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Abstract

Employing Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) ecological model of development, this ethnographic study investigated six Japanese middle school expatriate students in the United States (4 boys and 2 girls) from Autumn 2009 to Spring 2010 to better understand their linguistic environment, their beliefs and values in English, and how those beliefs and values were nurtured. All the students stayed in the host country for more than three years and they were all toward the end of their sojourn in America. In order to qualitatively reveal how the students learned and used English, and what views they had toward English, weekly interviews with the students inquired about their social networks and access to linguistic resources such as textbooks and television. At the same time, I visited one of the students’ schools to investigate how he was socialized to use English during casual conversations with his peers at the lunch table.

The first half of this study is based on the interviews to describe the Japanese students’ linguistic environment. The environment where the students used English was broadly divided into four domains: home, school, peer, and media. Despite overlap across domains, the students’ typical use of English and their values in language showed distinct features in each domain. Following the argument about the domains, this study further discusses a model where the contradictory values related to cussing, pronunciation, and
proficiency test in each domain affected the students’ multiple and contradictory identities.

The second half of this study is based on audio-recorded observations of a Japanese boy and his peers at a middle school. During observation of casual peer conversation at his lunch table, there were few explicit remarks in the Japanese student’s English as he had learned the language in America for three years. Due to the lack of overt teaching from his peers, this study focused on the Japanese student’s self-repair practices to understand how he interpreted his utterances in interaction with his peers and how he modified them following his peers’ open class initiators, particularly “huh?” and “what?” These modifications indicated subtle traces of the Japanese student’s second language socialization; his modification was made based on his “imagined community of English speakers,” which had been constructed through his past experiences.

Based on the analyses of the Japanese students’ English learning and language environment, this study argues that a variety of personal, linguistic, and material resources interdependently construct amorphous linguistic ecology for second language learners in society. However, by examining how language ideologies are transmitted and absorbed in a variety of contexts, including taking a Japanese language proficiency tests of English in America, this study also considers the notions of language ideology and imagined community as forces that give order to the complex relationships in second language learning.
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Two approaches to second language learning

Traditionally, when one is interested in second language (L2) learning in a society, one way to approach the concept of “society” is to focus on the people’s shared systems and practices, which are usually referred to as “culture.” In this approach, there is an assumption that, to a certain degree, people in a social group share common cultural practices and worldviews, and thus are homogeneous to an extent. On the other hand, another approach focuses on individual relationships that form when language learners study another language. Studies on talk-in-interaction and code-switching, for instance, look at relationships between people in order to understand how individuals construct a society through interaction. While these two approaches are not mutually exclusive, the difference between them is reflected in the assumptions they make about boundaries that separate one social group from another. In the approach that focuses on “culture,” social practices take place in specific containers (e.g., school, village, state, or nation), whereas the latter approach embraces learners’ interactions whether within a container or across group boundaries. Heller (2007) contends that interactionist approaches have potential for direct exploration of bilingual speakers’ social meaning construction—particularly their ethnolinguistic identities—while the container metaphor also enables ethnographic descriptions of the broad patterns of people’s views and behaviors in social structures,
which is important for understanding the contexts that learners learn in (Goodwin & Duranti, 1992).

The two approaches, if used appropriately, are helpful for understanding L2 learning in individual learners’ social contexts. Whatever a researcher’s focus is, L2 learning always takes place in society since language is an inherently social product. Even if a learner studies alone with a textbook, society cannot be separated from language; elements of society are always present in the materials that the language learners use and in their imagination, where they imagine using the target language in future. Therefore, one’s L2 learning is always necessarily social, whether the learner is in an ESL or EFL context.

While a macro context—whether it be a school or a country—provides individuals with reasons for learning another language such as monetary reward, prestige, intellectual satisfaction, friendship, etc., individual learners interpret the contexts of learning according to their own background, and this contributes to their attitude toward the language. On an individual level, one’s position in his or her society plays an important role in motivating his or her L2 learning. For example, those who speak the dominant language in a particular context have less need to learn another language than language minorities because many social occasions favor the dominant language but are disadvantageous to minority languages. Due to the different degrees of access to languages and language varieties, one’s subjective understanding of the relative importance of a particular language which in turn affects how much distance he or she keeps from the language. In the social psychological approach to bilingual development, this distance is understood in a construct, subjective ethnolinguistic vitality (e.g., Allard
& Landry, 1986; Bourhis, Giles & Rosenthal, 1981) where researchers obtain insight into the personal grounds individuals have for the distance they keep from their mother tongue in relation to the dominant languages in a bilingual society. The construct suggests that how one perceives the importance of a language in society affects his or her agency in learning that language.

Another social psychological approach to L2 learning embraces Gardner’s (1985) notion of integrativeness—language learners’ desire to identify themselves as part of the target language group—as an essential motivation for L2 learning. However, even though they do not constitute a complete rejection of the concept of integrativeness (cf. Dörnyei, 2009), there are at least two critiques that emerge from motivation studies, which hinder the adoption of Gardner’s notion. One view that criticizes integrativeness in L2 learning motivation is native and non-native dichotomy (e.g., Coetzee-van Rooy, 2006; Lamb, 2004) and the other is that integrativeness contains a homogenized assumption of target language groups, especially in the context of English as a lingua franca (e.g., Yashima, 2000, 2009). These views criticize integrativeness’ biased and simplified images of target language communities, particularly of English speakers. In other words, an integrative motivation approach cannot represent sociolinguistic reality, while scholastic “images of society” (Blommaert, 2007) are biased for particular speakers of English. Nevertheless, if they want to be part of it, individual learners certainly have their own images of society, whether or not those images represent ‘objective’ reality. This attention to the aspects of subjective and imaginative understanding about a society parallels a shift from a view that sees language and language learning as occurring in a ‘homogeneous speech community’ to a view that sees them in the ‘heterogeneous speech community with an
image of homogeneity’ (cf. Keating, 2001; Pratt, 1987). Learners position themselves within their own images of society, and they also have their own images of themselves (Lyons, 2009; Ryan, 2006).

**Individuals and society**

While an assumption of a heterogeneous society leads researchers to explore individuals’ construction of relationships through the transmission of values and beliefs from one individual to another, an assumption of homogeneous society implies that people share certain values and beliefs about language. These two assumptions are not mutually exclusive, because beliefs and values of homogeneity are often constructed through heterogeneous members’ interpersonal communication, such as negotiation, mutual agreement and above all, education. While babies establish their first relationship with their caregivers to become new members of the society where the caregivers belong, the babies’ initial social relationship is hierarchical when they learn language from their caregivers. Vygotsky (1979) pays attention to this transmission of sociocultural artifacts, particularly language, to children in this hierarchy and advocates for the presence of society before child’s development, which undergoes qualitative transformation rather than quantitative increase. The child’s stages of development and requirements for maturity are thus culturally specific to every community, as each community has its own ways of helping newcomers/children learn how to become a part of it (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008; Rogoff, 2003).

Still, in most societies, children start to produce their first words at about seven to twelve months (Harwood, Miller & Vasta, 2008), and the complexity of their language and personal network will grow as they do. Even though some children maintain the
same network of people for years, most keep adding new people to their networks while losing other members. As a child grows older, his or her social network gets larger and more diverse, and how the child interacts with others through language also evolves. Each individual’s social space expands and shrinks as his or her social network transforms and as their access to linguistic resources changes. In short, the relationship between individuals and society is spatiotemporally changeable. The simple one-on-one relationship with their caregivers disappears as the child grows up and gets involved with a variety of people in the outside world, and they learn from those different people in a variety of manners. The child’s life becomes complex as they grow.

**Second language development in society**

One’s social network transforms as they grow, and development in a particular language is a lifelong process (Ochs, 1988). In their changing social contexts, people learn new cultural practices at the periphery (Lave & Wenger, 1991) by observing experienced others, or by being guided by more knowledgeable members of the society (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, 2007; Vygotsky, 1978). Situated in a linguistic environment of a variety of people and cultural artifacts (e.g., physical objects, concepts, rules and above all, language), newcomers learn to be part of “them”. This transformation of an individual through Meadian development of identity and Vygotskian sense of internalizing cultural artifacts (cf. Holland & Lachcotte, 2007) is referred to as socialization (e.g., Duff, 2007; Ochs, 1986) and involves qualitative changes in how one behaves, thinks, and feels in various social activities. Because of the hierarchical relationship as in baby-caregiver interactions, socialization is also a power-laden process where some individuals exert power and others accept it; also some may choose to maintain their peripheral positions.
while others may gain fuller membership and authority in the group. Particularly in the context of second language learning, socialization is also a distinctly political process, since it always involves the question “Who learns whose language?”

Since language socialization, or language development in society, is fundamentally political (Watson-Gegeo, 2004; Watson-Gegeo & Nielsen, 2003), it also moves toward stability that contains inherent potential tensions. Postcolonial sensitivity has revealed ideological tensions in second language education, in which the awareness of the complexity of contexts within L2 learners’ social experiences has led to critical investigation of the assumption of neutrality in language learning (e.g., Pennycook, 2001). Learners do not necessarily choose to learn what their ‘teachers’ teach them—even though a hierarchical relationship is assumed in Vygotskian sociocultural perspectives. Learner’s lack of trust in their teachers does not allow the learners to be learners and teachers to be teachers. Negative values and beliefs that have developed elsewhere can prevent a learner from learning a particular language or particular features of the language. As one’s social space gets larger and more complex, there are contradictory social domains in which a variety of individuals have access to language learners’ daily lives. Saying “they are supposed to learn these things” is merely an ideological claim that is grounded in the static authority of a particular social domain. Such a claim is not necessarily shared by those in the other parts of the society (e.g., Davis, 2007).

Therefore, although classroom-oriented studies often investigate the “effectiveness” of teaching and learning, development in another language should be understood in terms of the entirety of a learner’s experiences in his or her language ecology. Whether students are learning another language in their home country or in a
host society, in either case they are in multiple contexts that are often complexly
interrelated with one another (Roberts, 2001). Learners of English in Japan learn English
from their teachers at school, by watching movies and listening to the radio at home, by
reading books with the help of dictionaries, or by asking other individuals questions over
the Internet. Even when the learner is using only Japanese, their language still has
connections with English, having borrowed many words and expressions from English,
and even containing pronunciations that have been affected through contact with the
English speaking world (Koscielecki, 2006; Preston & Yamagata, 2004; Stanlaw, 2004a).
Moreover, learning a target language in an academic setting is interdisciplinary and
interdiscursive (Wortham, 2005). High school students studying science and social
studies are exposed to different languages used in those disciplines, and their informal
conversations are not totally separate from the academic language. In sum, learning
another language is a complex process of linguistic development in society.

**Complex adaptive systems and L2 development**

In their book *Complex adaptive system in applied linguistics*, Larsen-Freeman &
Cameron (2008) elaborate on complexity in language and language learning. Complex
adaptive systems theory in language (also The “Five Graces Group”, 2009) explains the
interdependence of internal structure of language, where, through interaction with their
linguistic environment, new systems of rules in language emerge in learners. This
interdependence between learners and the surrounding environment—whether human or
not—is the core idea of linguistic ecology, which embraces difference and variation
among the constituents of one’s living space (Kramsch, 2002). Although the systems are
complex, the interdependent relationship in linguistic ecology is not totally chaotic.
Complex adaptive systems theory explains the existence of magnetic entities that give complexities an order. Even though idiolects presuppose individual differences, people can still communicate with each other because there are conventions that enable mutual understanding by stimulating the speakers/learners’ memories of their past experiences (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008).

In studying this complexity, as well as an order in L2 development in society, a holistic approach is unavoidable where “language is not studied as isolated, self-contained system, but rather in its natural surroundings” (Kramsch, & Steffensen, 2008, p.18). A holistic approach to L2 development thus investigates the interdependence between learners, language, and environment while looking into the complexities of these entities.

**Transnationalism and second language learning in “society”**

This ethnographic study approaches the complexity of second language development in society through the experiences of Japanese middle school students studying in the United States. The kind of transnational migration these students experienced is an increasingly a common phenomenon today, because of the global spread of standard economic systems and technological advances. While in America, the six Japanese expatriate students, whose fathers were sent to Japanese branch offices in the foreign country, necessarily conducted their lives in English during their temporary stay. Despite their overwhelming experiences in the foreign country, the students’ lives were not simplistically unidirectional toward the host society. While the students’ L2 development complexly involved multiple social domains including Japan, many aspects of the host language and the variety of people who surrounded the students interacted
with each other. This study approaches the Japanese middle school students’ experiences of second language learning in America by employing language ideology and identity as investigating lenses.

Through dynamic relationships with the environment, the Japanese students developed L2 proficiency as well as beliefs and values about their languages. In this study’s long-term perspective, the students’ lives in Japan and their future prospects back in their home country contributed to the construction of their immediate linguistic environments, which allowed access to multiple socialization agencies and a variety of linguistic resources. In a short-term view, after three years of formal education and casual peer relationships in America, the Japanese students’ interaction with same-age peers in English showed only very subtle pictures of L2 socialization. After several years of study in the United States the students were no longer newcomers who were one-sidedly socialized into the world of others, but had already become experienced members who evaluated others and pushed their views toward other members. The dichotomous views of non-native learners and native-speakers, and novices and experts do not apply to the complex relationships between the experienced Japanese students and the local middle school students. More politically sensitive and relationally subtle perspectives are required to see the second language development of the expatriate students who are no longer newcomers to their environment.

**Chapter overview**

This study consists of seven chapters including this introduction. The next two chapters establish the framework of this study. Chapter 2 reviews the literature and provides an overview of how the concept of society has been regarded in the field of L2-
related studies, particularly in language socialization. Employing the concept of ecology in language development, this study approaches language socialization by focusing on the contexts of Japanese middle school students’ second language learning with language ideology and identity as additional perspectives to drive the analysis. Chapter 3 discusses methodology in studying Japanese expatriate students’ second language ecology in America. In an effort to understand their views about English and about themselves, six Japanese middle school students were interviewed about their contact with English in their daily lives during their stays in America. One of the six students agreed to further investigation, specifically observation of his conversation with his peers during school lunch periods. His use of English in casual conversations with his peers at the lunch table was analyzed to understand how second language socialization was realized for the expatriate students.

Chapters 4, 5 and 6 discuss the Japanese students’ linguistic experiences in America. Chapter 4 illustrates the Japanese middle school students’ linguistic ecology in America. Employing Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) ecological model of development, this chapter depicts the Japanese students’ world where they learned and used English. While describing how the students interacted with their environment, this chapter provides grounds for a holistic understanding of the Japanese expatriate students’ L2 ecology. Chapter 5 analyzes the ideological aspect of L2 development. Taking a social psychological position toward identities and maintaining the holistic stance of L2 socialization, this chapter focuses on L2 learning on an ideological level to view L2 ideologies in relation to the expatriate students’ identities. Chapter 6 studies the talk-in-interaction in English among a group of middle school boys that includes a Japanese
student. Microanalysis of the students’ conversations at the lunch table points to the subtlety of L2 socialization among peers with small power differences. Chapter 7 discusses the students’ second language learning in society by focusing on three main findings, and the final chapter summarizes the findings of this study, discussing the complexity of L2 development with a holistic ecological perspective.
Chapter 2: Literature review

2.1. Second language learning in society

The role of society in the field of second language teaching and learning has attracted scholarly attention in the last few decades (e.g., Atkinson, 2002; Duff, 2007; Frawley & Lantolf, 1985; Giles and Johnson, 1987; Landry & Allard, 1994; Lantolf, 2006). In particular, Firth and Wagner’s (1997) controversial call for larger emphasis on the role of society in language learning boosted the debate over the role of society in the field. Although the calls from society-oriented scholars met with a range of agreements (e.g., Atkinson, 2002; Zuengler & Miller, 2006) as well as oppositions and rejections (e.g., Gregg, 2006; Long, 1996; Gass, 1998), L2 learners are always in a certain society where they experience many constraints and limitations in their lives (Norton, 2000; Peirce, 1995). Therefore, investigating the roles of society in L2 learning is meaningful to the understanding of the complexity of second language development (cf. Larsen-Freeman, 2002). As constraints and limitations are often associated with learners’ social attributes, such as gender, race, ethnicity, age, etc., real life contexts are not problem-free because L2 learners often have limited access to various linguistic resources, which are rejected by other members in social and economic stratification (Duff, 2007). A host of factors affect how learners interact with the users of a target language and what they can do within the restrictions of circumstances. To make the process more complex, these
factors are also in different degrees interdependent with each other (Kramsch, 2002; Lemke, 2002), and thus, the more variables there are, the harder it becomes to predict the processes of L2 development in real-life contexts. Furthermore, as social psychologists suggest with the concept of ethnolinguistic vitality, how learners view the status of their L1 in relation to a target language also affects their language learning attitudes (e.g., Allard & Landry, 1986, 1994; Giles, Bourhis, & Taylor, 1977; Landry & Allard, 1994; Ros, Huich, & Cano, 1994). This subjective distance from languages adds extra complexity to the understanding of L2 development.

