,8%) were followed by sentence final particles.

Noda found the same tendency by looking at his own data. Out of the total 1771[27] *masen* tokens 465[28] (26,3%) were followed by a sentence final particle. As for the 689 *nai desu* tokens, 395 (57,3%) were followed by a sentence final particle.

Table 4.26: Ratios for sentence final particles in Tanomura (adopted from Tanomura 1994:57)

***Masen* tokens total**	***Masen* used with particle**	***Nai desu* tokens total**	***Nai desu* used with particle**
7295	278 (3,8%)	1584	393 (24,8%)

Table 4.27: Ratios for sentence final particles in Noda (adopted from Noda 2004:232-233)

***Masen* tokens total**	***Masen* used with particle**	***Nai desu* tokens total**	***Nai desu* used with particle**
1771	465 (26,3%)	689	395 (57,3%)

Table 4.28: Ratios for sentence final particles in my own data

Sub-corpus	***Masen* tokens total**	***Masen* used with particle**	***Nai desu* tokens total**	***Nai desu* used with particle**
2	22	4 (18,2%)	168	56 (33,3%)
3	41	1 (2,4%)	58	22 (37,9%)
13	35	6 (17,1%)	172	74 (43,0%)
14	13	1 (7,7%)	158	68 (43,0%)
18	0	0 (0%)	8	4 (50,0%)
Total	111	12 (10,8%)	564	224 (39,7%)

As we can see in the tables above, hypothesis 5 holds for my data with 224 out of 564 (39,7%) tokens for *nai desu* + sentence final particle. Compared to the tokens for *masen* +

[27] Noda's number is actually 2462, but I have subtracted the *masen* tokens for '*sumimasen*' ("Pardon", "Sorry") because this word has no *nai desu* counterpart and is not included in my analysis.
[28] Again, Noda's number is 501, but I have subtracted 36 which were particles following '*sumimasen*'.

sentence final particle at only 12 out of 111 (10,8%), we see that *nai desu* forms are close to four times more often used with particles than *masen* forms. However, the legitimate question to ask now is why.

Noda assumes that the reason why the ratio of *nai desu* followed by sentence final particles is so high, is that these particles are more often used between people who are close friends than otherwise (Noda 2004:237). Furthermore, we can also assume that the lower the levels of formality, the more *nai desu* forms are used. Thus, particles appear more easily with *nai desu* than *masen*. Tanomura (1994:58) is certain that one of the reasons might be that especially *i*-adjectives + *desu* (e.g. *atsui desu* 'It is hot') can sound a bit unnatural, but when followed by the sentence final particle *ne*, as in '*atsui desu ne*', it sounds more natural. This may therefore also be a factor that increases the use of particles after *nai desu*, as if it were treated like an *i*-adjective. Tanomura does not, however, explain in more detail the reason for why *atsui desu ne* sounds more natural than *atsui desu*, and this explanation is thus unsatisfactory. Since this is beyond the scope of my study, I will not pursue this matter any further, but more research is unquestionably needed.

4.6 Summary and conclusion

In this part of my thesis I have conducted a corpus analysis of fairly new data, and investigated whether or not some findings from previous studies also apply to my own data, in total 5 hypotheses.

In Hypothesis 1 I compared my data to Kawaguchi's data in order to see whether or not his claim that the *nai desu* form is used more in declarative sentences than in interrogative sentences. The result of this investigation on my own data was that only sub-corpus 2 and 14 met the hypothesis, and the hypothesis did not hold for the total results. I concluded that the level of formality in my data was lower than Kawaguchi's data, and that this may have affected the outcome. The slightly lower level of formality can also explain the large amount of *nai desu* tokens in my data compared to Kawaguchi. Based on the results of my own data, Hypothesis 1 does not seem to be valid for all types of corpora and perhaps also not valid in lower levels of formality.

Hypothesis 2 was that *nai desu* forms are more likely to be used when denoting *negation* than when used in modality/fixed expressions. The results of my investigation fully supported this claim.

Hypothesis 3 was based on Kawaguchi's finding that the *nai desu* form is preferred when used as an answer to a yes/no question, or in cases where the (negative) form is repeated to show agreement. The hypothesis held for my data, although my results were different in two ways: First, Kawaguchi's claim was based on a slight difference in the favor of *nai desu* (59,6% to the 55,8% of *masen* forms), while the *nai desu* ratio in my data was more than double the ratio of *masen* used for answer/agreement with 17,4% to 7,7%. Secondly, "answer/agreement" tokens were much more frequent in Kawaguchi's data than in mine. I assumed this to be because his data are taken from the workplace, where "feedback communication", in other words finding a solution by asking and answering more questions is more prevalent in the workplace than other places. The conversations in most of my corpus are between people who meet for the first time, and the need for "feedback communication" is thus of less importance.

