Learning to Sound Male in a Female World? :
First Language Socialization to Use the 'Masculine' Japanese First-Person Reference Forms 'Ore' and 'Boku'

Cade BUSHNELL

Abstract

Clancy (1986) proposes that the ways in which Japanese male children are socialized to use masculine first person reference forms, such as *ore* and *boku* (both 'I') remain somewhat of a mystery. This is because, Clancy assumes, 'primary linguistic input to both boys and girls comes from their mothers' (1986: 514). In the present study, I examine data from the CHILDES database consisting of five corpora of child first language learners of Japanese interacting primarily with their mothers. In the analysis, I examine tokens of masculine first person reference first quantitatively and then qualitatively. In so doing, I will pursue the following questions: (1) Are there tokens of *ore* and *boku* in the data, and if so, who is producing them? and (2) What processes of language socialization are likely to follow? First, the quantitative analysis revealed that the reference forms in question were present in the data, and that, in the case of *boku*, Mother produced approximately three times more tokens than Child. In the case of *ore*, the distribution of tokens produced was roughly equal between Mother and Child. Next, the quantitative analysis showed that (1) *boku*, as phonological material, is made abundantly available to Child through its use by Mother in accomplishing second person reference, (2) first person referential use of *boku* is also modeled by Mother through, e.g., the animation of the voices of toys in play, and through quotative use of the voice of Child, (3) Child may be overtly and explicitly socialized to use *boku* (especially when a 'gender inappropriate' form, e.g. *atashi* 'I', is used), and (4) the use of *ore* may in part be socialized through Mother's animation of characters during story-reading activities, and through her censure of the situationally inappropriate use of *ore*.

I. Introduction

Research in language socialization seeks to examine the processes through which novices

(especially children) are socialized both through language and to use language (see, e.g., Ochs, 1996, 2002; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1986). Such linguistic and cultural development and learning is seen as being deeply embedded in sociocommunal participation. In this view, language is understood in terms of being a cultural artifact that is acquired by novices primarily through participation in socially structured interaction (see Vygotsky, 1978). In the case of Japanese, however, Clancy (1986) suggests that it remains somewhat of a mystery as to how Japanese male children are able to acquire the masculine first person reference forms *ore/boku* 'I' (OB, O, and B below). She asks: 'If the primary linguistic input to both boys and girls comes from their mothers, when and how do little boys learn to use masculine style' (1986: 514)?

In the present study, I will examine data from five corpora of child first language learners of Japanese interacting primarily with their mothers. Tokens of the masculine first person reference forms OB will be examined first quantitatively and then qualitatively. In so doing, I will pursue the following questions: (1) Are there tokens of OB in the data, and if so, who is producing them? (2) Are there opportunities for learning the forms in question,? (3) What processes of language socialization are likely to follow from such opportunities?

II. Previous Research

1. Research on ore/boku

There has been much etymological (e.g., Hashimoto, 1948; Hinds, 1971, 1975; Sakuma, 1959; Shibatani,1990; Suzuki, 1978; Wetzel, 1994), cross-linguistic (e.g., Kondo, 1990; Martin, 1988; Miller, 1967), and to a lesser extent, functional (e.g., Ono & Thompson, 2003) research done on Japanese first person reference forms. Ono and Thompson (2003), for example, examine the actual uses of Japanese first person reference forms *(w)atashi*, *ore*, and *boku* (all glossed in English as 'I') in a corpus of naturally occurring conversations. They found that these 'pronouns' do not appear to make good clausal arguments, and that they are *not* used exclusively for first person reference. Instead, they argue, the forms do not form a unitary category, but rather are 'best viewed as a set of three distinct constructions, each with its own grammatical, semantic, pragmatic, prosodic, and diachronic properties' (2003: 341). They conclude by arguing that their findings underscore the importance of examining the form–function relationship in naturally occurring conversational data. However, to the best of my knowledge, there has been very little research concerning the acquisition of these forms.

Specifically concerning OB, Clancy (1986) mentions that the specifics input and acquisition remain an important question. She suggests that Japanese boys face a paradoxical situation in that they must apparently undergo a shift in self-identification. This is because, in Japanese, forms of first person reference are in a complimentary distributional relationship based on the sex of the speaker.