Second language development is thus a complex process that involves a multitude of factors. Highlighting this complexity, Larsen-Freeman (1997) introduces the “chaos/complexity” theory to applied linguistics to attract attention to the fractal patterns of language and language learning. She further suggests establishing a certain degree of compatibility between approaches to the social aspects of second language learning and cognitive and psychological aspects of language acquisition. This holistic attitude toward L2 development is most noticeably found in the language socialization paradigm.

2.1.1. Language socialization

The notion of socialization has a long history since Plato, Montaigne and Rousseau (Clausen, 1968), but the aspect of language has long been overlooked in socialization studies (Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008). Starting with the interest in child’s language development in different disciplines, “[s]ocialization research posed a set of complementary but independently pursued questions, primarily revolving around the necessity for children to acquire the culturally requisite skills for participating society” (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008, p. 3). Language socialization approach
developed through cross-cultural interests in the linguistic development of the child, which were grounded on notions of speech community (e.g., Gumperz, 1968/2001) and communicative competence (Hymes, 1972). This approach started to form a shape after Schieffelin’s (1985) longitudinal study of Kaluli children in Papua New Guinea and Ochs’ (1985) study on Samoan children’s language acquisition, which was further developed in the field of linguistic anthropology (Rymes, 2008).

Language socialization sees the process of language development as “socialization through language and socialization to use language” (Ochs, 1986, p.2) rather than a mere result of computational input and output. Language socialization views language learners as apprentices of a linguistic community with interests in how members of a community organize language practices and how novice members learn to use language appropriately in society (Kramsch, 2002). The framework often investigates language development of infants and young children in closed communities with a focus on cross-generational transmissions of language and culture and with an interest in socioculturally distinct patterns of interaction among members.

Whereas many studies focus on linguistic features (e.g., Morita, 2003; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1995) within the language socialization framework, other aspects of language are also investigated such as communicative styles (Clancy, 1986; Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986), affect (Clancy, 1999; Schieffelin, 1986), identity (Baquedano-López, 1997/2001; Miller, 1994; Ochs, 1993b), and literacy (Heath, 1983). These studies have from time to time provided narratives that culturally distinct ways of language practices and developmental processes in a community create gaps between majority and minority groups, and that the values and practices of majority groups are often represented in

2.1.2 Second language socialization

While the practices of language teaching and learning vary from community to community in first language socialization, the codes into which the child is socialized add more complexity in bi- and multilingual environments (e.g., Kulick, 1992; Morita, 2003; Paugh, 2005; Song, 2007; Zentella, 1997). Morita’s (2003) study, for example, shows how different personal referent systems in Japanese and English confuse young Japanese children who stay in an English-dominant neighborhood in the United States. Although a caregiver’s input, such as correction, suggestions, and model-providing is significant in forming how children use language, Morita argues that two conflicting linguistic systems are solved by the creativity of language learners. Song (2007) also studies the language socialization practices by Korean families staying in America, whereby she emphasizes the roles of imagined communities (Anderson, 1991; Kanno, & Norton, 2003) in the transnational migrant families’ language practices. These studies suggest that the discrepancies in two language systems make second language (L2) socialization highly complex.

Furthermore, language socialization is not a matter of individual changes through unidirectional input from the environment, but it is a bi- and multi-directional transformation with multiple agencies around an individual (Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004;
Kramsch, 2002; Ochs, 1988). When individual changes occur according to the norms of the home community and of the world outside the community, they can also lead to changes in a community in the long run (e.g., Crago, Annahatak, & Ningiuruvik, 1993; Pontecorvo, Fasulo, & Sterponi, 2001; Zentella, 1997). For example, Zentella (1997) illustrates how Puerto Rican children in New York code-switch according to their interactional circumstances. Their choices of different codes are affected by individual knowledge as well as the symbolic values of each language under particular circumstances. Behind the uses of different linguistic codes, there are both Puerto Rican and New Yorker styles of socialization within the community. Both styles challenge narrow and exclusive compartmentalization of either practice.

The possibilities of transformation are inherent in every community due to language variation at the levels of register and code (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004), and purely reproductive views of language socialization are criticized for their behavioral, unchanging conveyance of language as a cultural tool and its values to the next generation (Kulick, 1992). In this respect, bi- and multilingual communities are more dynamic in terms of transformation and creativity. Their transformation is not only in linguistic practices, but it is also at the level of values of languages in the community in the long term. For example, Makihara’s (2005) study on the shift of Rapa Nui ways of speaking Spanish in Easter Island shows cross-generational transformation on the perception of symbolic values of two languages. Crago, Annahatak, and Ningiuruvik (1993) describe how patterns of mother-child interactions are different between older and younger mothers in Alaska, in terms of the use of traditional verses, kinds of vocabulary, the way of excluding children from adult conversations, and their
reliance on English. These studies on language contact situations show an interactive aspect of language socialization not only at the individual level in a closed community but also at the macro level across different languages.

2.1.3. Expanded framework of second language socialization

Language socialization studies on monolingual communities tend to see a linguistic community rather stable, generally focusing on how young children are socialized in adult communities. As the framework is applied in bi- and multilingual settings, it necessarily expands its scope from traditional socialization of the young into adult society to the ones that include adolescents and adults in a new society. However, the application entails ethical concerns at the same time since the approach conflicts with the problematic notion of “native speakers” as model for L2 learners to imitate (Kramsch & Steffensen, 2008). In addition, the relationship between second language learners and other members of the host society is not simple. While L2 learners may receive warm welcome by other members of the society and ironically end up with little development toward the norms of the host society (Teutsch-Dwyer, 2001), they may not get along with other members due to various reasons (e.g., Willet, 1995). The opportunities for socialization may be limited from the beginning whether or not the learners are highly motivated to learn to be part of the community (Duff, 2007). This difficulty in second language socialization also derives from L2 learners’ connections with their L1 society. In today’s international atmosphere where a large number of transnational migrants have greater access to global information technology, the migrants’ connection with their L1 society is stronger than it once was. Among various types of transnational migrants, short-term sojourners usually have stronger connections with their home country, where
these sojourners aim to return, than their host country, where they plan to stay temporarily.

Study abroad is one of the areas of studies on sojourners where language socialization framework is applied, and researchers increasingly emphasize learners’ connections with their home countries. For example, Matsumura (2001) criticizes past studies on second language socialization, arguing that they “looked solely at the synchronic in the target speech community without incorporating a diachronic perspective into its interpretation” (p. 638). Language learners in the target language society are not only socialized in the community to which they have direct access in everyday life, but also their socialization experiences reflect their past experiences of language learning outside the target community (Lemke, 2002, Watson-Gegeo, 2004). In addition, what constitutes a context is not limited to the immediate environments, but it is embedded in a larger world which is not necessarily connected with one’s direct experiences. A context even includes learners’ “imagined communities” (Anderson, 1991; Kanno, 2003) which are discursively constructed indirect societies in the present and future. As seen in studies by Haneda and Monobe (2009) and Song (2007), children and their caregivers in a bilingual environment often see both a host country and their home country at the same time. While children live in a host society, their parents may look at the future of their children in their home countries, and therefore control the linguistic resources to which their children have access. Thus, the L2 socialization approach should be sensitive with not only the meaning of society that contextualizes the use of language, but also with how learners view their environments in learning and using the language.
I have outlined how learning another language in society is complex in bi- and multilingual contexts. In this complex space, immigrants and sojourners should not be treated in the same manner because of the roles of their imagined communities in their immediate environments. In their maintenance of connection with their countries of origin and the development of new hybrid identities (Block, 2007), sojourners are expected to be more bound to their home countries than immigrants since their future plans are expected to be realized back home, even though immigrants in the present day context are also different from a traditional notion of immigrants “who move to a location, assimilate to local norms and proceed to live the rest of their lives isolated from their home language and culture” (Block, 2007, p. 188).

2.2. Sojourners and second language socialization

Although not every L2-related study deals with social contexts where language learning takes place, many studies on L2 learning are sensitive to the environment when learners’ move from one place to another. Those studies discuss immigrants’ language experiences in their new countries (e.g., Gordon, 2004; Harklau, 2003; Norton, 2000) as well as by their children who are often called 1.5 generation (e.g., Carhill, Suáres-Orozco & Páez, 2008; Goldstein, 1997, 2003; Jia & Aaronson, 2003; Liang, 2006; Lucca, Masiero, & Pallotti, 2008; McKay & Wong, 1996; Valdés, 1998; Willet, 1995). In contrast to these long-term residents in new linguistic environments, there are also studies that focus on sojourners who stay in a host country temporarily. As there are various types of sojourns from tourism and international volunteering (e.g., Peace Corps in Guntermann, 1995) to business and education, sojourners’ socialization experiences are also diverse according to their purposes.
Consequently, scholarly concerns also vary. For example, studies on study abroad programs often cover the development of L2 competence while there are growing concerns with L2 learners’ identities. In his literature review on study abroad programs, Kinginger (2009) points out that the emphasis on gender identities in the literature on study abroad (e.g., Polany, 1995; Twombly, 1995) is an American scholastic trend while researchers’ institutional concerns over the efficacy of study abroad programs drive their interest in communicative competence. He also cautions the field’s relative dearth of non-American contexts and dispersive pursuit of a big picture of L2 development in study abroad programs, claiming that the complexity of language learning in study abroad contexts requires “researchers to choose from a broad array of potential foci” (p. 207).

Although sojourners in study abroad programs still attract much scholarly attention since many higher education institutions offer their programs, there is a relative lack of attention to the experiences of other types of sojourners. While business is one major reason for staying abroad among many purposes for staying in another country, the experiences of these people are, in general, not documented in the field of SLA since they are assumed to have developed language skills before visiting the country, except for employees who are sent to participate in local language programs (e.g., Morrow, 1995).

The situation is complicated when people in business are accompanied by their family members for a relatively longer term. Even though fathers—as mothers alone rarely take their families abroad—may have sufficient command of the dominant language in the host country, their wives and children may not. Considering a large number of people in business staying in the countries of their trading partners in the age of globalization, there should be more attention to this population. While there are studies...
that focus on the experiences of expatriate children and their parents, their experiences are investigated generally in the context of psychology, not in the context of host language learning. Although the literature covers various issues behind sojourns such as coping with culture shock, maintenance of L1, and enhancing adaptation and adjustment in education (e.g., Miyamoto & Kuhlman, 2001; Yoshida, Matsumoto, Akiyama, Moriyoshi, Furuiye, Ishii, et al., 2002), there has been limited attention to expatriate students’ L2 development. Nevertheless, there has been considerable scholastic attention to Japanese sojourners stimulated by Japan’s economic growth after the mid-20th century.

2.3. Japanese sojourners abroad

Because of political and economical ties with Japan, the United States is the primary destination for Japanese transnational migrants\(^1\). The reasons for Japanese transnational migration are broadly classified into work, education, and tourism (see Figure 1). Although not every type of sojourning experiences is documented in L2-related studies, some types of sojourners’ experiences attract more attention than others. \textit{Kaigai shijo}, or expatriate children whose parents work for Japanese companies with international branch offices, are relatively popular subjects among Japanese transnational migrants.

\(^1\) As of 2008, there are 250,294 long-term Japanese residents in the U.S., consisting of a third of the total long-term residents overseas. (http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/toko/tokei/hojin/09/pdfs/1.pdf)
Sojourners

Work
- Working holiday
- Management
- Volunteering, etc.

International corporate staff
- Self-employed

Tourism

Education
- Adult
  - Self-initiated learning (e.g., Kobayashi, 2007)
  - Degree program
    - Post-graduate
      - Undergraduate (e.g., Morita, 2000)
        - Exchange program (e.g., Matsuura, 2001; Sasaki, 2011)
        - Other
  - On the job training (e.g., Morrow, 1995)

- Post-secondary
  - Study abroad
    - Exchange program (e.g., Matsuura, 2001; Sasaki, 2011)
    - Other

- Pre-collegiate
  - Japanese experiential approach
    - Kaigai shijo
      - Quasi-Bilingual approach
      - Japanese test-oriented approach
    - Exchange program
    - School program (e.g., Churchill, 2006)

2 Classification based on Langager (1999, 2010). Typologically, the use of the three categories is post hoc, as the types of schooling should be used to align with the others, and these categories are developed for secondary school students and are not necessarily applicable to younger children. But this study employs this classification to highlight the language learning experiences by the participants in this study.

Figure 1 Types of Japanese sojourners abroad
As Japanese companies sent more of their employees abroad for international business opportunities, there were many family members who accompanied their breadwinners as a result. As the number of expatriate children increased in the 1960s and 1970s with Japan’s economic development, the studies on Japanese expatriate children also increased (Kaigai shijo kyoikushi hensan iinkai, 1991; Fry, 2007). In those days, returnees’ experiences were viewed as undesirable because a common assumption of ethno-cultural homogeneity in Japanese society rejected returnees’ foreign manners (Kitsuse, Murase, & Yamamura, 1984; Fry, 2007; Kanno, 2003). The returnees’ readjustment to the Japanese school system was difficult because their “foreignness” was seen as a problem that needs to be removed without understanding their experiences as assets (Fry, 2007). Due to concerns about domestic education “problems,” the studies were generally oriented toward returnees rather than expatriate students while they were overseas.

In the 1970s, Ebuchi (1983) investigated Japanese expatriate children’s development from the perspectives of their cultural maintenance and readjustment to the Japanese education system. Ebuchi reported that Japanese expatriate children in North America tended to be enrolled in local schools whereas Japanese children in Asia tended to attend Japanese schools without much contact with the locals. Ebuchi also argued that these different living styles in the host countries contributed to Japanese children’s different degrees of contact with the host society and thus affected the degrees of mother tongue maintenance. According to Ebuchi, Japanese expatriate children in Asian type of schooling received education with constant access to Japanese language and culture, and consequently, it was easier for them to maintain their Japanese cultural identity while limiting their contact with the locals. This situation was contrasted with their
counterparts’ in North America, where the type of schooling limited Japanese children’s access to their home culture.

While Ebuchi’s study broadly classifies two lifestyles of Japanese expatriate students across the world in terms of their contact with the local societies and their sustained connection with their home culture, Japanese expatriate students’ lifestyles are diverse even in the same host country. Interested in children’s cross-cultural experience and development of cultural meaning systems, Minoura (1984) interviewed Japanese children in California who were learning simultaneously at local schools and at a Japanese Saturday school. She pointed out that the children’s age of arrival and length of stay primarily affected their self-evaluation of English proficiency, whereby these two variables were highly correlated with the density of the children’s personal networking with mainstream students. Younger Japanese expatriate students generally had less difficulty in having social network opportunities with mainstream children, which allowed Japanese students to be comfortable in using English. On the other hand, latecomers, generally after the age of nine, experienced relative difficulties in establishing social bonds with others in English. Minoura further argues that the children who arrived early in their lives—approximately prior to nine years old—showed behavioral, cognitive and affective congruity in using English. However, latecomers tended to struggle with adaptation where children felt unnatural about their behavior in the dominant society.

Social changes after the 1980s, focusing more on global networks outside Japan, also changed the perception toward returnee children (Goodman, 2003; Kaigai shijo kyoikushi hensan iinkai, 1991; Yoshida, Matsumoto, Akiyama, Moriyoshi, Furuiye, Ishii,
et al., 2002). The views toward returnees shifted from one where children’s bilingual and
bicultural experiences were problems to the one where their experiences were considered
as assets (Fry, 2007). Globalization and technological advancement such as the Internet
also affected how expatriate children lived in the host society (Fry, 2007, 2009).
context, arguing that the development of media technology today and the presence of
Japanese communities with their ethnic stores in multicultural London had significant
roles in the maintenance of children’s ethno-cultural identity. Fry (2009) also suggests
that such porous boundaries of sojourners’ environment affect the balance of children’s
language. She assesses linguistic abilities of Japanese expatriate children in London by
using the tests of kanji (Chinese characters) knowledge and English vocabulary (cf. Ono,
1994), and argues that the popular image of returnees in Japan as being proficient in
foreign languages and disadvantaged in their mother tongue was exaggerated. Fry argues
that sojourner children in London today were “more Japanese” than those a few decades
ago, producing discrepant images of the returnees as cosmopolitans, even though the
small number of participants in her study limits a proper chronological comparison with
the returnees in the past.