In Hypothesis 4 we turned to interrogative sentences to investigate Kawaguchi's claim that "*nai desu* is the preferred form in interrogative sentences of the 'Negative proposition' type", which is similar to Hypothesis 2 with its focus on *negation*. The hypothesis held for my data, although the token frequency was very low (11 tokens) and the significance of my results is uncertain.

The last hypothesis I investigated was inspired by an observation that is mentioned in most of the studies in the chapter about previous studies. Hypothesis 5 is concerned with sentence final particles and says that the *nai desu* form is more often used than *masen* when these particles are used. I compared my results with Tanomura (1994) and Noda (2004), and my results were that *nai desu* used with sentence final particles outnumbered *masen* about four times, supporting the hypothesis.

With the possible exclusion of Hypothesis 1, all the other Hypotheses held for my data. There are two main factors that I believe are responsible for the negative outcome of Hypothesis 1. First, the level of formality is generally lower in my corpus, thus containing more *nai desu* than *masen* forms. Secondly, there was a large amount of *ja nai desu ka* tokens (biased

question, ‘isn’t that so?’ expecting a positive answer, ‘yes’) , significantly increasing the ratio of *nai desu* in interrogative sentences.

5 Chapter 5: Summary and conclusions

5.1 Chapter 1

After having briefly explained my motivation for choosing the 'semi-polite' *nai desu* as my topic, I stated that I wanted to show what this relatively new style of polite language is, and how it is used in the real world, as a contrast to what is taught in grammars and textbooks.

5.2 Chapter 2

I used Chapter 2 to provide some theoretical background information on linguistic politeness in general and how politeness works differently in Japanese and English. Moreover, I introduced Matsumoto's (1988) critique of Brown and Levinson's (1987) self-proclaimed universal theory of politeness to highlight the controversy surrounding this theory, indirectly supported by the concept of *uchi* 'in-group' and *soto* 'out-group' (Wetzel 1994) which is a phenomenon that governs most social interaction and thus also language use in Japan.

We saw in this part that politeness in the Japanese language to a much greater extent is encoded lexically, by using honorific and humble verbs and verbs of giving and receiving, polite pronouns, prefixes, and polite auxiliary verbs such as *(-)desu* and *–masu*. This differs from Indo-European languages such as English, in which, although there are some everyday polite words and titles (e.g. 'please', 'sir', 'madam' etc.), politeness is more often realized not through politely lexicalized forms but rather by being indirect and showing deference to the addressee (e.g. 'could you?', 'would you?' etc.) when making requests (Watts 2003). Furthermore, Matsumoto (1988) stressed the fact that knowing one's *relative* position and rank to others in society is very important in Japan, something I tried to exemplify with *uchi* and *soto*, suggesting that *uchi* 'in-group' is the deictic center in Japanese utterances and not the personal 'ego' which is thought to be the deictic center in Indo-European languages.

In the last half of Chapter 2 the politeness system in Japanese was introduced. Honorific and humble forms of verbs are used when talking to or about persons of higher social rank in order to show that one knows their own relative position. Honorific forms are used to describe and exalt the actions of a respected person, whereas humble forms are used by a speaker to

describe his or her own actions in a humble way. When there is no big difference in social standing, polite forms without honorific and humble forms are used. This polite language is characterized by verbs ending in *–masu* and the copula *desu*. Moreover, adjectives are followed by *–desu* to make them polite. Contrasting these polite forms are the plain forms used between family and friends.

Introduced lastly in Chapter 2 was the relatively new phenomenon called 'semi-polite' or *nai desu* form, which was the main focus of this thesis. 'Semi-polite' means that they belong between the plain and polite forms, and this is also a characteristic of how they are formed: the politeness marker *–desu* is added to negative plain forms of verbs, and its use is believed to have spread from the way in which adjectives are made polite, namely by adding *–desu*. This works well for negative plain forms of verbs because they end in *–i* and also conjugate the same way as adjectives.