Thus, although Japanese girls will be exposed to, and socialized to use feminine first person reference forms, such as *atashi* 'I', through participating in interactions with their mothers, Japanese boys will not have this luxury. Thus, Clancy wonders, 'when and how do little boys learn to use masculine style [including first person reference forms], [while] eliminating or reducing the frequency of female forms heard from their mothers' (1986: 514)?

2. Learning in social participation: Learning to be male in a female world?

The overarching goal of research in language socialization is to uncover the ways in which children and other novices are socialized in and through language to both use language and to behave in culturally appropriate ways (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1986; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). To my knowledge, however, there has been no language socialization research specifically examining OB. However, a language socialization approach views identity-indexical terms such as OB, for example, as being co-negotiated and learned in, through, and for concrete participation in specific social situations. Thus, for the learning process to occur, novice participants must have opportunities to participate and receive expert guidance in situations where OB constitutes a valued participatory resource, and where the novices can observe expert use of the terms. According to Clancy (1986), however, the kind of participatory situations necessary for a successful socialization to use OB may be absent or highly limited for Japanese boys because of the apparent fact that they are primarily socialized by their mothers.

Researchers examining the putatively gendered use of the Japanese language have often implicitly or explicitly assumed a one-to-one relationship between form and gender. For example, in her study of the use of sentence final particles (e.g., *wa*, *ne*, *zo*, *ze*, etc.), McGloin (1990: 23) suggests that such particles function to express masculinity or femininity, and maintains that particles are 'sensitive to the sex of the speaker'. According to Ochs (1990: 293), however, indexical relations in interaction 'are much more complex than one-to-one mappings between linguistic forms and contextual features'. Rather, she argues, also in relation to Japanese sentence final particles, rather than functioning as direct indexes of gender, the particles '*directly* index affective dispositions and *indirectly* index gender of speaker' (1990: 295; original emphasis). In other words, according to Ochs, a sentence final particle such as *ze*, which has traditionally been considered as an index of masculinity, may function to index a 'coarse intensity' (1990: 296), which, in turn, can be taken as a constitutive feature of 'male voice' (1990: 296).

In the present study, I demonstrate that instances of OB seem to turn up in both second person reference to child by socializers, and in play or story reading situations. Drawing upon Ochs', I argue that within these domains, opportunities for learning to use OB as masculine first person reference forms may be made available through indexical relationships appearing within the context of specific interactional moments.

III. The Study

1. Research Questions

In the present study, I pursue the following three research questions:

(1) Are there tokens of OB in the data, and if so, who is producing them?

(2) Are there opportunities for learning the forms in question?

(3) What processes of language socialization are likely to follow from such opportunities?

2. Data

The data for the present study are taken from the CHILDES database. Specifically, I will examine the occurrence of OB in five corpora: Hamasaki; Ishii; Miyata-Aki; Miyata-Ryo; and Mitaya-Tai. The attributes of each of these corpora are displayed in table 1, below:

Table 1   Attributes of the 5 corpora

Name Attributes	Hamasaki	Ishii	Miyata-Aki	Miyata-Ryo	Miyata-Tai
Creator	N. Hamasaki	T. Ishii	S. Miyata	S. Miyata	S. Miyata
Language	Japanese	Japanese	Japanese	Japanese	Japanese
Age of Child	2 ; 2 - 3 ; 4	2-5	1 ; 5.7 - 3 ; 0	1 ; 4.3 - 3 ; 0	1 ; 5.20 - 3 ; 1.29
Mean Age	20.2 - 42 months				
Sex of Child	Male	Male	Male	Male	Male
Description	Case study of Taro	Case study of T. Ishii's son, Jun	Longitudinal study of two Japanese siblings (Ryo, Aki) in their home	Longitudinal study of two Japanese siblings (Ryo, Aki) in their home	Longitudinal study of Tai in his home

Each of the five data corpora include audio files and basic transcripts which are made publicly and freely available for download from the CHILDES website. [1]

3. Methodology

I first perform a quantitative analysis on the corpora using CLAN.[2] The purpose of the quantitative analysis is to ascertain how frequently and by whom OB is being deployed in the

---

1   http://childes.psy.cmu.edu/

corpora. Following the quantitative analysis, I perform a qualitative discourse analysis[3] of the uses of OB uncovered by the CLAN search, and consider how those uses might contribute to language socialization.