While many factors influence Japanese expatriate children’s relationship with
their host society, their parents are important in the children’s lives. When parents have
high expectations for their children’s future at home, the children will be more inclined to
stay connected with their home culture whereby they prepare for the future upon
returning to their country. However, when parents do not have such expectations,
children may feel more relaxed about their future. Haneda and Monobe (2009) illustrate
four sojourner children’s out-of-school literacy practices in America and point out the dual gaze toward home and host societies. The findings grounded on the researchers’ insights suggest that the gendered attitudes toward literacy practices were derived from the parents’ expectations in Japanese society—a factor that influenced parents’ attitudes toward children’s literacy practices.

To study parental educational intervention on their children, Langager (2010) investigates Japanese high school students at a Japanese private school in New York. Using principal component analysis for the students’ supplementary learning experiences, he presents three types of educational intervention by the Japanese parents. Based on the students’ engagement in language activities such as English camp, tutoring, and Saturday school, the three approaches are labeled with the following characteristics. Quasi-bilingual approach emphasizes English learning outside the Japanese school in New York, while Japanese test-oriented approach is inclined to a preparation for Japanese school life in future through emphasis on tests. Japanese cultural community approach makes best use of learning in Japanese contexts. The study shows the significance of parental intervention on the Japanese expatriate students’ linguistic environment, and the role of future plans in the intervention.

In sum, Japanese expatriate students’ lives have been studied largely in three areas; namely, (1) cultural adaptation and readjustment, (2) mother tongue and culture maintenance, and (3) host language development. While the studies outlined above introduce the difficulties in the sojourners’ lives and their future back at home, language issues are often limited to mother tongue maintenance. When their host language is discussed, it is usually within a discussion of other focuses (e.g., Cunningham, 1988;
Farkas, 1983; Okamura-Bichard, 1985; Nozaki, 2000). There are few studies available that primarily focus on the development of English among students below college level. Despite the dearth of studies on this matter, it is important for the field of second language education to study this population because of the following potentials.

First of all, different from college students in study abroad programs, students in primary and secondary education usually come to live in the host country with their parents. As Langager (2010) points out, their parents’ educational intervention highlights practical and ideological tensions between the two countries due to the different languages in education. These tensions are important areas of study in L2 education whether in ESL or EFL because L2 teaching is at the forefront of language contact where a host of values and beliefs are exchanged across various speakers.

Second, studying these young people adds complexity to the current understanding of L2 learning. While some view L2 learning as mere increment of knowledge with enhanced fluency, others view L2 development as a matter of living in the world. L2 socialization is not merely a matter of acquiring linguistic knowledge but of developing to live among other people in society. Obtaining other people’s values and beliefs toward their worlds is also part of L2 socialization. Especially for students in Japan, English is embedded in their school curricula and thus, it often becomes a folk measurement of intelligence. Considering that English thus affects how students see themselves through this measurement, second language teaching, even in EFL contexts, is benefited by the knowledge of L2 development in the host society.

2.4. Objectives of the study
The objectives of this study lie primarily in providing additional perspectives to second language socialization paradigm by focusing on the lives of Japanese young sojourners in the United States. Although there are studies in the context of age and second language acquisition that investigate the relationship between linguistic environment and language proficiency for Japanese sojourners (e.g., Minoura, 1984) as well as immigrants overall (e.g., Jia & Aaronson, 2003), there are few studies that investigate Japanese expatriate children’s linguistic practices especially in informal contexts from the perspectives of sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology.

Which linguistic features and varieties are accepted and which are not are largely unquestioned in foreign language education. This happens because publishers and textbook writers select and filter the varieties of language based on the dominant, mainstream values of the exporting countries. However, reflecting on recent attention to international varieties of English (e.g., Matsuda, 2002, 2003; Yano, 2001), which are collectively termed *World Englishes*, allows us to cast light on the monolithic values of English instruction. Whereas there is an increasing attention to the diverse values of international English, how and what values develop while learners stay in the host society is little investigated. At the same time, there are multiple ideologies of language even when Japanese children are in host countries. Particularly in the case of English, the regional and social varieties of English are inherent with tensions with the dominant values (e.g., Lippi-Green, 1997) while the global spread of English makes the issue more complicated (Blommaert, 2007). Considering such complexity, we need to explore how learners who maintain contact with their host societies develop their values in the target language. In this respect, Japanese expatriate children in the U.S., a country where
English is used predominantly, will provide an important understanding of L2 development in society.

2.5. Research questions

Driven by the review of the literature and the objectives of the study, I will investigate the following research questions.

1. How are Japanese expatriate students, who are called *kaigai shijo* in Japanese, socialized to use English while they stay in the United States? What social networks do they have? What linguistic resources do they have access to? What is the language to which they have access like? What restrictions are there in their socialization in English?

2. What values and beliefs toward English do the students develop during their residence? How are these values and beliefs related to their socialization experiences?

3. What beliefs and values do their parents have toward English? How are those beliefs and values related to their children’s English learning?

2.6. Theoretical framework

Before discussing the research methodology, this chapter discusses four theoretical perspectives employed in the study. The four perspectives are language socialization, ecological model of development, language ideology, and identity. These theoretical perspectives provide this study with a direction toward a holistic understanding of L2 development in addition to internal complexity.

2.6.1. Language socialization

As reviewed earlier in this chapter, language socialization is the starting point of this study. Although this is not strictly a language socialization study but a study of language and social interaction (Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004) because it does not
longitudinally demonstrate the acquisition of particular linguistic practices over time (cf. Garrett, 2006; Moore, 2008), language socialization perspective drives this study to conceptualize the interdiscursive nature of L2 learning at multiple sites. The term *socialization*, rather than *acculturation* or *enculturation*, implies L2 learners’ agency in selecting linguistic resources and learning contexts due to their cultural and ideological reasons (Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004). L2 learners become part of a society through interacting with a variety of agencies of socialization such as family, peers, schools and mass media (cf. Giddens, 1989).

A holistic approach derived from language socialization perspectives does not limit this study to one setting. By giving thought to the entirety of L2 learning experiences while the students are in the host country, this study aims to investigate the students’ agencies in selecting contexts of L2 learning. With this approach to language learning in society, L2 learning is not reduced to institutional power gaps between teacher and learner and between so-called native speakers and non-native speakers, which are often described by the terms “assimilation” and “acculturation” with connotations of unidirectionality. Since many learners of another language do rely on textbooks and other books of their selection, and if possible, they select teachers and schools, language socialization with emphasis on agentive choices is an appropriate approach to the linguistic environments for Japanese expatriate students.

As far as L2 learners are concerned, it is also meaningful to look into the settings where socialization does not occur; that is, the contexts where learners have no access to second language resources since their being or not being in the contexts of socialization is related to L2 learners’ investment (Pierce, 1995), a notion that separates itself from
motivation (Pittaway, 2004). Although the two notions may look similar, investment was first proposed by Pierce (1995) to criticize the concept of motivation in L2 learning which had long been employed and developed in the tradition of social psychological approaches (e.g., Dörnyei, 2005; Shumann, 1974; Gardner, 1985). The key aspect of investment, in contrast to motivation, is its emphasis on the role of society by examining what L2 learners actually did rather than, as in the notion of motivation, what they wanted to do. This difference is important when researchers take social restrictions in L2 learning into consideration since learners are not always welcomed by all groups of L2 speakers due to various reasons, may it be race, age, gender, etc. In such situations, L2 learners may end up without opportunities to interact with particular speakers (Willet, 1995).

The notion of investment, thus, provides important insight to L2 socialization where there can be external restrictions to learners’ access to linguistic resources as well as resistances from learners themselves. Considering that it is meaningful to see the entire settings of L2 socialization and the complexity and interdependency of multiple agencies surrounding the learners, this study employs an ecological model of development (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, 2005) to approach Japanese expatriate students’ lives in America.

2.6.2. Ecological model of development

To disentangle the complexity of society for the linguistic development of L2 learners and put it in a comprehensible form, this study employs an ecological perspective. Van Lier (2002) defines the study of ecology as follows:

Ecology is the study of the relationship between all various organisms and their physical environment. It’s a complex and messy field of study about a complex...
and messy reality. Its primary requirement is, by definition, that the context is centered, it cannot be reduced, and it cannot be pushed back aside or into the background. The context is the focal field of study. (p. 144)

In its ecological views of L2 socialization, this study finds in Bronfenbrenner’s (1979, 2005) ecological model of development a particularly helpful framework.

Bronfenbrenner’s model positions the child in the center of a multi-layered environment where smaller layers are nested in larger ones. The immediate circle around the child is a microsystem where the child develops through direct interactions with various people and through access to physical objects. Bronfenbrenner (2005) defines a microsystem as follows in his revised conception:

A microsystem is a pattern of activities, roles, and interpersonal relations experienced by the developing person in a given face-to-face setting with particular physical and material features and containing other persons with distinctive characteristics of temperament, personality, and system of belief. (p. 148)

Children have caregivers, siblings, friends in their neighborhoods, and peers at school, etc. By mutual interactions with these actors, children achieve qualitative changes in various aspects of behavior, including language. Language and other sociocultural behaviors are not separated here as Ochs (1996) argues where “the acquisition of language and the acquisition of social and cultural competence are not developmentally independent processes, nor is one process a developmentally prerequisite of the other” (p. 2).

Since Rogoff and others question the model’s assumption of a separation of the individual from the environment (e.g., Rogoff, 2003), my use of the model is primarily to represent the larger picture of the linguistic ecology for the sojourners.
While the ways in which the child interacts with others change as he or she develops, these ways are not unidirectional but interdependent with each other. People surrounding the child also develop and change their ways of interaction with the child. At the same time, the objects that help the child’s development such as books, games, televisions, etc. also form patterns of interaction with others.

In Bronfenbrenner’s model, these sites for direct interactions are nested in other external circles, namely, mesosystem, exosystem, and macrosystem. Mesosystem is a set of relations between the actors and settings with whom the child had a direct relationship. For example, talks between the child’s parents and his or her teacher will affect how each of them relates to the child. Similarly, when the child’s peer talks with their teachers, it may change both people’s attitudes toward the child. In an exosystem, there is an interaction between actors in direct contact with the child and settings that do not directly involve the child. A parent may have difficulty in his company, and it can affect how he or she approaches his or her child. The school district has changed its educational policy, and it affects teachers’ pedagogical strategies. A macrosystem represents the beliefs and values in a society affecting the other systems within it. It is defined as follows:

The macrosystem consists of the overarching pattern of micro-, meso-, and exosystems characteristic of a given culture, subculture, or other broader social context, with particular reference to the developmentally instigative belief systems, resources, hazards, lifestyles, opportunity structures, life course options, and patterns of social interchange that are embedded in each of these systems. The macrosystem may be thought of as a social blueprint for a particular culture, subculture, or other broader social context. (Bronfenbrenner, 2005, pp. 149-150)
Foregrounding complexity in a blended microsystem of two geographically distanced countries where expatriate students have contact, the present study is particularly interested in the nature of the macrosystem as well as the microsystem for Japanese expatriate students in the U.S.

2.6.3. Language ideology

People in a society have their values and beliefs in language. Particular features are favored in certain contexts and others are regarded as inappropriate. When one shares the same value with others and does exactly the same thing with them, his or her language is not marked and thus not problematized. However, it is unlikely that there is only one value of language in today’s globalizing, informational society. People from every part of the world communicate with each other with their own beliefs and values embedded in their language. While values and beliefs are used in personal and social contexts, the term ideology usually has social implications; that is, language ideology implies a collective construction of certain beliefs and values about language.

As for the concept of ideology, there are broadly two camps in its history (cf. Woolard, 1998). One takes the Marxian tradition that views ideology as what distorts “reality.” When Karl Marx introduced the notion of ideology in the 19th century with arguments over economic base and superstructure, he argued that dominant ideology produces false consciousness and benefits economically dominant groups. Whereas the view that ideology in a class-based social structure distorts “reality” has been adopted by other scholars of Marxist tradition, other scholars have adopted a neutral position over ideology that does not question whether ideology rightfully represents reality or not.
In the context of language ideology, where an ethnographic standpoint takes neutral positions, the first view that ideology distorts “reality” is not necessarily denied. In Silverstein’s (1979) discussion of the cognitive limitation of awareness, language structure filters one’s consciousness. However, different from the first view that focuses on the conflict in the social structure, the relationship of ideology with social structure is not the issue in question in Silverstein’s argument. For ethnographers, a particular ideology is a system of beliefs, values, and assumptions that is shared by the constituents of a group in focus. In this model, ideology affects people’s behaviors and ways of thinking. For the purpose of describing a particular social group, this study also does not question whether ideologies rightfully represents reality or not and does not entertain the assumption that the researcher has an access to the truth that is not distorted by ideology. This study regards language ideology as a collective representation of conscious and unconscious beliefs and values of language, which are also influenced by politics and social power.

Based on the discussion above, language ideology is defined succinctly as “shared bodies of commonsense notions about the nature of language in the world” (Rumsey, 1990, p. 346). Language ideology also affects how people make judgments and drives them to conduct a particular linguistic behavior in particular situations. Silverstein (1979) considers language ideology as “sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (p. 193). These beliefs are loaded with “moral and political interests” (Irvine, 1989, p. 255) and shared in a particular group. However, these definitions of language ideology need close
examinations about the meaning of “sharedness of ideology” (Silverstein, 1998) or “commonsense” (Rumsey, 1990) among the users of a language.

With multiple and contradictory ideologies in society, it is possible to determine and analyze those ideologies. As Silverstein (1998) argues, the tensions between ideologies are “problem areas for investigation” (p. 125). Gee (1992) employs the notions of primary and secondary “Discourses” to explain the tensions between ideologies held in the children’s home and by the world outside their home. As children grow up and their network gets larger, they are in contact with various beliefs and values. Language ideologies and their intensity in each individual are not fully homogeneous among the members of a speech community due to different degrees of exposure to these Discourses, since ideologies are already multiple and inherent with conflict and contention due to their social nature (Kroskrity, 2004). However, shared beliefs and values are often used to maintain solidarity within a community. Institutions usually become the site for ideological solidarity and maintenance through authorized social practice (Silverstein, 1998).

As this study is interested in language contact situation where Japanese expatriate students learn English in the U.S., two notions regarding language ideology are particularly relevant here. One notion is related to the worldviews developed through metalinguistic and metapragmatic discourses and the other notion concerns the values attached with a language as a whole system. Considering that socialization is not only a process whereby one learns to act like others, but it also is a process during which he or she adopts their beliefs and values. L2 socialization is a process where one learns to use his or her target language and shares what Anderson (1991) calls imagined communities
with the other speakers through mediating functions of language ideology (Kroskrity, 2004). As Gal (1998) and Irvine and Gal (2000) explain in the process of ideological differentiation—which is achieved through the process of iconization, recursiveness and erasure—close examination of language practices by members of a particular group may be diverse in their uses of language; however the members may ignore the internal differences to distinguish themselves from other communities. The contrast between “them” and “us” is realized through the iconization of particular features of language and simplifying the nature of the groups based on the iconized characteristics. Moreover, the contrast between insiders and outsiders create an image of homogeneity.

In the context of L2 socialization, the notion of imagined communities has dual implications (cf. Silverstein, 2000). One is the Whorfian sense of worldviews where using the same patterns of speech in habitual practices realizes the same beliefs and values. It is also a space where imagined communities are realized through the assumptions of homogeneity within the group of the same language variety. On the other hand, imagined communities are also the product of Foucauldian discourses as Anderson (1991) argues over the consciousness of a nation through mass printing technology based on the development of capitalism. While Silverstein (2000) points out that Anderson’s Foucauldian position shares the same aspect with Whorf’s position, this study separates two views to consider the sources that construct these worldviews. One assumes that development of learners’ language ideology derives from behavioral practices in interaction with others whereas the other considers the development of particular views as the product of others’ explicit evaluations.
As the metalinguistic and metapragmatic evaluations of a language and language users are important in the construction of the image of homogeneous speech communities, Blommaert’s (2006) “artifactual” view of language is relevant in this study. It is “a view in which language is seen as a manipulable, bounded artifact consisting of (grammatical) ‘structures’ with a clear function, denotation” (p. 512). This framework provides this study with an analytical lens for Japanese sojourners’ agencies in selecting L2 contexts. Whereas language is spoken and written to convey one’s communicative intent, people also talk about a language in society. English is a most commonly discussed foreign language in Japan where it is used as an object to index the users of the language with symbolic relationship mediating between particular social beliefs and users of the language.