5.3 Chapter 3

In Chapter 3, eight studies previously done on *nai desu* were reviewed, dating from between 1994 and 2012. Tanomura (1994) is considered one of the first major corpus studies on *masen* and *nai desu* and his work was cited through most of the following studies. The study uses written material, and finds that *masen* forms outnumber *nai desu* more than ten times. He does however notice that *nai desu* forms are preferred when followed by sentence final particles, and that some 'biased' questions give favorable ratios for *nai desu*.

Uehara & Fukushima (2008) used natural, spoken language as their source and this resulted in roughly 75% *nai desu* forms. Findings were categorized by word class, and while *nai desu* forms were preferred in most cases, *masen* ratios were generally higher with verbs. Their findings also suggested that *masen* was more used when starting and concluding a topic, while *nai desu* forms were used in between.

Noda (2004) used three different corpora: scripts (from TV dramas, fiction), dialogues from books (fiction) and natural speech (taken from the workplace), and these differences in materials gave different *nai desu* and *masen* ratios. Ratios for *masen* were high in scripts, close to even in book dialogues, whereas *nai desu* was more used in natural speech. Also in Noda's study, verbs seemed to be the most conservative word class with a higher chance of *masen* forms.

Taguchi (2010) was a fairly short study that investigated *masen* and *nai desu* forms in written, fictional materials that resemble the spoken language, such as scripts from TV drama, film and plays. In total, *masen* forms were the clear favourite at 80%. Some findings from earlier studies are also confirmed: *nai desu* is favored when sentence final particles are used. M*asen* is preferred within brackets, and in questions of a requesting or inviting nature.

Hudson (2008) coined the term 'semi-polite' when referring to the *nai desu* forms, and placed it between plain and polite forms in relation to degree of politeness. The study analyses *masen* and *nai desu* forms in a modern crime novel, and the data is thus comparable to Noda (2004) and Taguchi (2010). Overall, the ratio of *masen* forms is higher at 62,2% versus 37,8% for *nai desu* forms. Furthermore, verbs (and auxiliary verbs) are the most 'conservative' word class with high *masen* ratios, while *nai desu* is used more with idioms (e.g. modality/fixed expressions). Hudson's analysis suggests no difference in usage based on gender; however age seems to be a factor, as the form is more used by young people than by old. She also compares her data from the modern crime novel with similar novels from the 60s and 70s, where she finds no *nai desu* forms, suggesting that the form is a recent phenomenon.

Tanaka (2010) is a short study that analyzed natural conversation data taken from the part of one TV program and one radio program where viewers call in and talk with the host. The study found a surprising amount of *nai desu* forms, with 83,6% versus only 16,4% for *masen*.

Kawaguchi (2010) focused heavily on whether or not the *masen* and *nai desu* forms were used in interrogative or declarative sentences and found that *nai desu* is more used in declarative than in interrogative sentences. For declarative sentences he found that when these inherently negative forms were used as negation, *nai desu* ratios became higher. However in Modality and fixed/idiomatic expressions, where negative forms are used not as negation but to form expressions, *masen* forms were preferred. Higher ratios for *nai desu* when used to emphasize negation were also found in interrogative sentences. This was especially true for a type of interrogative sentence he called 'negative proposition' when treating 'biased' questions, where the question is biased because the speaker expects a certain answer, and the expected answer (and the question) is negative.

Banno (2012) used three different corpora when examining the use of *masen* and *nai desu*, and these included 'Proceedings of the Diet', 'Books' and 'Yahoo *Chiebukuro*', an internet message board. All of these are written materials, and as expected *nai desu* forms were few.

Among Banno's findings was support to earlier claims that *nai desu* is used more frequently with nouns and adjectives, whereas *masen* forms are still the dominant form with verbs. She also suggested that the deciding factor for choosing *masen* or *nai desu* forms is not necessarily tied to whether the materials are written or spoken language, but rather that the deciding factor is levels of formality.

In my summary of this chapter I discussed some of the main determining factors for the use of *masen* or *nai desu* forms. First of all, there was a tendency for higher ratios of *masen* when written materials were analyzed (e.g. Tanomura's newspaper articles). On the other side, *nai desu* ratios were relatively higher when natural, spoken language was analyzed, as for example in Uehara & Fukushima (2008) and Tanaka (2010). Noda (2004) also served as a good example of this, since he used three different corpora.