IV. Analyses

1. Quantitative analysis

As mentioned above, Clancy (1986) suggests that Japanese boys may be placed in a highly impoverished environment in terms of being socialized to use masculine stylistic devices such as the first person referential terms *ore* and *boku* (both glossed as 'I' in English). It therefore first becomes necessary to examine the data for the existence and frequency of OB. An initial quantification revealed that there are three hundred fifty-nine instances of OB across the five data corpora. Of these instances, seventeen were O and three hundred forty-two were B. However, a manual verification of each of the individual instances revealed that two of the O instances detected in the Ishii corpus were actually variations of the verbs *oreru* 'to snap' and *oru* 'to be'. All three hundred forty-two instances of B were verified. Thus, the total number of instances of OB were three hundred fifty-seven, with fifteen instances of O. Though only a rough quantification, this already provides evidence of the existence of OB in the data, even though the children were primarily interacting with their mothers.

We now turn to an analysis of the frequency of OB across participants for each individual corpus (see table 2, below). In the Hamasaki corpus, while Child produced one token of O and twenty-two of B, the Socializers produced four tokens of O and seventy-three of B. Subdividing the Socializers into Mother, Father, and Other socializer, there were four tokens of O and seventy tokens of B produced by Mother, zero tokens of OB produced by Father, and 3 tokens of B produced by Other socializer. This results in five and ninety-five tokens of OB, respectively, for the Hamasaki corpus. For the Ishii corpus, there were four tokens of O and ten of B produced by Child, zero tokens of O and six of B, all produced by Father. This results in a total of four O and sixteen B for the Ishii

---

2   Freeware, available for both Macintosh and Windows platforms, designed specifically for corpus analysis of the CHILDES data.

3   Analyses of the interactional data are performed from the viewpoint or mentality of ethnomethodologically-based conversation analysis (see, e.g., Heritage, 1984; Have, 2007; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008; Schenkein, 1982/1978). However, due to the fact that, at the time of the analysis, I had access to only (non-CA) transcripts, I have not been able to bring to bear the full set of analytical tools offered by conversation analysis, especially in regard to such things as overlap, and embodied action and gaze (see, e.g., Goodwin, 1979, 1980, 2000; Streeck, Goodwin & LeBaron, 2011). It may be noted, however, that video files are now (i.e., June, 2013) available for the Ishii corpus, and audio for the Miyata-Tai corpus. These resources may lead to futher and more refined insights in subsequent research.

corpus. In the Aki corpus, while Child produced zero tokens of OB, Mother produces one token of O and fourteen of B, resulting in a total of one token of O and sixteen of B for the corpus. Though no participants produced any tokens of O in the Ryo corpus, Child produced eighteen of the thirty total tokens of B; the other twelve were produced by Mother. Finally, in the Tai corpus, the largest of the Miyata corpora, Child produced three tokens of O and forty-two of B, and Mother produced two O and one hundred forty-five B, totaling five O and one hundred eighty-seven B for the corpus.

Thus, of the three hundred forty-two total tokens of B across the five corpora, only ninety-two were produced by Child. Mother, on the other hand, produced two hundred forty-one tokens of B. Conversely, for O, Child and Mother productions were almost equal, at eight and seven tokens, respectively. As may have been expected, since the primary interactants were Child and Mother, Father and Other socializer produced only nine tokens of B and zero of O across all five corpora.

Table 2 Frequency of OB across participants

	child		socializers		mother		father		other soc.		total	
	O	B	O	B	O	B	O	B	O	B	O	B
HAMA	1	22	4	73	4	70	-		-	3	5	95
ISHII	4	10	-	6	-		-	6	-		4	16
AKI	-		1	14	1	14	-		-		1	14
RYO	-	18	-	12	-	12	-		-		-	30
TAI	3	42	2	145	2	145	-		-		5	187
Totals	8	92	7	250	7	241	-	6	-	3	15	342

These results reveal and interesting percentage distribution in production of OB across the participants (see table 3, below). Looking across all five corpora, while Child produced only twenty-seven percent of the total tokens of B, Mother produced seventy percent—almost three times more than Child. In the case of O, on the other hand, production was very nearly evenly distributed between Mother and Child.