Discourses about a language, rather than in a language, give indexical characteristics to its users. The discourses are not only found in public domains. Academia is also not free from constructing discourses about English. For example, L2 motivation studies often use questionnaires that treat English as a system rather than focusing on specific features (e.g., Taguchi, Magid, & Papi, 2009; Yashima, 2002). Some studies on loanwords in Japan attach youthfulness and modernity to English loanwords (e.g., Kay, 1995; Takashi, 1990). The social psychological studies on the images of bilingual speakers and the images of languages in bilingual societies, so-called ethnolinguistic vitality (e.g., Allard & Landry, 1986; Kondo, 1998), also construct the discourses about English with their statistical corroborations while treating English itself as an abstract, all-encompassing linguistic system. Although I am not criticizing the discourses of academia, I find that it is important to investigate the relationship between
these academic discourses and ideologies among L2 learning since academia is not separated from L2 learners.

2.6.4. Identity

Ideologies of language are also tied with the identities of speakers (Kroskrity, 2004). How speakers choose particular features of language in a particular context indicates how they view themselves in relation to others in a specific time and setting. Block (2007) reviews identity-related studies in the field of second/additional language learning where he argues that the multi-layered and interrelated nature of categorical identities does not give researchers stable grounds for analysis.

As individuals make their way through the world around them, they are forever inhabiting and having attributed to them new and emergent subject positions that call into question constructs commonly used by researchers, such as gendered identity or national identity. (Block, 2007, p. 187)

In this respect, scholars with poststructural feminist positions (e.g., Peirce, 1995; Weedon, 1997) argue for the multiplicity and frequently changing identities in language learning and language use. In this framework, multiple ideology-embedded discourses about language, speakers, and other components of context affect speakers’ conscious and unconscious uses of language. While the research methodology to approach L2 speakers’ identity vary such as narrative analysis (e.g., Norton, 2000) and discourse analysis (e.g., Kramsch, 2000), the notion of non-fixed, multiple identities in contrast to traditional “Western” understanding of selves with fixed and unitary core (cf. Markus & Kitayama, 1991) is widely supported in the current trend of identity-related studies (Block, 2007).
In the context of language ideology and L2 socialization, the multiplicity of identity needs more elaboration, because the concept needs to be separated from the multiplicity of social roles. An individual carries many social categories even when he or she interacts with a particular person; and as the topics of conversation change, the roles of the speakers may change. For example, when a man is talking with his wife about his job, he is talking about it as a husband of the woman, as a man in a larger social context, as a father of the couple’s son, as a son of his parents, as a subordinate of his boss, and as a newcomer to his colleagues. These roles, although he is only talking to his wife, come to his mind when the topics change and direct the conversation according to his relations with his wife. On the interpersonal level, one speaks to the other while negotiating his roles and the meanings of the roles during the interaction.

The multiplicity of identity also needs to be separated at the level of meanings in social categories. As the women who moved to another country with drastically different expectation toward their gender roles experience (e.g., Gordon, 2004), their identities become multiple as they are in contact with new ideologies about their social roles. In one social category (e.g., Japanese, Asian, student), there are different assumptions and values depending on contexts, wherein an individual experiences internal tension between the different values of the category. Even when they act in the same way, the new ideology highlights the old one to make them aware of the way they act. Different from multiple identities as social roles, this multiplicity within a role is constructed by the multiplicity of ideologies in society. Certain behavior is not noticed when one lives in a context with only one ideology; however, the behavior starts to have different meanings
from the perspective of another ideology, and as a result, different meanings about him-or herself emerge as someone who acts in that particular way (Harklau, 2000).

Finally, the multiplicity of identity should be seen at an individual level. This is where the interest of reflective interview-based studies on bilinguals identities are usually located (e.g., Kanno, 2003) and where the multiplicity of identity is emphasized in contrast to a unitary view of identity. However, this multiplicity of identity (i.e., not social roles) should not be seen as the norm in every society since it is the product of an “industrial-capitalist society that evolved in the second half of the 20th century” (Côté and Levine, 2002, p. 125). The unity of self is not much questioned in a society where cultural norms were stable and unchallenged as it is today and where external influence does not threaten the reproduction of existing social values and structure. Taking these points into consideration, this study employs an integrative approach to identity as developed by Côté and Levine (2002) to provide this study with a theoretical lens to view language ideologies and identities in L2 socialization.

Aiming to develop a comprehensive understanding of identity, Côté and Levine (2002) adopt House’s (1977) “personality and social structure perspective” which has three levels of analysis: personality, interaction, and social structure. As social psychologists, Côté and Levine point out the complementary roles between the concepts of self by Erik Erickson, a developmental psychologist, and George Herbert Mead, the founder of symbolic interactionism, and elaborate on how objective and subjective dimensions are interrelated in the personal and social realms which are mediated by interaction. Their attempt to integrate Freudian psychoanalytic tradition—even though they discard Freud’s original concepts of id and ego—with sociological views of identity
allow them to illustrate identity in six dimensions crossed by subjective-objective and personal-interactional-social dimensions (see Figure 2).

Figure 2 Social psychological model of identity (adopted from Côté & Levine, 2002)

Côté and Levine (2002) further analyze this model according to types of society, namely, pre-modern, early modern and late modern, to give an explanation on the multiplicity of identities in late modern society. While Côté and Levine reject postmodern elusiveness in viewing identity, they attribute the multiplicity of identity to constantly transforming values and environments where an individual resides. Their framework rejects Freudian notions of id and ego as consistent and unitary identity, but accepts relatively stable sense of self or “ego identity” in a stable, pre-modern society. In this society, division of labor is not questioned by outside values aiming to maintain conventional social structures. Although one’s historically constructed sense of self is
comparatively stable through reflection, contradictory values in rapidly transforming society affect the construction of ego identity to produce multiple and contradictory senses of self.

At the level of ego identity, these late modern trends can affect people’s sense of continuity in a variety of ways … they become identity diffused, with no real sense of inner continuity based on their ego synthetic and ego executive abilities. Instead, they look to others to synthesize information about the world and tell them how to behave—they become passive rather than active. Accordingly, identity formation processes often involve a process of “discovery,” not of anything from “within” the person but of identity markers outside the person. (Côté & Levine, 2002, p. 138)

Although the poststructural approach and Côté & Levine’s social psychological approach both espouse multiplicity of identity, this study adopts the latter since it is less elusive and more suitable for the analysis of individuals in relation to society.

The current study employs Côté and Levine’s (2002) social psychological integrated framework to approach Japanese middle school students’ beliefs and values of English in L2 development in the U.S. Through reflective practices, it was assumed that the students historically developed their sense about themselves in relation to English and to particular features of English. The reflective selves (i.e., ego identity in Côté and Levine’s framework) would emerge in the interviews with the researcher in the form of narratives. However, the identities in interviews might not perfectly correspond to what the students felt about themselves when they were alone because the identities that emerged in reflective interviews were, strictly speaking, personal identity. However, the
stories had been channeled through their reflection, and thus the values and beliefs in the stories should be considered to have developed in the students’ living history. There might be stories that did not emerge in the interviews because the interviewees were faced with an adult male interviewer; however, the stories that did emerge were assumed to represent the students’ ego identity with modifications in the face of the researcher.

In sum, the theoretical framework explains that language ideologies and identities are connected at the level of social identity where various discourses in society about the characteristics of language index particular social categories in the structures of society, and social identities are multiple as there are multiple discourses in society. Whereas individual constituents of a society take in the same discourses, their assumptions about social identities are not necessarily the same because of historical differences. The two individuals meet and interact with each other; they bring different assumptions about particular social identities and negotiate meanings through interaction. According to their relationship with the other speakers, each person presents their personal identities. However, what is presented in the interaction does not necessarily match what one feels he or she truly is, and the feeling of his or her true self is a form of ego identity. From an outsider’s view, what the person really feels is considered to be one’s personality although this may only be accessible to psychoanalysts because we usually see someone in personal interactions as the presentation of his or her identities.
Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1. Introduction

The current study, which investigates Japanese expatriate students’ second language development in the U.S., consists of two parts. First of all this study aimed to understand the nature of linguistic ecology associated with Japanese students’ L2 development through reflective interviews. Second, observation at a specific site focused on the linguistic environment outside the classroom. The combination of interviews and observation was intended to describe the world where Japanese expatriate students lived during their stay in the U.S. The interviews and observation approached the values and beliefs in English that the Japanese students came to have through a variety of contacts with English and its speakers.

3.2 Participants

3.2.1. Japanese middle school students in the U.S.

Six Japanese middle school students—Ryu, Shoji, Yasushi, Daisuke, Chisa, and Noriko (all pseudonyms)—participated in this study (Table 1). All of them had stayed in the Midwestern United States for more than 3 years planning on returning to Japan at some point in the near future. Although there was a range of Japanese expatriate students in the U.S., from Kindergarten to Grade 12 and college, middle school students were chosen because of the following reasons.
First of all, it was preferred that participants were not old enough to have received English instruction at school before coming to the U.S. because such an experience of English learning would affect their views toward English by dominant discourses in the Japanese education system, which would complicate the interpretation of their views about English. Although some elementary schools in Japan had started to teach English experimentally, English instruction in primary education was still controversial and the majority of elementary school students had little exposure to English at school before they come to the U.S. All of my participants in middle schools came to the U.S. when they were between the fourth and sixth grades, and they had not received regular English instruction at the elementary school level prior to their arrival.

Table 1
Japanese middle school students in the U.S. in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students (Pseudonym)</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Middle School (Pseudonym)</th>
<th>Arrival to US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ryu</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hillsdale</td>
<td>Sum. 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoji</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Apr. 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasushi(^4)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>Apr. 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisuke</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>Sep. 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisa</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>Apr. 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noriko</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>Apr. 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Japanese middle school students in the U.S. in this study

Second, the participants should be old enough to be able to express themselves in either language since this study primarily relies on interviews to understand the participants’ worldviews. The participants needed to be able to describe their world and

---

\(^3\) English was introduced to elementary education in Grade 5 and 6 in 2011.

\(^4\) Yasushi was enrolled in one grade below his fellow students because of his and his parents’ concerns over language at school. Daisuke was one grade below Yasushi in Japan.
their views in interviews. In this regard, my casual conversations with Shoji, one of the
participants, prior to this study convinced me that Japanese middle school students were
mature enough to express themselves with regard to their worldviews and their social
networks.

Third, although this study focuses on sojourners who bridge two countries’
present and future, I was also interested in how the sojourners’ lives were applicable to
foreign language education in Japan. In this regard, I thought the experiences of Japanese
middle school students in the U.S. would be informative of ecological concerns in EFL,
because ecological perspectives would contribute to developing curricula, programs and
distributing finance to fund supportive materials and environment\(^5\). Furthermore,
students’ sociolinguistic identity and the language used in classes are important elements
to consider even in EFL contexts. For example, Taron and Swain (1995) raise the
difficulty for adolescent students in immersion classes in using target language in non-
instructional, informal settings. Thus it is important to explore what aspects of language
would be sociolinguistically effective in the development of English for adolescent
students.

Lastly, different from the US education system, high school education is not
compulsory in Japan where Japanese middle school students are expected to take
entrance examinations to enter high school. From the findings on Japanese expatriate
students in the U.S. (e.g., Langager, 2001, 2010; Minoura, 1984), it was expected that the

\(^5\) One example of the finance issue is often seen in the area of extensive reading since
reading materials are usually costly and few classes can provide plentiful reading
resources to the students at their casual use, which is argued as an important element for
L2 acquisition (Krashen, 1982).
hurdle would add extra values to learning English encouraging additional efforts and agentive selections of language environments during their stay. It was also expected that such struggles and selections would enrich the description of the students’ language socialization experiences.

I recruited participants through my personal network. First, I asked two students, Shoji and Yasushi, whom I tutored before the study, to participate in this study. I also asked the boys and their parents to introduce me to their friends in their networks. After I started interviewing with the two boys, Yasushi’s mother introduced me to Daisuke’s mother. Both Daisuke and his mother accepted my request to participate in the study. Two months later, Daisuke’s mother introduced me to Ryu’s mother who was looking for a tutor. After a few weeks of tutoring, I asked Ryu and his mother if they wanted to participate in the study and they accepted. Five months after I started the interviews with Yasushi and Shoji, Yasushi’s mother introduced me to a mother of two sisters, Chisa and Noriko, when they briefly needed a substitute tutor. I asked the sisters and their mother to be part of this study for the interviews only, as they were leaving the country in two months, and they accepted. In short, all the students except Shoji were connected to the network of Yasushi’s mother (see Figure 3).
There were several potential participants who did not choose to participate in the study. Two boys were too busy for weekly interviews because of their regular after-school activities and supplementary education including private tutoring. One girl declined the request when Chisa and Noriko’s mother tried to introduce me to her. A boy in Grade 6, to whom Shoji’s mother wanted to introduce me, just arrived in the U.S. He was not suitable for the objective of this study because the process of rapport building would probably affect greatly the values and beliefs if participants were new to the environment. Due to these reasons, this study focused on six Japanese middle school students. Partly because the participants came from the network which started from my

Figure 3 Network of the Japanese participants

(šíallest) represents a younger sibling. Fathers are omitted.
tutoring circle, the participants shared certain commonalities in addition to their nationality, schools, and ages. I will discuss these commonalities in chapter 4.

3.2.2. Non-Japanese students at lunch table

In addition to the Japanese middle school students and their mothers, this study involved another set of participants for observation. While the Japanese students and their mothers participated in interviews about their lives in the U.S., the second part of this study focuses on Shoji, one of the Japanese students, and his non-Japanese friends at school. The other Japanese students were not observed at school because either they or their school rejected my request. To understand how Japanese middle school students use English in conversation, I asked the participants to allow me to visit them during lunch periods so that I could watch and audio-record their conversations with their friends. However, this attempt was nearly unsuccessful. Daisuke and Yasushi did not want me to observe their conversations at school. Chisa and Noriko told me that they spoke almost no English during lunch periods at that time.

Ryu did not mind me visiting his school although he told me he did not talk much during lunch periods. However, his school did not welcome a researcher before the state test, and the test was over in the middle of April, only a month before the school year finishes. Thus I had access only to Shoji’s school and his peers at their lunch table. After asking Shoji to tell his peers that I was going to ask them for participation, I visited the school and explained the study to the students at Shoji’s lunch table. Then, I gave them assent and consent forms, corresponded with their parents over the phone and by email, and obtained their permission.
There were four non-Japanese male students—Andrew, Casper, David, and Manuel (all pseudonyms)—who were at the same table with Shoji. There was no female student at the table. Except for Manuel, all other students were native to the area, without ever living outside the state where they were born. Their parents had a little knowledge of Spanish or French as a foreign language, which they learned in their school days, but they did not use the language at home. Manuel was a son of Mexican parents who immigrated to the U.S. when he was in grade 2. Manuel got out of ESL when he was still in elementary school before Shoji came to the U.S. in Grade 5. Manuel was Shoji’s closest non-Japanese friend since Shoji came to the U.S. three years before. I will discuss in detail the relationship among the students that I observed at the lunch table in Chapter 6.

Because this study recruited participants through personal networks rather than through a given class, I was faced with certain difficulties in accessing and obtaining permission from the participants (see Figure 4). It might have been easier if this study had started in a specific classroom with a specific group of students in it. However, I avoided employing classes because I was concerned that the Japanese students might resist participating if they thought I had connections with their teachers. Moreover, I thought schools might not like a researcher’s presence since I was sensitive to the fact that I was there at a time when the results of standardized tests had begun to be reflected in schools’ budgets and the hiring and firing of staff. With such considerations in mind, I tried to clear the hurdles and it was fortunate that I had at least one group of participants at lunch table.
3.3. Data collection procedure

Data collection in this study consisted of two parts. The first part was the collection of narratives through interviews with Japanese middle school students about their lives in the United States, with a special focus on their learning of English. The second part was the observation and audio-recording of their actual uses of English during their lunch breaks. I aimed to understand how Japanese expatriate students learn English in American society even though they were expected to return to Japan. From the
perspective of language ecology in second language socialization (cf. Kramsch, 2002), it would be ideal for this study if I was able to follow the students 24/7 from the moment they came to the U.S. until they leave the country, recording all their conversations with everybody; however, such an approach would be practically impossible to apply and ethically problematic. Thus this study necessarily relied on reflective interviews and partial observations of the students’ linguistic experiences. This study focuses on students’ informal and out-of-class linguistic experiences as a specific site for observation because many past studies conducted microgenetic investigations about ESL students’ learning in a classroom setting in addition to the reasons for excluding classroom discussed earlier.