Age might also be a factor if we look at the results of Uehara & Fukushima (2008) compared to Noda (2004). In the former, the data was comprised of conversations between university aged students, while the latter used conversations from the workplace. This may also be an example of different degrees of formality, as suggested by Banno (2012).

Many of the studies also found similar tendencies when word class and sentence final particles were analyzed. The least likely word class to take *nai desu* forms is verbs, however in cases where sentence final particles are used, *nai desu* seems to be preferred over *masen*.

Finally, analyzed most in-depth in Kawaguchi (2010) was the differences of *masen* and *nai desu* usage in declarative and interrogative sentences. Ratios of *nai desu* were higher in declarative than in interrogative sentences, and Kawaguchi assumed that this was because of the relatively higher occurrences of sentence final particles in declarative sentences. In both declarative and interrogative sentences, negation versus non-negation (e.g. modality/fixed expressions) also seemed to affect the choice between *masen* and *nai desu* forms, and it was found that when negation is emphasized, *nai desu* is preferred.

5.4 Chapter 4

In Chapter 4 I took what I had learned from the previous studies chapter and made five hypotheses to test on my own data. The corpus is titled "BTSJ *ni yoru Nihongo hanashikotoba koupasu*", which is compiled by Mayumi Usami, and it is in general a

collection of naturally occurring language of mostly university aged individuals meeting for the first time. Largely inspired by Kawaguchi (2010) I investigated the following hypotheses:

1. There are more *nai desu* forms in declarative sentences than in interrogative sentences.
2. In declarative sentences, *nai desu* appears more frequently when denoting negation, opposed to when they are part of a modality/fixed expression.
3. *Nai desu* is preferred when answering a question in a negating manner, OR when repeating a previous negative statement to show agreement.
4. A 'negative proposition' type interrogative sentence will more likely be realized with a *nai desu* form.
5. *Nai desu* is the preferred form when followed by sentence final particles.

All hypotheses held for my data, with the possible exception of Hypothesis 1. In order to explain this exception I mentioned that my corpus yielded considerably more *nai desu* forms than did Kawaguchi's data, and that this is most likely caused by lower levels of formality. Perhaps of more importance, however, was the interrogative use of *…ja nai desu ka* ('Isn't it …?'), which was abundant in all of my corpora. This expression is grammatically interrogative, although it is widely used more like a tag question for seeking agreement with the listener. Thus, if these tokens were omitted in the results, the hypothesis would most likely hold.

5.5 Conclusion and final thoughts

The 'semi-polite' *nai desu* form is without doubt a fairly recent phenomenon in the Japanese language. A good example of this is the difference in how verb and adjective conjugation, and also the copula, is presented in the first (1999) and second (2011) edition of the beginner's textbook "Genki". The first edition from 1999 only mentions *nai desu* for adjectives, and it is not mentioned at all for verbs and the copula as shown in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1: Verb, adjective and copula in Genki (1999) (adopted from Banno 1999)

Predicate type	**Tense**	**Affirmative**	**Negative**
Verb	Present	*tabemasu*	*tabemasen*
	Past	*tabemashita*	*tabemasen deshita*
Adjective	Present	*omoshiroi desu*	*omoshiroku arimasen* (*omoshirokunai desu*)
	Past	*omoshirokatta desu*	*omoshiroku arimasen deshita* (*omoshirokunakatta desu*)
Copula	Present	*-desu*	*-ja arimasen*
	Past	*-deshita*	*-ja arimasen deshita*

In the second edition from 2011 (see Table 5.2), however, both adjectives and copula are presented first in *nai desu* forms, while their *masen* counterparts are mentioned in parenthesis and considered 'more conservative' (Banno 2011:110:133). Verbs are still taught in the *masen* form, but *nai desu* forms are mentioned in a footnote as being 'colloquial sub-standard' yet 'increasingly popular new negative forms' (Banno 2011:88) The *nai desu* form has thus become more accepted in only the past twelve years, and it seems like it is here to stay.

Table 5.2: Verb, adjective and copula in Genki (2011) (adopted from Banno 2011)

Predicate type	**Tense**	**Affirmative**	**Negative**
Verb	Present	*tabemasu*	*tabemasen*
	Past	*tabemashita*	*tabemasen deshita*
Adjective	Present	*samui desu*	*samukunai desu* (or *samuku arimasen*)
	Past	*samukatta desu*	*samukunakatta desu* (or *samuku arimasen deshita*)
Copula	Present	*-desu*	*-ja nai desu* *-ja arimasen* *-dewa arimasen*
	Past	*-deshita*	*-ja nakatta desu* *-ja arimasen deshita* *-dewa arimasen deshita*

In short, the first edition of Genki only mentions *nai desu* only as a more regular conjugation pattern for adjectives, but still considers *masen* endings the standard for all three predicate types. In the second edition, however, *nai desu* is mentioned in a footnote for verbs, and adjectives and copula are taught in their *nai* / *nakatta desu* forms first.