Table 3　Relative percentages of use across participants

	child		socializers		mother		father		other soc.		total	
	O	B	O	B	O	B	O	B	O	B	O	B
HAMA	.20	.23	.80	.77	.80	.74	.0		.0	.03	.29	.28
ISHII	1.0	.63	.0	.37	.0		.0	.37	.0		.36	.05
AKI	.0		1.0	.86	1.0	.86	.0		.0		.06	.04
RYO	.0	.60	.0	.40	.0	.37	.0	.03	.0		.0	.09
TAI	.60	.23	.40	.77	.40	.77	.0		.0		.29	.54
Totals	.53.	.27	.47	.73	.47	.70	.0	.02	.0	.01	1.0	1.0

2. Qualitative analysis

The above quantitative analysis has revealed that (1) there were a significant number of tokens of OB across the five corpora and (2) production of tokens of O were essentially evenly distributed between Mother and Child, but (3) Mother produced seventy percent of B, which is almost three times the tokens produced by Child. This, however, is only a partial view of the whole picture. We must now ask how OB are being used by the participants, and how this might make manifest opportunities for the children to learn the forms. Ono and Thompson (2003) argue that OB may have a variety of situated uses. The data examined in the present study revealed at least the following four uses of OB: (1) to accomplish first person reference by Child (both O and B); (2) to accomplish second person reference by Socializers (only B; indexical of Child); (3) to accomplish first, second, and third person reference in quotative utterances, frequently in the context of play, by both Child and Socializers (both O and B; second person reference usage only done by Socializers); and (4) to accomplish first and third person reference in 'story-time' (i.e. in 'animating' (see Goffman, 1979, 1981) characters while reading stories together). These uses are summarized in table 4:

Table 4　Uses of OB across Child (C) and Socializer (S)

User	Form	Use
Child	OB	First person reference
Socializer	B	Second person reference
Child/Socializer	OB	Quotative (1, 2, and 3 person)
Child/Socializer	OB	Reading (2 and 3 person)

Because of the limitations of the data,[4] it is impossible to provide a quantitative analysis of the relative frequencies of each usage. However, this does not preclude the possibility of considering what opportunities are made manifest by the various situated uses of OB, and how these opportunities might play into language socialization for Child to use the forms. As is made clear in table 4, there are many and various situated meanings-in-interaction for OB. Notably, Mother produced seventy percent of the B tokens across the five corpora. An examination of the actual interactional data reveals that one of the main uses of B by Mother is to accomplish second person reference to Child, as in lines 2, 4 and 6 of Extract 1.[5]

Extract 1　[204.cha (slightly modified)]

	1	M: oisha e iku no yo.
→	2	M: boku mo iku?
	3	M: terukichan ga mitemorau no yo.
→	4	M: boku chan wa doomo shinai.
	5	S: itcho ni iku.
→	6	M: bokuchan wa iku dake yo.
	7	S: boku pompo itaku nattara ne oichachan ni ikoo ne.

(English gloss)

	1	M: We're going to the doctor's.
→	2	M: Are you [*boku*] going too?
	3	M: Teruaki is going to get an examination.
→	4	M: You [*boku*] don't need to get one.
	5	S: (I'm) going too.
→	6	M: You [*boku*] are just coming along.
	7	S: If I [*boku*] get a stomach ache, let's go to the doctor's.

Though there were many instances similar to Extract 1, where Mother refers to Child using

---

4　In the absence of video data, it becomes impossible to disambiguate many of the instances of OB use in the data. For example, without being able to actually see the embodied orientations and gazes of the participants, it becomes impossible to disambiguate the such meanings as (1) I want to ride (first person reference), (2) you want to ride (second person reference), (3) I want to ride (animated or quotative first person reference) in an utterance like 'boku, noritai'.