Because the present study focuses on ecology where Japanese expatriate students learned and used English and looks at their views toward language and their world, ethnography of communication (Hymes, 1972; Saville-Troike, 2003) was considered an appropriate methodological approach for data collection. Since ethnography is about description of a particular group of people, this study also had an assumption that the participants were in the same group. The life styles of sojourner families, their first language, and their social system in which they grew up before coming to the U.S. were assumed to have broadly common features. Although living separately in the U.S., it was expected that they had contact with each other directly and indirectly through the use of the Japanese language, exchanging information unique to their group, and accessing to common information.

3.3.1. Ethnography of communication
Saville-Troike (2003) explains that ethnography of communication, which directed toward building global metatheory of human communication, intends to understand and describe the “communicative behavior in special cultural settings” (pp. 1-2). Through longitudinal participant observation, ethnographers of communication stay in the community under study to understand the linguistic practices among the constituents of the community, whereby they describe various features of communication. In short, the work of an ethnographer of communication is to understand the linguistic culture of the community under study by participating in the community and observing their practices. In the process of learning the values as well as the language practices in the community, ethnographers, critically conscious of their assumptions in their own cultures, will see the world through the use of the language in the group under study (cf. Whorf, 1956/2001). Geertz (1973) argues that doing ethnography means “testing the validity of one’s perceptions against the intuitions of natives” (p. 3), and illustrates the cultural ways of communication through “thick description” (Geertz, 1988), namely, “the provision of ‘rich’ details of cultural scenes … through which the reader can develop a strong sense of the particular realities involved” (Goldbart & Hustler, 2005, p. 17).

3.3.1.1. Speech community

As a unit of analysis in the ethnography of communication, Hymes (1972) introduces the concept “speech community.” Contrary to the popular view of community as a homogeneous entity as depicted in the criticisms against the ethnographic and sociolinguistic work that employs this notion, a speech community assumes linguistic and social diversity and is analytically more imagined than the real (Keating, 2001; Pratt, 1987). While the ethnography of communication aims to describe certain features of
language use in a particular group, it is not simple to determine to which linguistic communities the participants belong, especially considering the highly developed technology and transnational migration in the world today. Saville-Troike (2003), for example, points out that “[t]he essential criterion for ‘community’ is that some significant dimension of experience be shared, and for ‘speech community’ that the shared dimension be related to ways in which members of the group use, values, or interpret language” (p. 15).

While geographical proximity does not necessarily presuppose the membership in the same speech community for speakers in the neighborhood, even family members may belong to different speech communities if they lived apart as they grew up. Being a member of a categorical group, such as students in a particular school or nationality, does not automatically mean he or she is a full member of a specific speech community “since membership depends upon the shared knowledge of rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech” (Williams, 1992, p. 181). Although people can share knowledge of rules and interpretation of language, the assumption of homogeneous speech community still entails a problem. A person may share one feature of language, such as morphemes, with the others but may show differences in other features, such as phonemes. Such within-individual inconsistency can be found after investigation rather than prior to the initiation of an ethnographic study. A “native speaker” of English, in this regard, does not presuppose that they belong to the same speech community on all levels. Although monolingual speakers of English who grow up in relatively close areas may be in the same speech community at one level, in that they were using the same linguistic code (i.e., English) to communicate with each other, it does not necessarily mean that
they share “the same understandings of its use and meanings in various contexts” (Keating, 2001, p. 288)—for example, phonologically and morphologically.

Therefore, it is best to assume in this study that an individual is “a member of more than one speech community—often to different degrees” (Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 21) whereby the forces to accommodate within each society and the freedom to oppose the norms are politically and ideologically intricate (e.g., Eckert, 2000; Heller, 1999; Rampton, 1995) due to the contact with a variety of language use—for example, daily interaction with a variety of friends and adults, watching attractive actors talking each other on TV, or chatting with somebody in other parts of the world without directly seeing them online, and so on. Taking this intricacy into consideration, this study employs Duranti’s (1997) definition of speech community as “the product of the communicative activities engaged in by a given group of people” (p. 82) to frame the linguistic practices by the variety of speakers.

However, this does not mean that the six Japanese expatriate students were in the same speech community in this study because they did not have direct contact with each other. According to Duranti’s definition, this study considers the five boys including Shoji at the lunch table as constituents of a speech community. Although the boys had different linguistic backgrounds, they constructed a speech community through their daily interactions during lunch breaks. When speech community is viewed in this way, another important notion in language development, communicative competence, also has to take the diversity of speakers into consideration.

3.3.1.2. Communicative competence
Among the various concepts in the ethnography of communication, communicative competence is one of the keys to understand the linguistic culture of a particular group. Although the notion has been explored differently with a variety of elements in linguistic anthropology (e.g., Philips, 1970/2001) as well as second language education (e.g., Bachman, 1990; Canal & Swain, 1980; Celce-Murcia, 2007; Kim, 1991; Kramsch, 2006; Wulf, 2010), the basic tenet of communicative competence is summarized as follows:

Communicative competence involves knowing not only the language code but also what to say to whom, and what to say to whom, and how to say it appropriately in any given situation. Further, it involves the social and cultural knowledge speakers are presumed to have which enables them to use and interpret linguistic forms. (Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 18)

As seen in this tenet, the conventional notion of communicative competence requires a certain degree of essentialization. That is, while Hymes advocates linguistic diversity in a community, particular abilities and practices are assumed to be shared among community members. Especially in the context of second language acquisition, such broad essentialization in the dichotomy between native and non-native speakers has often been criticized (e.g., Davies, 1995, 2004; Higgins, 2003). Although categories such as native vs. non-native, American vs. Japanese, etc. give individual learners their grounds for their identities, poststructural positions (e.g., Weedon, 1997) oppose static and monolithic views of identity as discussed in chapter 2. In other words, communicative competence is measured based on a homogenized image of a speech community, where different speakers share their images of “appropriate” linguistic behaviors. Because of this
association with imagination, it is important to understand how individual speakers and learners conceive of their world.

3.3.2. Ethnographic interviews

In the first part of this study, ethnographic interviews (Spradley, 1979) were conducted with six Japanese middle school students in the U.S. The interviews were unstructured and reflective, and they aimed to obtain information about how the participants lived in what kind of environment through using English. Interview was the best available method to obtain the information in light of the objectives of this study; that is, to holistically describe the Japanese expatriate students’ experiences in the U.S. rather than microgenetically limiting the study to one setting such as a classroom. It would have been ideal if a researcher could follow the students everywhere in and out of school, checking who they meet and talk with, what they watch and read, and what they write to describe the totality of their experiences; however, such an approach is not realistic due to privacy and practicality. Therefore, as an available way of investigation, I visited the students at home every week to elicit the information about their life and inquired about everything that had anything to do with English and their thoughts and feelings toward the events. While I was ready to conduct interviews in English, all the students felt more comfortable with answering the questions in Japanese. Thus all the interviews with Japanese participants were conducted all in Japanese.

In the first interview (Appendix B), I asked the students about their background information such as how long they had stayed in the U.S. and who their close friends were. I also asked their mothers about their children’s backgrounds (Appendix E). From the second interview, I only asked the students about their linguistic experiences in the
past week. The interviews, which were conducted mostly in a casual and friendly manner, generally started with questions, “How was your last week?” “When and how did you use English?” These questions allowed me to explore the students’ linguistic experiences. With these general questions, I expected that the students would describe their experiences freely, especially if they had special episodes to tell me. I had the students describe the details that went along with my research questions. I often asked the students for clarifications and delineation after confirming what they said in their answers. Because I found that the students sometimes interpreted “use English” (Eigo o tsukau) narrowly i.e., limiting it to formal situations, I often asked about their experiences specifically such as on “answering the phone,” “watching TV,” “reading something,” “listening to people talk,” etc. in later interviews.

I needed to build rapport with the participants since the purpose of the interviews was to phenomenologically understand the world for the Japanese participants from their viewpoints—i.e., “direct approach” in Titchen & Hobson (2005)—rather than the world constructed by “objective” numbers and statistical measurements. Through the interviews, I tried to “take the role of the respondents and attempt to see the situation from their viewpoint, rather than superimpose his or her world of academia and preconceptions upon them” (Fontana & Frey, 2000, p. 655). Except for first two students, the participants did not know me for long; therefore, I needed to establish rapport with them almost from the beginning primarily through interviews.

However, it was not always easy to maintain the friendly relationship as Fontana and Frey (2000) point out:
Gaining trust is essential to the success of the interviews and, once gained, trust can still be very fragile. Any faux pas by the researcher may destroy days, weeks, or months of painfully gained trust. (p. 655)

The Japanese middle school students were sometimes tired with their homework and busy with after-school activities, and their moods were not constant during the interviews. When I noticed the students’ fatigue, I sometimes had to terminate interviews earlier than I had planned or did not go deep enough for clarification to prioritize the rapport in the long run. The participants’ gender and age also added difficulty to such fragility in the relationship. I was aware of the potential differences in the quality of responses due to my age and gender. Particularly, gender seemed to have negative effects on eliciting information from girls about their networks of friends. Boys did not seem to care so much about my gender and I was able to maintain a relatively casual and friendly relationship with them. But my age seemed to matter for Yasushi, who did not share much information with me. As is often the case for Japanese boys in the puberty phase, Yasushi did not talk much to his mother either and his mother was worried if he was contributing to the study. Because Yasushi answered very softly and succinctly, usually with one word or two, I sometimes needed to ask him to repeat his answers to understand him which was probably annoying to him.

As for the other participants, my identity as a tutor (or “sensei” in Japanese with a more authoritative tone) and my identity as a researcher sometimes conflicted except for Daisuke. However, the conflict also enriched my understanding of their responses by having them familiarize with my multiple identities, including being graduate student. In the long run, exposing my different identities to the students was helpful in keeping a
close and casual relationship with them. Developing a close relationship with the students had one drawback. Because one week between interviews was a short time for the busy students in a rather monotonous life, some participants started to assume that they had already said everything that they had to say. While some information came out of the students repeatedly without difficulty, some students, especially Ryu and Yasushi, seemed to find it bothersome to repeat what they had already talked about in previous interviews where they often tried to omit their daily routines by saying, “same as ever (itsumo to onaji).”

3.3.3. Participant observation to unstructured and semi-structured observation

Because it was realistically not possible to follow a teenager everywhere all the time, this study needed to select a site for regular observations where the teenagers used English for communication. In addition to the literature (Minoura, 1984), my informal conversations with Shoji prior to the study and with some parents and students when I taught at a Japanese Saturday school informed me that lunch period was the best possible site for continuous observation of Japanese expatriate students’ informal conversations in English. Other sites, such as socializing opportunities with friends after school, were not suitable for regular observation since teenagers usually have such opportunities irregularly and even if I had a chance to be there, data collection required each friend’s assent as well as their parents’ consents. In this manner, it would be unrealistic for me to be there to collect data, considering the possibility of refusal of participation while they have fun with their friends.

Although classes, mainstream and ESL, could have been chosen as sites of observation, this study avoided including them for its data collection. There was mainly a
methodological concern for not including the classroom in this study. The request needed to be as easy as possible for the schools to accept it because this study had to recruit participants first and then requested each student’s school for cooperation. In other words, I tried to give the schools as little pressure as possible because schools constantly face official evaluation in the policy of “No child left behind”. I also wanted to avoid giving them any impression of criticizing “American education” as an international graduate student from Japan. Nevertheless, Ryu’s school rejected my request and asked me to wait until they finish the state test. This deferment made me give up conducting observations at the school as there was little time left before Ryu’s graduation.

Observation at lunch periods was planned when the Japanese participants had weekly interviews. Due to rejections and limitations, I was able to conduct observation for only Shoji and his friends at their lunch table. After obtaining approval from the school, I visited Shoji’s school at a lunch period, introduced myself to the teachers who sat on the front stage for “mob control.” At first, I positioned myself in the corner to see the whole cafeteria where students had lunch. After a week of unstructured observations (Jones & Somekh, 2005) in the cafeteria, I told Shoji to tell the other students at the table that I was going to ask for their participation. In the next visit, I went to their table to explain my study to the non-Japanese students and gave each boy an assent form and a consent form. Corresponding with their parents via email or by the phone to obtain their permission to include their children in my study, I continued to conduct unstructured observations at the cafeteria until I obtained the consent forms from the parents. My observations included watching how students in the room formed groups, how they talked within and across tables, how teachers interacted with students, and how lunch
time was organized. I also got a sense of the physical descriptions of the room, such as the location and shapes of tables, etc.

I first visited Shoji’s school in the first week of November, 2009 and started my audio-recording in the middle of December. Since I had learned that Shoji was going to return to Japan at the end of March, 2010, I intensified my visits to the school at a rate of three to four times a week to audio-record conversations conducted at the lunch table; however, I did not visit them five days a week because I was ethically concerned about “intrusive” aspects of an ethnographer (Angrosino & Mays de Pérez, 2000, for detailed discussion). More specifically, I was concerned about the possibility of interrupting natural flows of interactions among friends. Because the interactions among middle school students at lunch period were dynamic, the students often dropped by the tables of their friends and talked with them. In fact, during the unstructured observation period, I found Shoji visiting another table for several minutes, and other students came by the table and went away after a brief chat. I thought audio-recording could hinder the students’ constant reconstruction of their network of friends because other students may not easily talk to audio-recorded students. Due to this concern, I left one or two days a week without the intervention of a researcher.

After collecting the students’ assents and their parents’ consents, I gave each student a lapel microphone so that their individual utterances were recorded. Because the room was noisy, it was not enough to leave a microphone on their table and to give Shoji
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6 In reality, other students went to three directions. Whereas some students noticed the recording (e.g., Casper, Carl) and avoided Shoji during audio-recording sessions for the initial period, other students were interested in audio-recording, actively talking to Shoji and speaking into his microphone. The majority of the students did not notice the recording or were not concerned about it.
his microphone to record everyone at the table. Although my initial plan was to conduct participant observation by sitting with the students at the same table listening to their conversation, my first attempt made the participants at the table too nervous to talk because of an Asian adult researcher’s presence at the center of the cafeteria among a largely white young students’ population. I also felt awkward with the other students’ curiosity and the silence at the table. Because of this difficulty, I chose to observe the students’ interactions from a corner of the cafeteria, which was about 15 feet from the table.

I initially planned to pick the students’ voices through a microphone attached only to Shoji and one at the table; however, due to the loud noise in the cafeteria, I brought in individual microphones and audio-recorders. I used six microphones with audiorecorders—one for each boy and one at the center of the table to check the timing of the conversation as a whole and as a backup—and combined them in transcription. While I sat at the corner near the entrance of the cafeteria, I watched how the students interacted with each other, such as when who spoke to whom, and in what manner. I wrote down as much information as possible into my fieldnotes—including what I saw in the cafeteria, how other students formed groups, how they were talking and moving, and how teachers interacted with students. The fieldnotes of each observation also included my impressionistic comments before and after each observation. I was aware of the nature of fieldnotes being selective and incomplete since they represented events that I observed and found significant (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995, p. 353). Thus the representations in my fieldnotes also needed critical examination in the stage of data analysis.

3.4. Timeline for the study
I interviewed the Japanese participants largely in the same period, but due to various reasons, the duration of the interviews were not exactly the same. Because I knew Shoji and Yasushi prior to the study, I was able to start interviewing them once I obtained IRB permission, assent from the students, and consent and permission from their parents. I started to interview other participants later. Although I knew that Shoji and Yasushi were going back to Japan in March, 2010, the administrative work and IRB screening process took an unexpectedly long time, for almost eight weeks in total. I therefore could not start the interviews and observations as early as I had expected. As for observations and audio-recording, it took an extra month to obtain consent forms from non-Japanese parents, and I had to wait until December. In the meantime, I kept doing general observations at the cafeteria. Since Shoji returned to Japan at the end of March, 2010, I was able to audio-record the peer conversation for about four months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Started</th>
<th>Ended</th>
<th>Returned to Japan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoji</td>
<td>October, 2009</td>
<td>March, 2010</td>
<td>March, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasushi</td>
<td>October, 2009</td>
<td>March, 2010</td>
<td>March, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisuke</td>
<td>November, 2009</td>
<td>June, 2010</td>
<td>Not decided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryu</td>
<td>January, 2010</td>
<td>May, 2010</td>
<td>Not decided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisa</td>
<td>March, 2010</td>
<td>May, 2010</td>
<td>May, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noriko</td>
<td>March, 2010</td>
<td>May, 2010</td>
<td>May, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunchtime</td>
<td>November, 2009</td>
<td>May, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observation</td>
<td>(Audio-recording</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Only Shoji)</td>
<td>December, 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Periods of participation

3.5. Data set

The main data consisted of (a) 26 hours of interviews; (b) 13 hours of audio-recorded peer conversation; (c) ethnographic fieldnotes; (d) 80 photos at Shoji’s school (not including people); (e) 150 photos of students’ works and textbooks; (f) school and
local demographics available online, and (g) other. I transcribed 56 audio-recorded interviews with a total of 14 participants (see Table 3) in English if the interview was conducted in English and in Japanese if it was held in Japanese. Interviews were not conducted equally for every student partly due to their schedule for return (Chisa and Noriko) and partly due to over-consciousness about recorded interviews (Yasushi).