Being relatively new form or style, it is used more by the younger population as an easy way of being more polite; you only have to add *desu* to negative plain forms. An interesting question to ask now is: Will the affirmative verb forms ever be used with *desu*? Only time will tell. However, if we look at how *–desu* spread from adjectives to verbal negatives because they both end in *–i*, the same could happen to affirmative past forms of verbs because they end in *–(t)ta*, just like the past form of adjectives which are already compatible with *-desu* (e.g. *atsukatta desu* 'was hot, polite' -> *itta desu* 'went, polite').

Only the non-past tense (ending in *–u*, e.g. *iku* 'go') does not have this adjective/verb shared property, and would thus presumably be the last form to change, but it could theoretically change if *desu* after past affirmative verbs (*-(t)ta*) were to become a reality (e.g. *atsui desu* 'is hot', *atsukatta desu* 'was hot' -> *iku desu* 'go, polite', *itta desu* 'went, polite'). This is an example of grammaticalizaition, or rather an analogy (or generalization) (Hopper and Traugott 1993), which covers the process of language change when, in this case, verbs, gradually take the politeness marker *–desu* which is already used with adjectives and copula instead of *–masu*.

As I have shown in this thesis, *desu* is already used with verbal negatives, and while the affirmative with *desu* is still generally not used, Hudson (2008:143) found some occurrences of past affirmative (e.g. *omotta desu* 'thought', *datta desu* 'was') in her study. Given the spreading of *desu* to adjectives, copula and negative verbs, it is very plausible but not necessarily given that *desu* might replace *masu* in the future.

Litterature

Bachnik, J., & Charles Jr, J. (Eds.). (1994). *Situated meaning: Inside and outside in Japanese self, society, and language*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Banno, E. (1999). *Genki: An integrated course in elementary Japanese* Tokyo: Japan Times.

Banno, E. (2011). *Genki an integrated course in elementary Japanese* (2nd ed.). Tokyo: Japan Times.

Banno, E. (2012). Koopasu wo tsukatta jutsugo hiteikei "masen" to "nai desu" no shiyoo jittai choosa / A Corpus-based Study on the Negative Predicate Forms "*masen*" and "*nai desu*" Language Education Center, Okayama University, *Ryuugakusei kyooiku* (17) 133-140

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Frellesvig, B. (2010). *A history of the Japanese language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fukushima, E. and Uehara, S (2001). "Gendai Nihongo ni okeru teineitai hitei keishiki." *Toohoku Daigaku Ryuugakusei Sentaa Kiyoo 5:* 11-17

Hopper, P. J., & Traugott, E. C. (2003). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

House, J., & Kasper, G. (1981). 'Politeness markers in English and German', in Coulmas, F. (eds.) *Conversational routine* The Hague: Mouton, 157-85

Hudson, M. E. (2008). Riyuu" reason" for nai desu and other semi-polite forms. *Style Shifting in Japanese* (Vol. 180) Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing 131-160

Inoue, H. (1998). *Nihongo wocchingu [Watching Japanese]*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Kamio, A. (1997). *Territory of information* (Vol. 48). John Benjamins Publishing.

Kawaguchi, Ryo (2010). "Factors related to the shift from the -masen to the -nai desu form: in terms of language change of the negative polite verb form." *Nihongo Kyooiku (144):* 121-132.

Kobayashi, Mina (2005). "Nichijoo kaiwa ni arawareta «masen» to «nai desu»." *Nihon Kyooiku* (125): 9-17.

Kyooiku-Shuppan (2005). *"Q07 "utsukushii desu" "ookii desu" wa tadashii iikata ka"* <https://www.kyoiku-shuppan.co.jp/view.rbz?nd=1750&ik=1&pnp=101&pnp=113&pnp=566&pnp=1750&cd=17> (Read: 10.09.2014)

Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of pragmatics*, *12*(4), 403-426.