5　I arrow lines of analytical interest in the data extracts throughout.

B, Child never reciprocates by using B to accomplish second person reference to Mother, Father or Other socializer. This second person use of B arguably provides opportunities for learning to use B to accomplish first person reference in the following two ways: 1) it provides the phonological material involved, which may have a familiarizing effect for Child, and 2) it is clear from context that the referent of B is Child, thus providing a demonstration that the phonological material *boku* may be applied to do reference to Child; this fact may facilitate Child's understanding that the form may also be self-applied.[6]

It is important to note, too, that Mother also frequently used B to accomplish first person reference. This was typically done in play activities, where Mother was apparently animating the putative utterances of a doll or other play item, as in Extract 2.

Extract 2   [t940120.cha (slightly modified)]

	1	M: ha:i.
	2	M: a.
	3	M: a.
	4	C: notchatta yo:.
	5	M: notchatta. ((laugh))
→	6	M: boku dake oite ikareta:.
	7	C: doite:!

(English gloss)

	1	M: Okay.
	2	M: Oh.
	3	M: Oh.
	4	C: They've ended up riding.
	5	M: Yes they have. ((laugh))
→	6	M: I [*boku*] got left behind.
	7	C: Get out of the way!

Extract 2 is taken from a sequence where Mother and Child appear to be playing with a toy vehicle. They are loading passengers (presumably dolls or other toys) on to the vehicle when, in line 4, Child says 'notchatta yo:.' ((they've) ended up riding). In line 5 Mother repeats Child's line 4 with a laughter token (suggesting that it was somewhat unexpected) and, in line 6, animates the utterance

---

6   I wish to express my gratitude to the reviewer for bringing this point to my attention.

of a toy that was apparently left behind. Thus, the kind of interactional sequence shown in Extract 2 may provide opportunities for Child to learn to use of B as a first person referent. Similar first person use of B by Mother also frequently occurred during reading, where Mother animated the voices of characters in the book.

There was also one sequence involving explicit socialization to use B. Extract 3, below is taken from the Ishii corpus and features a relatively rare (in the data) interactional episode between Child and Father.

Extract 3   [20628.cha (slightly modified)]

	1	C: kankobasu yoo.
	2	F: sore kankoobasu kaa ?
	3	C: eebiishii ((i.e. ABC)) no basu yoo.
	4	F: i gi ri su no basu ya.
	5	C: igisu no basu yoo.
	6	C: bokuu kore hoshii waa.
→	7	C: boku atashi yuwantoite.
	8	F: nani ?
→	9	C: atashi yuwantoitee ya.
→	10	F: atashi yuwantoitee ya.
→	11	F: boku ya.
	12	C: yuwantoite.
→	13	C: boku.

(English gloss)

	1	C: It's a tour bus.
	2	F: That's a tour bus?
	3	C: It's the ABC bus.
	4	F: It's the England bus.
	5	C: The England bus.
	6	C: I [*boku*] want this.
→	7	C: Don't you [*boku*] say I [*atashi*].
	8	F: What?
→	9	C: Don't say I [*atashi*].
→	10	F: Don't say I [*atashi*].
→	11	F: It's I [*boku*].

12   C: Don't say (it).

→   13   C: I [*boku*].

In this extract, we see Father and Child engaging in topical talk about a (toy) bus (lines 1 to 5). In line 6, Child produces 'boku atashi yuentoite.' (*boku*, don't say *atashi* [feminine 'I']—apparently quoting prior speech by Father or other socializer). In line 8, Father displays trouble in either hearing or understanding Child's line 7 by producing the repair initiator 'nani?' (what?). Child responds to this by rephrasing the utterance in line 9, to which Father says 'atashi yuwantoitee ya.' 'boku ya' (don't say *atashi*, it's *boku*). In line 13, Child uptakes B. It would appear that this sequence is indexing prior interactions between Child and Father where Father has requested that Child not use the feminine first person referent *atashi*, and to use B instead.