Mothers and non-Japanese students were interviewed only once for their background information and their views. Andrew could not participate in the interview because his mother was hospitalized during the study and it was difficult to make contact with him after school. Interviewing him at school was not possible due to his tight schedule as well as his unwillingness to do so. Therefore, I collected part of Andrew’s information from Shoji. All the interviews with Japanese participants were conducted in Japanese and transcribed in Japanese. For adults and non-Japanese participants, the interview questions were asked as they were. But for the Japanese students, the questions in the list were usually followed by other open questions for clarification and delineation because the young students’ responses tended to be short and lacking in detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ names</th>
<th>Japanese students</th>
<th>Mothers</th>
<th>Non-Japanese students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Times</td>
<td>length</td>
<td>times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>180min</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noriko</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>180min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasushi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70min</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisuke</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>290min</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryu</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>290min</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoji</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>240min</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Audio-recorded interviews with the participants

I also selectively transcribed 33 twenty-five-minute audio-recorded peer group conversations following Gumperz and Brentz’s (1993) transcription notation (Appendix
A). Not all parts of the recordings were transcribed primarily because the study focused on the Japanese students’ use of English and secondarily because the recordings sometimes contained interactions with non-participating students who were not supposed to be analyzed. Since each student carried his microphone and audio-recorder, Shoji’s utterances were all separately transcribed to see how he spoke English. Then, the table recorder and other students’ recorders were also selectively transcribed mainly to complete the interactions between Shoji and other students. The quality of sound in the noisy cafeteria hindered the transcription process at times; however, individual microphones helped me to fill in the missing parts and inaudible utterances picked up by the table microphone. Since the table recorder sometimes could not show clearly who said what, individual recordings of the other students were greatly helpful in confirming each student’s utterances.

Since transcribing acoustic information onto paper had limitations, the transcribed information was necessarily selective (Green, Franquiz, & Dixon, 1997; Lapadat, 2000; Oliver, Serovich, & Mason, 2005; Tannen, 2007). Therefore, much tonal information was lost in the transcription which otherwise might have been described (Erickson, 2004). Since pronunciation in English was one of the highly value-laden aspects for Japanese learners of English, the analysis of the transcription was conducted while I listened to the audio-recording with a sound editing computer program that visually projected, the wavelengths of the sounds. The transcription was combined with the information on my fieldnotes mainly to confirm who was talking to whom and whether the others were paying attention to the speaker or not (i.e., personal vs. group conversation). While the
students’ interactions were thus analyzed, the differences of language across the students were also examined to understand the nature of communicative competence at the table.

A preliminary analysis of fully transcribed three typical days encouraged me to focus on the interaction with self- and other-initiated repair (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977), particularly other-initiated repair with “what” and “huh.” These cues for other-initiated repair are important in my study because they indicate the gap of understanding between the speaker and the listener. Considering that language socialization is acquiring other members’ language practices and language ideologies, modifying one’s utterances according to other members’ cues of non-understanding can be an emergence of language socialization even though there is no explicit teaching in hierarchical relationship. This is based on an assumption that two speakers in the completely same speech community would not need to modify their utterances when the listener missed what the speaker said and even if the speaker does modify his utterance, the modification should be different from the ones by the speakers in different speech communities.

Ethnographic fieldnotes played an important role for data collection as I often had small conversations with Japanese parents, ranging from five to fifteen minutes, after I finished interviews with their children. The Japanese mothers sometimes wanted, after the initial interviews with them, to add information by briefly introducing me to recent events and happenings. When the Japanese fathers happened to be at home, some of them showed interest in what I was doing and expressed their views about their children’s education and development. I jotted down the information after I left the houses. In addition to what happened during my visit to the school and the Japanese students’ homes,
what the Japanese parents told me about their life in those casual conversations was included in the fieldnotes.

3.6. Data analysis

Since weekly interviews with the Japanese students were conducted in Japanese, I transcribed these conversations in Japanese but transcribed the peer conversations in English for detailed analysis based on format provided by Gumperz and Brentz (1993) (Appendix A). The interview transcripts were examined together with fieldnotes through grounded theory strategies (Charmaz, 2000) so I could find general themes, commonalities across the Japanese participants with open and line-by-line codings and memo writing. Moreover, I looked for chronological changes within one student through repetitive readings of the whole data (Emerson, Frez, & Shaw, 1995; Spradley, 1979). The themes were primarily built around the students’ interactions with people speaking English or any physical objects that contained English. In addition to the students’ communicative experiences with people around them, the students’ references to physical objects in the interviews helped me understand the linguistic environment in which the students lived.

Although this study is separated in two parts and the first part is based on interviews, this study as a whole employed discourse analysis (Erickson, 2004; Faircough, 1992; Heller, 2001) as an analytical perspective. While there are a variety of approaches to “discourse” and “discourse analysis” (Fairclough, 1992; Schiffrin, Tannen, & Hamilton, 2001), discourse analysis (in contrast to conversation analysis; see Wooffitt, 2005) generally looks at the social roles in one’s discourses and attempts to find the links between the micro (i.e., local use of language) and macro (i.e., ideological assumptions in
the society where language is used), by bringing “other sources of data to bear on the analysis of interactional data” (Heller, 2001, p. 252). As Erickson (2004) describes, “[l]anguage is a cultural tool for the work of speaking and of understanding what others are saying” (p. 14). Analyzing the grammar and vocabulary of a language leads to an understanding of the society where the language is used in daily interactions among its constituents. In the patterned uses of a language in various social situations, “we are saying something to someone and doing so with particular purposes in a particular moment and in particular relationships with those we are talking to then” (p. 16).

However, it is not only grammar and vocabulary that need analysis. People in interaction express their emotions in addition to their ideas in a variety of behaviors. Laughter, for example, is not a linguistic element but it contributes to the construction of meanings in interaction. By creatively exploiting linguistic and discursive resources, social actors “accomplish local as well as long-term goals, whether consciously or not” (Heller, 2001, p. 261). Behind the use of those non-linguistic resources, there are ideologies in society concerning how the resources should be used in a specific context. In this regard, I found Fairclough’s (1992) three-dimensional framework of discourse particularly helpful in viewing the students’ linguistic experiences in society. As Fairclough attempts to combine “social-theoretical sense of ‘discourse’ with the ‘text-and-interaction’ sense in linguistically oriented discourse analysis” (p. 4), each of the three dimensions—discourse-as-text, discourse-as-discursive-practice, and discourse-as-social-practice—follow not only linguistic approaches to discourse but also an Foucauldian approach to “discourse as something that is produced, circulated, distributed, and consumed in society” (Blommaert, 2000, p. 448) and Gramscian and Althusserian
hegemonic concerns over the production of discourse. This integrated approach to discourse analysis was important in that it offered a critical view to examine how social space was constructed in the interactions between the Japanese students and their environment.

As for the peer conversation at lunch table focusing on the interaction between a Japanese child and non-Japanese children, this study also closely looked for differences between Shoji and the other students at the table over their uses of English. In particular, I looked for problematic communication (Gass & Varonis, 1991) and subsequent repairs because they would allow this study to see how each student was socialized into what norms—voluntarily or with external guides—in the context where there were smaller differences between the speakers than the differences in adult-infant relationship. By looking into the uses of English by middle school students in this way, this study aimed to find how Shoji used English during informal peer conversation at lunch table.

Since this ethnographic study aimed to describe the entirety of Japanese expatriate students’ L2 learning experiences in society, the analyses covered both broad views including chronological changes and microanalysis of linguistic practices. At the same time, the analysis of the ideological aspect of L2 learning aimed to describe an aspect of L2 socialization. The following chapters will illustrate these different views of L2 development in society so that the integration of these views from different angles constructs a larger picture of Japanese expatriate students’ L2 development. Chapter 4 discusses Japanese students’ opportunities for using English to illustrate their L2 ecology in the U.S. Chapter 5 examines ideological aspects of Japanese expatriate students’ L2 learning and use, and discusses how L2 socialization occurs on this level. Chapter 6 looks
into a lunch table, a site where it is not usually seen for language learning, and discusses how subtly Shoji was socialized into his peer group through casual group conversations at their lunch table.
Chapter 4: Ecology of English for Japanese middle school expatriate students in the United States

4.1. Introduction

This chapter discusses how Japanese expatriate middle school students in this study lived in the United States while learning English in their daily lives. Six middle school students from Japan who temporarily stayed in the U.S. were enrolled in local schools just as American domestic students and other children of immigrant parents did, but their eventual return to Japan after several years of stay in the U.S. allowed them to lead distinct lives from their local and immigrant counterparts. The middle school students as well as their parents had a variety of choices and constraints in their sojourns bearing in mind that English might not be a future necessity in Japan. This chapter will illustrate these students’ lives with a language socialization perspective and will discuss the complexity of their linguistic environments and their learning experiences of the dominant language.

4.2. Six Japanese middle school students

Five of six Japanese middle school students in this study came to America when they were still in elementary school, either in fourth or fifth grade. Only Chisa came in April when she was in Grade 6 in Japan, which is the final year of elementary school in
Japanese school system. She was in elementary school only for two months because Grade 6 is part of middle school in America. All of these students accompanied their fathers when Japanese companies sent those breadwinners to America for three to five years or possibly longer. At the time of this study, the boys and girls had stayed in their first country outside of Japan for three to four and a half years while they expected to return to Japan before long.

The students participating in my study were selected largely because of my personal connections. I had tutored most of the students, except for Daisuke, for half a month to ten months prior to my requests for their participation. Shoji and Yasushi had known me the longest since I started tutoring them in the fall of 2009. Before I started tutoring these two students, I had already known the circumstances for Japanese expatriate students in the area to some extent because I had taught at a Japanese Saturday school for three and a half years. I often had casual conversations with students, parents, and other teachers at the school. The school was managed by the representatives of Japanese parents in the area and a few licensed teachers from the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT or Monbu kagakusho) who acted as principals. When I was working at the Saturday school, I had opportunities to talk with the parents and teachers who were hired by the school.

Enriched by these experiences, I started to develop a relationship with the middle school students and their parents, mostly their mothers, to conduct this study. During the fieldwork and interviews, I was constantly conscious of myself as both researcher and
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Japanese school year starts in April and ends in March whereas many American schools start in late August and ends in June.
tutor since what I communicated to the students would be part of their linguistic experiences. Still, weekly reflective interviews helped me realize how these students had lived since they came to America and how they saw the world in terms of English.

Ryu

Ryu was the eldest son of a family of five who came to America due to his father’s job. Ryu’s father was an engineer for a Japanese automaker who frequently went back and forth between Japan and the U.S. With two male siblings younger than Ryu, his mother often appeared to be busy with her housework, but she put greater emphasis, compared to other families, on Ryu’s tests for certification as part of his preparation for the future in Japan. She often considered Ryu to be laid-back, and she was constantly complaining about his lack of organization and lack of serious attitude toward study.

Ryu’s house was located in a large and relatively new housing complex surrounded by huge farmlands. There was no Japanese family within a walking distance from his house. When I visited Ryu weekly in the evening, he was often playing basketball with his younger brothers in the driveway where a tall basketball post was erected in front of the garage. Being one of his two tutors, I taught Ryu math for the first month before a test to obtain certification in Japan. After the test, I continued teaching him for the Eiken test, a popular educational test of English proficiency in Japan.

When I first met Ryu in his house and judging from his very relaxed manner of talking to me, I did not have a particularly good impression about him. His Japanese sounded to me carefree although I did not find it inappropriate for a middle school student. After I taught him for a few weeks, I was impressed with his talent in math and with his pragmatic thinking. From a certain viewpoint, his emphasis on practicality may
be seen as laziness, but he tended to draw clear lines between what was useful and what was not. Because of his divided attitude between what is useful and what is useless, Ryu often enraged his mother because of his lack of organization and low grades. His reluctance to submit his homework and his messy notebooks lowered his grades in some subjects although he earned As and Bs for others. By the time of the study, Ryu had already developed a self-image of an anti-school student, which sometimes made him say that his teachers did not like him. Despite his liking math and science, he found his science classes to be very dull.

Among the six participants in this study, Ryu had the most intimate relationship with local students; however, he was at distance from his Japanese peers geographically and psychologically. This distance from his Japanese peers was not only developed through his life in America as it is often seen among early arrivals (cf. Minoura, 1984). When Ryu was still in Japan, his elementary school classmates had seen him somewhat as eccentric and he had also found some of his peers mean. Ryu’s mother was worried about his social distance in childhood when they were still in Japan and suspected that he was autistic, which his teacher in America had rejected later. When the interviews started, Ryu was already comfortable in his life in America and did not want to go back to Japan.

Interview with Ryu (RI03152010359; my translation)

1 **Shima:** How about your relationship with people?
2 **Ryu:** It’s also better in here. There are many weird people in Japan.
3 **Shima:** What are weird people like there?
4 **Ryu:** Weird people are like obnoxious
As illustrated in this interview, Ryu had negative experiences in his personal network in Japan. Although he attended Saturday school and Japanese community math school (juku) on weekends, he kept a distance from his Japanese peers and maintained a weak friendship with only a few friends at these Japanese community schools. In contrast, his preference for American society helped him maintain his network with his American peers.

Shoji

Shoji was one of the first students who participated in this study because I had tutored him for ten months before starting the study. Since it was a common practice for big Japanese companies to subsidize the education of their employees’ children overseas, Shoji had had several tutors, both Japanese and American, before I started to tutor him.
Shoji had a busy life after school—with his homework, Japanese Saturday school, juku on Sunday, and his soccer club. In a high season, he had soccer games on weekends, which meant that he had to be absent from Japanese schools.

With his parents and a ten-year-old little brother, Shoji lived in the area where there were a few, but not many, Japanese families in the neighborhood. When he came to America in his fifth grade, there was a girl who taught him how to cope with the school system. At the time of the study, he attended a middle school where there were a few Japanese students in each grade. He was often accompanied by a Japanese boy who had just come to America. In addition, his ESL teacher was also from Japan and also taught in an elementary school division at a Japanese Saturday school. The Japanese school was able to open classes in the school building with the cooperation and understanding with Shoji’s school district.

I was often impressed with Shoji’s mature ways of thinking considering he was a middle school student. He did not hesitate to talk with an adult like me in a friendly way from the beginning. He usually talked to me casually without polite forms in Japanese but he was never rude. He often saw things from more mature points of view than the other Japanese students of his age I knew. For instance, when I initially had trouble finding participants, Shoji understandingly said to me, “Middle school students are difficult” (chugakusei wa muzukashii yone). Though he was also part of the “difficult” generation, he separated himself from the rest, but he still got along with his friends, whether American or Japanese.

Shoji’s network was comparatively balanced thanks to his mild temperament and athletic abilities. However, his mother was a little worried about his friends in America.
She wondered if they might be “lower than his level” compared them with his “better” friends back in Japan. She was rather proud of him being mature and flexible in thinking even though she had some concerns about Shoji’s network of friends in America. She believed that the network of friends was important for his personal development and lamented that he would have been in touch with smarter kids if he had been in Japan.

Interview with Shoji’s mother (SMI1025200946; my translation)

1 **Shoji’s mom:** I think children make friends based on their abilities. Smart kids can share similar fun. Well, I think smart kids get together, and he [Shoji] was surely one of them when he was in Japan. He hanged around with good kids. When we came here, he first became friends with a boy who liked Japanese. He didn’t have good grades, but he was kind.

Because the boy was not good in his studies, he understood the feelings of the kid who did not understand what was going on; or maybe he had only simple vocabulary [chuckles] and he got along with Shoji. And year by year [they got closer]. I thought Shoji would “graduate” from the boy and make friends with many others. But he is having fun still in the same group [chuckles] even after he started middle school. I’m a bit worried because he may be with the kids in this group until the end of our stay [laughs].
Interestingly, the ways of categorizing friends were the same for the mother and her son.

Shoji also described some of his American friends as “too childish,” scoffing at their talk over their *Pokemon* photos on Facebook.

**Interview with Shoji (SI0204201083; my translation)**

1. **Shima:** Can you give me some examples about the cultural differences with your friends?

2. **Shoji:** When I first came here, I thought they were childish [chuckles]. Maybe I was not with very mature people but I thought they were doing something childish. I sometimes think so now, too. “What the crap [chuckles] are you doing?” Well, that’s all, I guess.

3. **Shima:** Can you explain about it a little more?