Matsumura ed. (1995) *Kotengo gendaigo joshi jodooshi shoosetsu* Tokyo, Gakutoosha

McClain, Y. M. (1981). *Handbook of Japanese Grammar*. Tokyo: The Japan Times.

Noda, Haru. (2004). "Hitei teinei kei «masen» to «nai desu» no shiyoo ni kakawaru yooin – yoorei choosa to jakunenzoo ankeeto choosa ni motoduite." *Mathematical linguistics. 24(5):* 228-244.

Pizziconi, B. (2003). Re-examining politeness, face and the Japanese language. *Journal of pragmatics*, *35*(10), 1471-1506.

Taguchi, Ai. (2005). "Teineitai no hitei keishiki «masen» to «nai desu»." *Shindai Nihongo Kyooiku Kenkyuu 5:* 18-35

Tanaka, Kayoko (2010). "Dooshi no hitei teinei hyoogen «masen» to «nai desu» ni kansuru koosatsu" *Tokyo Gakugei University* <https://www.lang.nagoya-u.ac.jp/nichigen/menu7_folder/symposium/pdf/8/10.pdf> (Read: 03.05.2014)

Tanomura, T. (1994) "A corpus-based study on the polite negative predicate forms in Japanese." *Journal of Osaka University of Foreign Studies 11:* 51-66.

Tsujimura, Natsuko. (1996). *An introduction to Japanese linguistics*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Uehara, S., & Fukushima, E. (2008). Masen or Nai Desu—That is the question A case study into Japanese conversational. *Style Shifting in Japanese* (Vol. 180) Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing 161-184.

Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wetzel, P. J. (1994). A movable self: The linguistic indexing of uchi and soto. *Situated meaning: Inside and outside in Japanese self, society, and language*, 73-87. Princeton: Princeton University Press

Corpus:

Usami Mayumi (ed.) (2011). "*BTSJ ni yoru Nihongo hanashikotoba koopasu*", Tookyoo Gaikokugo Daigaku Usami Mayumi Kenkyuushitsu <http://www.tufs.ac.jp/ts/personal/usamiken/btsj_corpus.htm>

Appendix

Total results

Total	nai desu	declarative	negation	modal	answer	particle	interrogative	unbiased	yes-bias	no-bias	expression	invitation	particle
2	168	90	78	12	11	53	78	6	70	2	0	0	3
3	58	47	37	9	7	20	11	0	7	4	0	0	2
13	172	109	81	27	8	72	63	4	56	3	0	0	2
14	158	97	81	14	23	63	61	3	57	1	0	0	5
18	8	5	5	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	0	0	1
SUM	564	348	282	62	49	211	216	13	193	10	0	0	13

Total	masen	declarative	negation	modal	answer	particle	interrogative	unbiased	yes-bias	no-bias	expression	invitation	particle
2	22	8	6	2	1	3	14	3	11	0	0	0	1
3	41	38	14	23	2	0	3	1	1	1	0	0	1
13	35	25	15	10	0	6	10	6	4	0	0	0	0
14	13	7	4	3	0	1	6	4	2	0	0	0	0
18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUM	111	78	39	38	3	10	33	14	18	1	0	0	2

These are the data/results of my corpus analysis. The numbers to the far left indicates the sub-corpra in this section (total results, i.e. the numbers 2, 3, 13, 14 18), and indicates the file number in each sub-corpus hereafter (i.e. 20-30 for sub-corpus 2).

Sub 2	nai desu	declarative	negation	modal	answer	particle	interrogative	unbiased	yes-bias	no-bias	expression	invitation	particle
20	23	12	11	1	3	8	11	3	8	0	0	0	0
21	32	22	18	4	2	11	10	1	9	0	0	0	0
22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23	14	4	2	2	0	1	10	0	9	1	0	0	1
24	24	13	11	2	0	9	11	0	11	0	0	0	0
25	28	13	11	2	0	10	15	1	14	0	0	0	0
26	9	6	6	0	3	4	3	1	2	0	0	0	1
27	26	15	14	1	3	8	11	0	10	1	0	0	1
28	7	2	2	0	0	1	5	0	5	0	0	0	0
29	3	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
30	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
SUM	168	90	78	12	11	53	78	6	70	2	0	0	3

Sub 2	masen	declarative	negation	modal	answer	particle	interrogative	unbiased	yes-bias	no-bias	expression	invitation	particle
20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
25	10	5	4	1	0	1	5	0	5	0	0	0	0
26	2	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
27	3	1	1	0	1	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
28	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	0
29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUM	22	8	6	2	1	3	14	3	11	0	0	0	1