The qualitative analysis thus far has made clear that the early environment of socialization for Japanese boys may offer ample opportunities for being socialized to use B—even in cases where the primary socializer is female. Ono and Thompson (2003), however, note that O is far more common than B in the large corpus of adult conversational data that they examined. It would seem that O may be the preferred[7] form for first person reference in adult Japanese males. However, as noted above, O is never used by Mother to accomplish first or second person reference, or in play. Child, nevertheless, uses O to accomplish first person reference several times in the corpora. This shows that socialization to use O is indeed occurring, but how?

The affective stance (Ochs, 1990) indexed by O is markedly more 'rough' in comparison to B. Because of this, one might expect that Mother would have no occasion to produce O. Indeed, there is no instance in the data of Mother using O for self reference. One setting in which Mother *is* seen to produce O, however, is in animating character voices during reading, as shown in Extract 4.

Extract 4   [aki42.cha (slightly modified)]

1   M: omae no medama o yokose. ((reading voice))

2   M: tasukete tasukete. ((reading voice))

→   3   M: ore no namae o atetara yurushiteyaru zo. ((reading voice))

4   C: tasukete:.

(English gloss)

1   M: Give me your eyeball. ((reading voice))

2   M: Help help. ((reading voice))

---

7   Not in the conversation analytic sense of preference organization (see, e.g., Bilmes, 1988), but the lay sense.

→ 3   M: I [*ore*] will spare you if you can guess my name. ((reading voice))

4   C: Help.

In this sequence, Mother is apparently reading to Child from a story book. In line 3, she produces 'ore no namae o atetara yurushiteyaru zo.' (if (you) can guess my name I will spare (you)). The English gloss does not do this utterance justice in portraying the 'roughness' of the linguistic tokens used; it is unlikely that Mother would use such language in many other settings. Importantly, in this sequence O is not simply produced in a vacuum. It appears in association with a specific type of character who is also portrayed to be using a constellation of other 'contextualization cues'[8] (Gumperz, 1982). Thus, the situated appearance of O, as it is animated by Mother on this occasion, indexes a distinctively coarse stance, which, within the context of the story, seems to be a constitutive feature of 'villainessness'. Such an instance may provide an opportunity for Child to observe the sort of affective stance O may be used to index — a stance which may already, or may eventually be understood as a constitutive feature of a strong masculine voice.

The argument for the role of indexicality in Child's socialization to use O is supported by the fact that explicit protest against its use by Mother is also attested in the data. Just before Extract 5, Mother and Child were playing with toy trains by making them go through tunnels. Extract 5 begins with what appears to be Child talking about another pass being made through the tunnel; It is unclear, however, whether Child is requesting Mother to pass her train through the tunnel or to watch him do so with his train.

Extract 5   [t940113.cha (slightly modified)]

1   C: <moo ikko tsuu> moo ikko tsuu.

2   M: n?

3   C: moo ikko tsuu .

→ 4   M: moo ikkai tooru?

→ 5   C: o:re!

→ 6   M: o:re janai yo, chotto.

(English gloss)

1   C: *moo ikko tsuu moo ikko tsuu.*

2   M: Huh?

3   C: *moo ikko tsuu.*

→ 4   M: (You're) going through again??

→ 5   C: I [*ore*] am!

→　6　　M: Not I [*ore*], come on now.

In line 2, Mother displays trouble with either hearing or understanding Child's line 1 utterance. In response to Mother's repair initiation, Child repeats his line 1, of which Mother formulates a candidate understanding in line 4. Though the lack of visual data precludes analysis of the embodied actions that Mother and Child are deploying in coordination with their talk, it is possible that Mother accompanied her line 4 utterance with an action such as beginning to pass her train through the tunnel. Such an action would seem to create a relevant sequential environment for the deployment of Child's line 5 'o:re!' (me:!), which is notably marked by elongation and prosody. In line 6, Mother appears to censure Child's line 5 utterance by producing 'o:re janai yo, chotto' (not I:, come on now). Mother's utterance here is hearable as being highly critical of Child's line 5 use of O, though the English gloss does not reflect this sense. Thus, it would seem that Mother's actions may be visible as treating O as an 'inappropriate' word for Child to use for doing self reference on this occasion, where Child's actions seem to possibly impose on an other.[9] In this way, Child is exposed to potential opportunities for socialization to use language (e.g., not to use strong language when going out of turn) through language; Mother's utterance may work to implicitly associate *ore* with an aggressive affective stance, and to negatively evaluate its use on this occasion. Notably, there are no similar occasions involving B. In sum, opportunities may be made interactionally available for Child to appropriate the use of O through, e.g., (1) O regularly appearing as part of a constellation of contextualization cues associated with 'tough' characters in stories read by Mother and Child, and (2) the use of O being occasionally censured by Mother as 'inappropriate'.