4. **Shoji:** The topics of conversation with some guys are, well, like *Pokemon* or something like that. I say to myself, “you guys are too childish,” and I have no energy to talk with them.

5. **Shima:** Is it around lunchtime?

6. **Shoji:** No. Not at lunchtime. When we spent time together, well, when we talked about Facebook, everybody in Miles

しかしたらこの子は最後までこういうグループの子たちとい続けるのかなとか、ちょっと心配なんですけど（笑い）。

友達との文化的な面での違いっていうのは、何か例が挙げられる？

いや、最初着たときはやっぱ、なんだろう、幼いな（軽い笑い）と思ったね。その何か、喋ってることも、まあ、幼いメンバーといたのかもしれないけど、なんかやってることが幼いな、と思う。ま、時々今も思うけど、くだらねえな（軽い笑い？）、お前らめっちゃ幼いぞってなって、時々話す気力もなくなると、うん、そんな感じかな。

もうちょっと具体的に掘り下げて話してくれる？

話してると、こととかが、やっぱポケモンとか、そう言ってるやつらもいるし、なんか（笑い）、お前らめっちゃ幼いってなって、時々話す気力もなくなるときもあって、うん、そんな感じかな。

それでもランチタイムの時？

いや、ランチタイムはないな。遊んだときとかに、そうfacebookとかでもなんか、プロフィールの写真、なんかみんな
Middle started to change their profile pictures to their favorite *Pokemon*. I didn’t understand it. They suddenly told me to change mine to a *Pokemon* and I thought, “what?”

7 **Shima:** I see. You don’t have such an experience with your friends at Saturday school, do you?

8 **Shoji:** No. Absolutely not.

In this interview, Shoji weighed the level of maturity with the cultural measurement in Japan. *Pokemon*, or *Pocket monster*, is a Japanese cartoon program which has its own cultural appreciation in America. Whereas Shoji thought it was a cartoon for a younger generation than his, it was not thought so among his local peers at least in this context. Through his filter, Shoji found his friends’ practice over Facebook photos to be childish, which indicates that Shoji was living in at least two societies with conflicting views toward maturity. As Shoji was one of few Japanese students in the school, he did not have others to share his dismay over *Pokemon* photos on Facebook.

Contrary to his mother’s concerns, Shoji still appreciated his friendship with his existing friends. Shoji’s description of his closest friend, Manuel, was the same as his mother’s; namely, he thought that his friend was kind and understanding. Similar to his mother, Shoji categorized his peers based on their smartness with “levels.” However, Shoji’s evaluations of himself and his friends were different from his mother’s evaluations in that he was comfortable with being with his friends. Shoji was the most
cooperative student in this study and the most interested in English partly because he was
influenced by this study and his mother.

Shoji was one of a few Japanese students in Miles Middle School and Ryu was
the only one in Hillsdale Middle School. Yasushi, Daisuke, Chisa and Noriko went to
Dartmouth Middle School, which had the largest population of Japanese students in the
area. Presumably because of this population, there were also at least two American
teachers who had learned Japanese in Japan for several years, one for ESL classes and the
other for music. In addition to those teachers, the school had the budget to hire a Japanese
bilingual aide to help new Japanese students.

*Yasushi*

Yasushi came to America when he was in the fifth grade. He had a younger
brother in kindergarten. Since his brother was too young, Yasushi did not talk with his
brother very often, but they often had time together when their busy father was at home.
As his father was an engineer for a big Japanese automaker, Yasushi and his little brother
were both interested in cars. Yasushi watched F-1 races until his favorite team withdrew
from the race due to the global economic downturn. Yasushi and his brother stored the
photos of fancy racing cars on their laptop computer in the living room. The brothers
showed me the photos and talked rather passionately about them although Yasushi was a
little hesitant at first.

Like Shoji, Yasushi was one of my first tutees whom I had taught for ten months
before the study. From the outset, Yasushi was very quiet and spoke to me in a curt
manner. Yasushi and Daisuke were close friends, and according to Daisuke, Yasushi did

---

8 All school names are pseudonyms for confidentiality.
not talk much at school, either. A bilingual aide at school also told his mother that she had never heard him talk—something that the caring mother told me with a hesitant laughter. Judging from the facts that he finished most of his homework on his own and still received As and Bs, Yasushi had sufficient English ability to do well at school. He also attended Japanese Saturday school and had little difficulty in subjects in Japanese and in becoming friends with other Japanese students.

Yasushi’s mother was somewhat worried about his sensitivity due to his puberty. In addition to his silent attitude toward his mother, he also maintained a certain distance from me. He did not want me to visit him at school and he was also inhibited during the recorded interviews. Contrary to his cooperative mother and father who showed interest in my study, he often appeared to be nervous, and I stopped recording after the third interview when his responses to my questions became repetitive. Most of his answers were made up of no more than three words by then. For instance, when I used open questions to ask him to describe his school life, his responses tended to be either “I don’t know” (wakaranai), “many” (iroiro), or a long pause that made me feel awkward.

Yasushi was not apathetic or emotionless, however. When I visited the Japanese Saturday school on a winter day, I saw him walking with a big smile with his Japanese friends. I had seen many weak smiles on his face when I tutored him, but he looked different when he was with his friends. I saw his non-defensive smile, or cynical grin, in the last interview just a few weeks before his family returned to Japan. When the topic was about bad language in English, he showed me a shrewd smile on his face and started to explain how his friends in Saturday school talked about swearing in English. Although limited, the information from the interviews allowed me to depict Yasushi’s life in
America. When he came to America, he became friends with a Japanese boy who was proficient in English. After a while, this friend went back to Japan, but Yasushi had already established himself in a network of several other Asian students, including Daisuke. While he attended classes and had friendly people around him, he maintained a solid relationship with his friends through weekly tennis practices and lunchtime gatherings. However, due to his reserved personality, he tended to stay home unless he was invited for an event and his after school life tended to be for personal pleasure rather than interpersonal activities.

*Daisuke*

Daisuke was an active baseball player who played with American students one year older than him. His mother, a great supporter of his activities, was quite proud of his achievements. Daisuke came to America with his parents and his little brother, who was three years his junior. His father, keen on learning foreign languages, was an engineer who worked for a Japanese automaker. At the time of the study, the father was learning Chinese with textbooks he had brought from Japan. Daisuke admired his father’s attitude toward foreign language learning while he struggled to increase his English vocabulary. Daisuke felt inferior in learning English to his younger brother who became proficient in a shorter period of time. His mother often emphasized the relationship between birth order and personality. According to her, Daisuke was more easy-going than his brother and avoided doing things by himself because he was the first son.

Daisuke was the only participant whom I did not tutor. As Daisuke went to the same middle school as Yasushi’s, I was introduced to Daisuke’s mother by Yasushi’s mother. Daisuke’s mother accepted my request for her child to participate in my study in
a very friendly manner and she pushed Daisuke to participate in this study although he was somewhat shy and hesitated to interact with strangers. Because Yasushi, who sat with Daisuke during lunch break, had already rejected my request to observe him, I was not allowed to observe Daisuke’s conversation with his friends at lunch. After Yasushi left America in March 2010, Daisuke gave me a few chances to watch him at the cafeteria on condition that I stayed at a distance so that none of his friends would notice me. I visited his lunch periods four times to observe him from the other corner, which was at the farthest end of the hall.

Chisa

Chisa and Noriko were sisters. Chisa was two years older than her sister, Noriko. Chisa came to America in April 2007 when she was eleven years old. At the time of the study, Chisa was in the eighth grade in Dartmouth Middle school, where many other Japanese students were also enrolled including Yasushi and Daisuke. I first met Chisa and Noriko when their parents were looking for a Japanese tutor only for two months before they returned to Japan in April 2010. Learning about the period of her sojourn abroad, I felt sorry for Chisa because she came to America when she had just started her final year of elementary school in Japan and she was going back to Japan just a few months before finishing middle school in America. In other words, she had to say goodbye to her friends just before completing schools (i.e., elementary and middle schools) in Japan and in America. After returning to Japan in April, she would have a year left before high school. As a returnee, she would be placed with the other students who had spent two years together in the same junior high school. Although she had
friends from her elementary school days, Chisa did not share experiences at the junior high school level in Japan with them.

Maybe my sympathy for Chisa affected how I saw her—as I also had to leave my elementary school in the last year due to my father’s business—as Chisa usually looked tired and somewhat apathetic to me. She was mostly quiet and chose words carefully, often avoiding clear answers. Her careful manners in talking and answering questions were occasionally highlighted by the strong tones of denial when I interpreted her words incorrectly to obtain her confirmation. Maybe I, an adult male researcher, caused her somewhat cautious disposition considering that her mother told me that the girls were usually very different and talkative with family members. Furthermore, I did not find enough time to build rapport with the girls as I did with the boys because the interview period with Chisa and Noriko was short. Two weeks after I first met the girls, I asked them to participate in this study but limited their participation to interviews.

Chisa and Noriko’s father was working for a Japanese company that was different from the companies for which the other participants’ fathers worked. Because of this difference, whereas the girls’ father was critical of the other company’s conservative culture, their mother was surprised to see many Japanese people in the area. Lacking personal connections and basic information, the mother and her daughters had initial difficulties in their American lives. Many other Japanese sojourners in the area were from regions in Japan where driving cars was a norm. However, the girls’ family came from a metropolitan area in Japan where the convenient public transportation system did not require the mother to drive at all. The girls’ mother had to learn how to drive to live in the new country. Because of this lack of transportation, the sisters could not participate in
any after-school activities for the entire first year. As the Japanese Saturday school had a bus service, the girls had connections with other Japanese students once every week but their lives in America were mostly limited to local schools and their home.

Noriko

Noriko was the youngest participant in this study. Two years younger than Chisa, Noriko came to America when she was in the third grade. She would still have been in elementary school at the time of the study if she had been in Japan, but due to the difference in the education systems, she was already studying in the sixth grade in an American middle school with her elder sister Chisa. In comparison to her sister, Noriko appeared to be relatively carefree during the interviews and told me many episodes about her life in America. However, it also seemed to me that she was struggling with telling me what she wanted to say either in Japanese or in English, seeing that she described events only succinctly despite her tones of excitement in her narratives. Noriko’s mother was concerned that Noriko sometimes used “strange” Japanese because she came to America when she was still young. When she talked in the interviews, I did not notice what her mother found concerning in her speech; however, Noriko’s responses were usually limited to short sentences in Japanese.

Noriko’s mother told me that Noriko had had difficult time in the first few years in elementary school because she could not make friends and would often tell her mother that she did not want to go to school. Although there were a few Japanese students in the same school, Noriko did not develop a close relationship with them. The first Japanese student around her was a boy and he did not try to help Noriko unless he clearly knew that she needed help. There was also a Japanese girl in the same school but according to
Noriko’s mother, Noriko and the girl were not compatible with each other. Partly because of this initial difficulty in making friends with her Japanese peers, Noriko did not enjoy her first two years in elementary school.

Noriko’s mother told me that her daughters must be showing different faces at school and at home. She said that her daughters were very quiet at school although they talked a lot at home. Noriko’s life changed to some extent in middle school since there were more Japanese students in Dartmouth Middle. Noriko spoke cheerfully about her Japanese and American friends in the interviews until her network changed at the end of her stay in the U.S. There was a local girl who used to sit and talk with Noriko at lunch table but the local girl made a new local friend. There were also two new students from Japan in Noriko’s team. As these new people added to each of the girl’s network, Noriko lost her chance to talk to the local girl during her lunch period. Instead, Noriko stayed with her Japanese friends at lunchtime. When I saw her at the cafeteria one day, she was having a conversation with her Japanese friends cheerfully all in Japanese. Noriko and Chisa returned to Japan two weeks later with their parents and a dog which they adopted in America.

4.3. Proficiency in English

Determining a person’s L2 proficiency is not straightforward because it depends on what is measured and what measurement to use, particularly if a study focuses on language as a whole rather than on specific features. Strict measurements of the learners’ L2 knowledge did not make great sense in this study, because learning to live in one’s L2 society is not the issue in one or two features of the language, which otherwise would be appropriate in experimental psychological studies. Even though one has sufficient
knowledge of grammatical structures, communication may fail because of pronunciation.

Talented learners may read aloud with a variety of accents like actors but they may be misunderstood because of their inappropriate structural knowledge in a given context. Shy learners who cannot speak well even in their own language may write elegantly and a fluent speaker may not successfully communicate with others because of his or her poor listening ability. A boy who communicates with his peers perfectly in slang and cussing may not read newspaper articles.

The measurement of proficiency is generally in relation to the standards in an abstract community of speakers of the target language where this measurement does not necessarily reflect the language practices of a specific group. A good result of a proficiency test in English does not necessarily mean that the person has no difficulty everywhere that “English” is spoken.

Nevertheless I believe it is helpful to include some information about the students’ proficiency based on measurements outside this study because language tests are also an important part of L2 learning in society. As McNamara and Roever (2006) argue that:

Language acts socially as a marker of identity, and as linguistic identity is shared among members of a speech community, language tests can be used as a procedure for identification and classification of individuals in terms of relevant social categories. (p. 150)

As I will discuss later, the information about the students’ English proficiency should not be exclusively seen as what represents the students’ competence in the language. Embedded in each student’s L2 ecology, the test helps reinforce beliefs in what is
important and what is not. Inherent with this political power balance over legitimation, language tests can exert a strong “centripetal force” with the authorities of institutions that employ measurement tests while it can be misused to exclude particular speakers due to biased validation (Shohamy, 2001). Still, what one learns through tests is also part of his or her L2 socialization experiences regardless of what language varieties the test represents. Aware of this sociopolitical nature of language tests, I discuss in this section English proficiency among Japanese students. There were two kinds of information about the students’ proficiency in English. One is an English proficiency test in Japan and the other is enrollment in an ESL program.

The Japanese students in this study took—or at least were preparing—for Eiken, a criterion-referenced proficiency test of English administered by the Society of Testing for English Proficiency Inc. (STEP) in Japan. All but Daisuke had taken the test at least once. Daisuke was preparing for the test at the time of the study. This test is different from other proficiency test such as TOEFL in that the test assessed test-takers’ performances either by granting them a “pass” or “fail” in each grade. Eiken certifies test-takers according to seven grades ranging from fifth (hereafter Grade 5) to first (hereafter Grade 1). Grade 1 is the highest and there are grades between Grade 1 and Grade 2 (hereafter Pre-1) and between Grade 2 and 3 (hereafter Pre-2). Each grade has specific rubrics about the expected abilities in four skills: reading, writing, listening and speaking. In this regard, Eiken is more educational than purely evaluative in nature where the educational aspects can be found in their explicit guidelines for learners about “what to learn next.” The institute gives the test-takers certificates for each grade which also bore some
resemblance to awards. In this way, the test has a motivating aspect for Japanese learners of English to achieve the next level rather than simply assessing their present abilities.

All the students in this study were around the Grade 2. Daisuke hesitated to challenge the grade because he thought he might get a “fail” and therefore was preparing for his Pre-2. Ryu was preparing for Grade 1, the highest grade, after passing the Pre-1 a few months earlier. The organization administering the test provides general ideas of the suitable education level for each grade. For example, the organization approximately considers Grade 3 as an appropriate level for junior high school students, Pre-2 and Grade 2 for high school, Pre-1 and Grade 1 for college and above. This linear increase of appropriateness with education level corresponds with the Japanese school system where English education starts in the first year of junior high school (i.e., grade 7).

In the organization’s “Can-do List,” detailed information about each skill is available although it “does not guarantee that everyone who passed the test can do them without fail” (Nihon Eigo Kentei Kyokai, n.d.a, para. 2, my translation). As the organization articulates in its purpose statement, the list provides test-takers with grand images of Japanese learners of English that correspond with their abilities in English. Following is an excerpt from the test’s purpose statement:

The primary aim of the EIKEN Can-do List is to help test users gain a better understanding of the levels of language ability targeted by the EIKEN
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9 For example, those who passed Grade 2 are expected to be able to “understand lengthy expository texts and find necessary information in texts of a practical nature” in reading, “understand information and explanations relevant to everyday life and understand the content of extended speech” in listening, “describe everyday experiences and convey his/her needs and requirements” in speaking, and “write texts of some length about topics from everyday life” in writing.
tests…While the primary focus remains EIKEN test takers, the list also aims to contribute to a better understanding of typical language learners in Japan. By providing an empirically based snapshot of what a large and diverse sample of EIKEN test takers believe they can do with English, STEP also hopes to provide information with which educators and researchers can achieve a better understanding of Japanese learners of English in general.” (Nihon Eigo Kentei Kyokai, n.d.b, p.4)

However, this list is based on test takers’ self-assessment of their abilities even if they do not have such experiences indicated in the questionnaire. In a sense, the list is a collective image of linguistic abilities by EFL learners in Japan according to each grade level. As Dunlea (2009) argues, the drawback in test takers’ lack of experiences is complemented by a statistical approach based on a large number of respondents.