Sub 3	nai desu	declarative	negation	modal	answer	particle	interrogative	unbiased	yes-bias	no-bias	expression	invitation	particle
43	15	14	10	4	3	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
44	6	6	5	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
45	11	10	10	0	1	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
46	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
47	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
48	6	5	2	3	1	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
49	2	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50	2	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
51	10	3	3	0	0	2	7	0	5	2	0	0	0
52	3	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
total	58	47	37	9	7	20	11	0	7	4	0	0	2

Sub 3	masen	declarative	negation	modal	answer	particle	interrogative	unbiased	yes-bias	no-bias	expression	invitation	particle
43	16	16	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
44	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
45	4	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
47	5	5	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
48	3	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
49	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50	3	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
51	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
52	4	3	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
total	41	38	14	23	2	0	3	1	1	1	0	0	1

Sub 13	nai desu	declarative	negation	modal	answer	particle	interrogative	unbiased	yes-bias	no-bias	expression	invitation	particle
173	12	8	7	1	0	5	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
174	8	7	7	0	0	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
175	19	12	10	1	0	7	7	0	7	0	0	0	1
176	10	6	6	0	0	3	4	1	3	0	0	0	1
177	19	13	9	4	5	11	6	1	4	1	0	0	0
178	25	13	7	6	0	5	12	0	11	1	0	0	0
179	4	2	1	1	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
180	9	2	1	1	0	2	7	0	7	0	0	0	0
181	6	4	4	0	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
182	6	5	5	0	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
183	4	2	2	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
184	7	5	4	1	0	4	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
185	4	4	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
186	11	6	2	4	0	3	5	0	4	1	0	0	0
187	4	1	1	0	0	1	3	0	3	0	0	0	0
188	5	4	3	1	1	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
189	11	10	7	3	0	10	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
190	8	5	3	2	1	3	3	0	3	0	0	0	0
SUM	172	109	81	27	8	72	63	4	56	3	0	0	2

Sub 13	masen	declarative	negation	modal	answer	particle	interrogative	unbiased	yes-bias	no-bias	expression	invitation	particle
173	5	3	3	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
174	3	3	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
175	4	4	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
176	5	3	2	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
177	5	3	2	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
178	7	4	3	1	0	1	3	1	2	0	0	0	0
179	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
180	2	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
181	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
182	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
183	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
184	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
185	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
186	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
187	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
188	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
189	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
190	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUM	35	25	15	10	0	6	10	6	4	0	0	0	0

Sub 14	nai desu	declarative	negation	modal	answer	particle	interrogative	unbiased	yes-bias	no-bias	expression	invitation	particle
191	6	3	3	0	1	2	3	0	3	0	0	0	0
192	6	3	3	0	1	3	3	1	2	0	0	0	0
193	17	7	6	0	4	4	10	0	10	0	0	0	1
194	17	11	8	3	3	9	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
195	3	2	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
196	8	8	6	2	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
197	3	1	1	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
198	3	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
199	13	8	8	0	0	5	5	0	5	0	0	0	0
200	9	7	5	1	0	4	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
201	15	5	4	1	2	3	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
202	15	12	11	1	1	5	3	0	3	0	0	0	0
203	16	12	11	1	3	10	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
204	10	3	2	1	0	1	7	0	6	1	0	0	4
205	12	11	8	3	2	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
206	5	3	3	0	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
SUM	158	97	81	14	23	63	61	3	57	1	0	0	5

Sub 14	masen	declarative	negation	modal	answer	particle	interrogative	unbiased	yes-bias	no-bias	expression	invitation	particle
191	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
192	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
193	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
194	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
195	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
196	2	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
197	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
198	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
199	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
200	2	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
201	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
202	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
203	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
204	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
205	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
206	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUM	13	7	4	3	0	1	6	4	2	0	0	0	0

Sub 18	nai desu	declarative	negation	modal	answer	particle	interrogative	unbiased	yes-bias	no-bias	expression	invitation	particle
239	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
240	6	4	4	0	0	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	1
241	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
242	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUM	8	5	5	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	0	0	1

Sub 18	masen	declarative	negation	modal	answer	particle	interrogative	unbiased	yes-bias	no-bias	expression	invitation	particle
239	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
240	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
241	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
242	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0