V. Discussion and Conclusion

In the present study, I have examined five corpora of Japanese Socializer (primarily Mother)/Child longitudinal interactional data in pursuit the following three research questions:

(1) Are there tokens of OB in the data, and if so, who is producing them?

(2) Are there opportunities for learning the forms in question?

(3) What processes of language socialization are likely to follow from such opportunities?

A quantitative analysis of the data revealed that the forms in question, i.e. OB, were present in the data. In the case of B, it was found that, somewhat surprisingly, Mother produced approximately

---

8　Mother also animates tokens such as *omae* (you), *zo* (sentence final particle), and *yokose* (give it here [strong imperative]) — all very 'rough' and 'coarse'. These features may work to form a sort of constellation providing a richly intra-indexical display for Child.

9　In other words, Mother seems to be censuring Child for attempting to pass his train through the tunnel 'out of turn', so to speak.

three times more tokens than Child. In the case of O, Mother and Child were found to have produced roughly equal tokens.

The quantitative analysis was subsequently used as a basis for a qualitative analysis, which primarily focused on ascertaining the situational uses of OB by Mother. The qualitative analysis showed that (1) the phonological material of B, and its usabillity in doing reference to Child, is made abundantly available to Child through its use by Mother in accomplishing second person reference, (2) first person referential use of B is also modeled by Mother through, e.g., the animation of the voices of toys in play, and through quotative use of the voice of Child, and (3) Child may be overtly and explicitly socialized to use B (especially when a 'gender inappropriate' form, e.g. *atashi* 'I', is used). Additionally, socialization to the use of O seems in part to involve a display during story-time of the rough-and-tough affective stance indexible by O, which may then be related to 'masculinity', or to the 'toughness' which seems to be understood as a virtue for Japanese boys.[10] However, as mentioned throughout, there were many sequences in the interactional data that can only be fully understood in relation to the embodied actions of the participants. Therefore, it is imperative that future research base its analyses on visual data. Doing so should allow a more penetrating and participant-relevant analysis of the talk-in-interaction.

In regard to possible questions for future research, I will make two suggestions here. First, although OB have been traditionally characterized as being used by males to accomplish first person reference (see, e.g., SturtzSreetharan, 2009), there are also (usually young) females who deploy these forms in order to refer to themselves (see, e.g., Miyazaki, 2004). Thus, the question may be asked as to how, when and why females are socialized to use OB. Second, while the present study has focused exclusively on first language socialization to use OB, many of the same questions might be posed in the case of users of Japanese as a second language. While such users of Japanese may not typically be socialized to use Japanese first person reference terms by their parents, in most cases, the existence of a primary socializer (or socializers) does seem possible, or even probable. Although at this point it remains an empirical question, it is likely that, in at least some cases, such primary socializers would be female (e.g., Japanese teachers, girlfriends, spouses, etc.). Given that this might be the case, are second language users of Japanese socialized to use OB? And if so, how, when and why?

---

10 Such 'toughness' is amply socialized in and through such ubiquitous advice to boys as: *naku na! otoko no ko desho?* (don't cry! you're a boy, right?).

Works Cited

Bilmes, Jack. 1988. "The concept of preference in conversation analysis," *Language in Society 17*, pp.161-181.

Clancy, Patricia. 1986. *The Acquisition of Japanese*. New Jersey, L. Erlbaum Associates.

Goodwin, Charles. 1979. "The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation," in G. Psathas (ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*, New York, Irvington Publishers, pp.97-121.

——— 1980. "Restarts, pauses, and the achievement of a state of mutual gaze at turn-beginning," *Sociological Inquiry*, 50(3-4), pp.272-302.

——— 2000. "Action and embodiment within situated human interaction," *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(10), pp.1489-1522.

Goffman, Erving. 1979. "Footing," *Semiotica*, 25(1/2), pp.1-29.

——— 1981. "Footing," in E. Goffman (ed.), *Forms of Talk*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, pp.124-159.

Gumperz, John. 1982. *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hashimoto, Shinkichi. 1948. *Kokugohoo Kenkyuu* [Studies in Japanese Grammar]. Tokyo, Iwanamishoten.

Have, Paul t. 2007. *Doing conversation analysis*. Boston, Sage.

Heritage, John. 1984. *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Hinds, John. 1971. "Personal pronouns in Japanese," *Glossa*, 5(2), pp.146-155.

——— 1975. "Third person pronouns in Japanese," in Peng, F. C. (ed.), *Language in Japanese Society: Current Issues in Sociolinguistics*, Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press, pp.128-157.

Hutchby, Ian and Robin Wooffitt. 2008. *Conversation analysis* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, Polity.

Kondo, Dorinne. 1990. *Crafting Selves: Power, Gender, and Discourses of Identity in a Japanese Workplace*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Martin, Samuel. 1988. *A Reference Grammar of Japanese*. Rutland, Tuttle.

McGloin, Naomi H. 1990. "Sex difference and sentence-final particles," in S. Ide and N. Hanaoka McGloin (eds.), *Aspects of Japanese women's language*, Tokyo, Kurosio, pp.23-41.

Miller, Roy. 1967. *The Japanese Language*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Miyazaki, Ayumi. 2004. "Japanese junior high school girls' and boys' first-person pronoun use and their social world," in S. Okamoto and J. Shibamoto Smith (eds.), *Japanese Language, Gender, and Ideology : Cultural Models and Real People: Cultural Models and Real People*, New York, Oxford University Press, pp.256-274.

Ochs, Elinor. 1990. "Indexicality and socialization," in J. Stigler, R. Shweder, & G. Herdt (eds.), *Cultural psychology*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp.287-308.

———1996. "Linguistic resources for socializing humanity," in J. Gumperz and S. Levinson (eds.), *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*m, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp.407-438.

——— 2002. "Becoming a speaker of culture," in C. J. Kramsch (ed.), *Language Acquisition and Language Socialization: Ecological Perspectives*, London, Continuum, pp.99-120.

Ochs, Elinor and Bambi Schieffelin. 1986. "Language socialization," *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 15,

pp.163-191.

Ono, Tsuyoshi and Sandra Thompson. 2003. "Japanese (w)atashi/ore/boku 'I': They're not just pronouns," *Cognitive Linguistics*, 14(4), pp.321-347.

Sakuma, Kanae. 1959. *Nihongo no Gengoriron* [Linguistic Theories Concerning the Japanese Language]. Tokyo, Kooseikaku.

Schenkein, Jim. 1982/1978. "Sketch of the analytic mentality for the study of conversational interaction," in J. Schenkein (ed.), *Studies in the Organisation of Conversational Interaction*, New York, Academic Press, pp.57-78.

Schieffelin, Bambi and Elinor Ochs. 1986. *Language Socialization Across Cultures*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1990. *The Languages of Japan*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Streeck, Jurgen, Charles Goodwin, and Curtis LeBaron (eds.). 2011. *Embodied Interaction: Language and Body in the Material World*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Sturtz Sreetharan, Cindi. 2009. "Ore and omae: Japanese men's uses of first- and second-person pronouns," *Pragmatics*, 19(2), pp.253-278.

Suzuki, Takao. 1978. *Japanese and the Japanese: Words in Culture*. Tokyo, Kodansha.

Tanaka, Hiroko. 1999. *Turn-taking in Japanese Conversation: A Study in Grammar and Interaction*. Amsterdam, Benjamins.

Vygotsky, Lev. 1978. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Wetzel, Patricia. 1994. "A movable self: The linguistic indexing of uchi and soto," in J. Bachnik and C. Quinn, Jr. (eds.), *Situated Meaning: Inside and Outside in Japanese Self, Society, and Language*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, pp.73-87.