The organization’s use of grade system and its focus on Japanese learners of English indicate that a simple conversion of the test results to other language measurements (e.g., TOEFL) is difficult although such attempts have been made (e.g., Hill, 2010). In this respect, providing only one source of information is not sufficient to understand L2 learners’ proficiency. In this study, the Japanese middle school students’ enrollment status in ESL provided additional information about their general proficiency in English. Since the students were in the same state, they took the same state-administered tests to get out of ESL programs. Only two of the students in this study were out of ESL at the time of the study. Ryu did not attend ESL classes after elementary school, and Yasushi left his ESL program in spring, 2009, which had him accomplish harder tasks in mainstream classes. The other four students were still in ESL programs.
Table 4 is a summary of the six students’ proficiency in English based on the two measurements discussed in this section. I did not ask the students for their detailed scores in each section—grammar, reading, listening, writing and speaking—because of potential pressure on the students during the study. Nonetheless the students’ relative position in this measurement test provides some information about their knowledge in English; that is, how much they had learned in terms of the criteria of the test during their three to four year stay in the U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ESL</th>
<th>The <em>Eiken</em> proficiency test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ryu (H)</td>
<td>No ESL after elementary school</td>
<td>Pre-1 (passed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 1 (preparing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoji (M)</td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>Grade 2 (passed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-1 (preparing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasushi (D)</td>
<td>No ESL after spring 2009</td>
<td>Grade 2 (first section passed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 2 (preparing for speaking test)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisuke (D)</td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>Never taken before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-2 (preparing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noriko (D)</td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>Grade 2 (first section passed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 2 (preparing for speaking test)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisa (D)</td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>Grade 2 (first section failed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 2 (preparing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(H)...Hillsdale Middle; (M)...Miles Middle; (D)...Dartmouth Middle

Table 4 Japanese expatriate students’ English proficiency

Based on the available information, it can be said that Ryu had developed the best proficiency among the six students during their stay. Yasushi and Shoji followed him, and Daisuke, Noriko and Chisa were mostly the same after the three. This order also corresponded with my own impressions of the students when I tutored them for their
homework and the Eiken test. I tutored Ryu for the Grade 1 and despite his difficulty in the vocabulary of that level, he was skilled in reading, especially in the field of science while he was easily bored with the stories on language, anthropology, and economics. Although Ryu was good in reading and listening, his writing skill showed little more than a middle school student partly due to the writing topics of Grade 1. For instance, he had to write on the Japanese policy on English education in elementary school and alternative energy resources, etc. The topics appeared to be far more advanced for an average middle school student. Therefore, Ryu struggled with writing due to his lack of knowledge in those topics and his frequent uses of colloquial expressions. Ryu’s lack of writing skills at this level was understandable because he did neither read newspapers nor have an experience of an academic writing experience beyond his middle school textbooks.

Though Yasushi passed Pre-2 with little difficulty, he barely passed the first section of Grade 2. Except for Eiken, Yasushi did not provide me with much information on his skills in English but he was able to read the textbooks in science and social studies without extensive help. He did not ask questions on vocabulary in the textbooks or use dictionary because he understood, though vaguely, what was written in the textbooks. When his Language Arts teacher gave the students a project to make vocabulary cards filled with additional information such as suffix, prefix, synonyms and antonyms, he used online dictionaries to find the meanings of the words. Since he did not know what a thesaurus was, I taught him how to use one online. He did not have to ask for my help before long as he looked for synonyms and antonyms by himself.

Shoji also passed Grade 2 although he remained in ESL. Shoji was able to read school textbooks; however, difficult words often hindered his comprehension,
particularly in social studies. Shoji also struggled with sciences but his difficulty derived from concepts rather than language alone. As for Daisuke, who had never taken the Eiken test, I did not have enough knowledge about his English because I did not tutor him, except that he was still in an ESL program. Chisa and Noriko did not participate in my study for a period long enough to allow for proper evaluation, but they had more difficulties than the other students in reading as well as in speaking when I tutored them for Grade 2. Their lack of knowledge in vocabulary greatly hindered their comprehension and production of the English language.

While not much information on the Japanese students’ English proficiency is available, the discussion on their proficiency does not aim to provide a static view of the students’ linguistic abilities. Rather, this study approaches their proficiency in a way that the tests were embedded in each student’s L2 ecology, providing particular standards to the students and influencing their identities and attitudes toward learning English. The following sections describe L2 ecologies for the Japanese expatriate students.

4.4. The Japanese students’ language ecology

The students, at one level, lived in the same society where the same set of assumptions applied to all of them. For instance, the students lived in a country where they had the same status as foreigners where the rules and regulations for foreigners applied to them equally. But even in one country, there were a multitude of groups of people that shared rules, beliefs and values different from the others in other levels. Ryu and Shoji went to different schools from the other four, who also attended different classes in the same school due to their age differences. These schools shared some assumptions under the education system of the nation and the state but the school’s
demography, teachers’ backgrounds, and district policies were different. These differences made each school a unique space for the Japanese expatriate students.

The relationship between the development of children and these multiple layers of society is an important element in an ecological model as they mutually influence one another. School systems have such features as a kind of miniature representation of multiple layers of a society. Classes, teams, grades, schools, districts, and states consist of multiple containers related to education, and they provide students with spaces to learn their target language through the interaction with a variety of people. This section illustrates such mixture of social layers at school and after school with a focus on the commonalities and differences of experiences across the Japanese students under study.

Table 5 presents an overview of the Japanese students’ access to English during their stay. Based on the students’ references to each activity and explanation, the activities are marked with four levels (from ++ to --). As this overview is my impressionistic comparison across these students, it does not necessarily reflect the students’ actual access to English in each activity. For instance, every student is supposed to have access to English constantly in his or her classes but this figure emphatically marks Shoji with (++: very frequent) while the others with (+: regularly present) because Shoji’s emphasis and description of his interpersonal connection in science was different from the other students. While this overview does not represent an exact degree of access to English in each activity, it broadly illustrates how the students positioned themselves in relation to English.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Ryu</th>
<th>Shoji</th>
<th>Yasushi</th>
<th>Daisuke</th>
<th>Noriko</th>
<th>Chisa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before arrival</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School bus</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream Classes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch break</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVDs</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell phone</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music (songs)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet (Research)</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure reading</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test preparation</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor (American)</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor (Japanese)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-school club</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-school friends</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symbols:
++: frequent or active engagement
+: regularly present
-: only sometimes or just started
--: mostly no access

Table 5 Overview of Japanese middle school students’ access to English in the U.S.
4.4.1. Before coming to America

All the six students were still in elementary school when their parents told them that they were going to live abroad for the next several years. The students learned English before coming to the U.S. through monthly or bi-monthly contact with English-speaking guests at elementary schools. The students also took some lessons at English conversation schools for a few months to half a year to prepare for their new lives. However, three students told me in retrospect that they did not think their English learning in Japan was helpful in preparing them for their new lives. Chisa and Noriko only remembered that they learned color terms, which they thought were not very useful, from a British teacher at an English conversation school. Ryu also attended an English conversation school for six months in Japan and learned phrases of survival English—mainly greetings. Though this experience helped him for the very initial period, he found that learning after his arrival was much more meaningful in understanding how to communicate with people, mostly thanks to his first and longest tutor, who was a son of British immigrants to the U.S. These students’ impressions do not necessarily mean that the initial learning in Japan was not helpful at all because it was simply a matter of comparison between the two contexts of learning. Nonetheless, their views toward their learning in Japan show how vivid the memories of learning could be after the students faced difficulties in their new lives.

With regard to L2 learning, all the students had only a small amount of exposure to English prior to coming to the U.S. However, limited information in the interviews does not allow this study to examine how the students’ learned English in Japan. the students probably could see and hear English loanwords in many situations in Japan (cf.
Kay, 1995; Takashi, 1990), but English learning was not situated in their daily lives in Japan, where the experiences of L2 learning was a kind of simulation in their imagined communities.

4.4.2. Starting a new life in America

For the families that had little knowledge of what their new life would be like in the U.S., deciding on where to live in the new country was the first challenge to overcome. While the parents had great concerns over their children’s education, they also had their own needs and worries. The availability of information and places to stay was also a factor to choose their new home.

The students in this study spread into three different districts and three schools (see Table 6). The three districts, or cities, were different in size. D city was the largest in size with approximately 40,000 of rapidly increasing residents, followed by H city with 28,000, and M city with 14,000. In these different sizes of districts, the numbers of schools were mostly the same. Both D city and M city had four middle schools and 12 elementary schools. H city had three middle schools and 17 elementary schools. Because the population of M city was almost half the size of D city, the size of the school was therefore smaller than the schools of M city—in one of which Shoji were enrolled.

Each city also had its own characteristics in terms of demography. D city had a relatively higher ratio of bilingual speakers with a range of subjectively measured proficiency, especially in Asian and Pacific Island languages. The percentage of the speakers of Asian languages (6.3%) was more than twice as many as the other two cities and about eight times as much as the state. On the other hand, H city had a relatively
higher ratio of Spanish speakers compared with the other two although it was still greatly lower than the nation’s ratio.

Racially and ethnically, D city had the smallest ratio of White population (80%) and the largest of Asian (15%) while the other cities had about 90% Whites and 2-6% Asians. All the three cities had a greatly lower ratio of Black or African American population (2-3%) compared to the state and the nation (both 12%). In short, although the state demography was still greatly skewed for Whites, D city was distinct with its Asian population among the three cities. Also, the state was in favor of English monolingual speakers compared to the national level, and the ratios were even smaller in D city and M city.

Four of the six students—Yasushi, Daisuke, Noriko and Chisa—lived in D city, where there were a relatively large number of Japanese residents—sojourner and permanent. The four students went to the same middle school with several Japanese students in each grade. At the time of the interviews, Yasushi and Daisuke were friends who sat at lunch and played tennis together, even though Yasushi was one year older than Daisuke. Yasushi was enrolled in one grade lower than he was supposed to be in Japan because of his parents’ worries about language. Therefore, he was in the seventh grade at the time of this study while he attended the eighth grade at the Japanese Saturday school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D city</th>
<th>H city</th>
<th>M city</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (2010)</td>
<td>41,800</td>
<td>28,400</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>11,543,000</td>
<td>308,754,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (2000)*</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>24,200</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>11,353,100</td>
<td>281,421,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native*</td>
<td>28,600</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>11,013,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign born*</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>339,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak only English*</td>
<td>25,500</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>9,951,500</td>
<td>215,423,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak other than English*</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>648,500</td>
<td>46,951,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>33,600</td>
<td>25,200</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>9,539,400</td>
<td>223,553,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American alone</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,407,700</td>
<td>38,929,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian alone</td>
<td>&lt;100</td>
<td>&lt;100</td>
<td>&lt;100</td>
<td>25,300</td>
<td>2,932,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>192,200</td>
<td>14,674,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese alone*</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>&lt;100</td>
<td>&lt;100</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>796,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita income*</td>
<td>41,100</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>35,500</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>21,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Demographics of the three cities, state, and the nation

(based on US Census 2010; *US Census 2000; rounded off to one hundred)
Yasushi’s parents looked for a place where there were not too many Japanese people around so that Yasushi could learn English by interacting with local friends. At the same time, they thought Yasushi would need Japanese friends to help him acclimate to the new environment. Both their neighborhood and Yasushi’s elementary school had few Japanese residents but as Yasushi went on to middle school, the students from several elementary schools in the area were merged together. There, Yasushi encountered a lot more Japanese students than before. Yasushi’s mother hesitantly described the situation as: “there are too many Japanese.” The preference of an environment with “not too many Japanese but a few helpers” seemed to be common for many Japanese sojourners who aimed to make the best use of the opportunity of living in America. ¹⁰

Shoji’s mother was content with his environment with a moderate number of Japanese around while Ryu’s parents chose the environment with “as few Japanese as possible.” Four mothers out of five anticipated the effects of environment on their children’s development in English and thought that the life in America would be a precious experience for their children.

The parents of Chisa and Noriko, however, did not have such freedom to choose the places to live in where their children might have good opportunities to learn English. While the fathers of many Japanese families in the area were working for large global companies who had had some contact with their predecessors and had access to information about the area, there were also families that were not in such a network of

¹⁰ Based on his study on the parental educational intervention for the Japanese sojourners at a Japanese private school in New York, Langager (2010) classifies the types of Japanese sojourners into three. The participants in the current study appeared to be categorized in “bilingual orientation” although some families were inclined to the other two types as well.
people and information. The girls’ father worked for a company that was different from where the majority of the Japanese in the area worked. Because his company sent its employee to this area for the first time, the family had initial difficulties with settling in the new country. Although the father’s company was also global and had branch offices in other parts of the U.S. as well as in China, the family was the first to be sent to the area. They had no one whom they could ask for information, except for a Japanese landlord whom the father met while he was staying at a hotel without his family in the same country.

Later, the parents were able to obtain information only from the Japanese landlord primarily to match the needs of the mother who could not drive due to the convenience of transportation system back in Japan. The initial restriction to transportation in their new life, particularly in the area, was a great handicap for the sisters since they could not participate in any after-school activities for the first year. The sisters attended their local school as well as the Japanese Saturday school thanks to the bus services. However, their opportunities to interact with people in English were limited to the local school. The neighborhood had few children of their age and the sisters had somewhat isolated lives linguistically once their school was over every day.

The initial struggles might have been lessened if the family had had a connection with someone already in the area. For example, Daisuke’s family chose the area because an old friend of his mother used to live in the area. The family obtained information about the neighborhood, school, and whatever helpful for their new life from the friend. The other mothers in the study, except for the girls’, told me that they had had someone with some information to help them select the neighborhood. Although their choice was
limited because the families were after all sent by the fathers’ companies, the parents were able to find places that broadly matched their plans, at least initially, in the new country.

The parents’ motives in choosing the neighborhood were not necessarily the same because each family had its vision of its new lives. The mothers of Daisuke, Yasushi and Shoji were concerned about the balance between Japanese and English. While these mothers were worried about their children’s difficulties in the new environment, they also looked for opportunities to have their children learn English. On the other hand, Ryu’s mother preferred a non-Japanese environment and therefore, the family decided to live in away from many other Japanese. Ryu’s family lived in new housing complex with large and bleak cornfields across the street. In the neighborhood where there were no Japanese residents, the family lived in a house large enough for three boys to enjoy their time in it.

The choice of environment was related to the students’ personal networks during their stay since the choice determined the schools the students would go to. The primary concern for the parents was whether there were many Japanese children in the school or not. It is noteworthy that the parents did not mention any other race or ethnicity in the interviews. Had it been a region where racial, ethnic, and linguistic diversity was more politically controversial, there might have been references to such issues. But it seemed that the mothers did not have particular concerns and worries about these issues.

The foundations for the students’ L2 socialization in the new country were thus set up through various anticipations, constraints, and information. Particularly, the role of access to information was great since, the Japanese families who were sent by multi-national companies in Japan were not much different from one another.
socioeconomically. Although the informants to the parents did not provide linguistic input to the children, an ecological perspective takes those informants into consideration because the information as well as various constraints help the parents and the students see what investment they could make in their new lives. Thus the informants as well as the fathers’ companies have indirect contact with the children in the Meso-system in Bronfenbrenner’s (1979, 2005) ecological model of development. Although the initial decisions did not determine everything, especially in terms of simple success and failure, the parents’ decisions led the students’ experiences of L2 learning in society in particular directions.

4.4.3. School life and after school

Throughout my interviews with the students, I elicited narratives about their lives at school and after school to understand the patterns of their lives, quality and amount of exposure to English, and their interactions with people who spoke English. Since the interviews focused on detailed information about students’ immediate lives, elementary school was largely uncovered in their answers except for occasional comparisons between elementary school and middle school.

The patterns of lives among the Japanese middle school participants were largely identical due to the US education system. Generally speaking, the Japanese students woke up in the morning, got on the bus, met teachers and friends in the first class, attended several classes where they moved from classroom to classroom, had lunch at the cafeteria with their friends, attended afternoon classes which included a period to do their homework, came back home by bus, and stayed at home mostly to do their homework with their tutors unless they had activities such as baseball, soccer, etc. On Saturdays, the
students went to Japanese Saturday school where they had no opportunity to use English, and sometimes they went out with their Japanese friends over weekends. The students’ weekend lives varied but half of the students went to a community private school (juku) for math and for other preparation for the school life back in Japan. Some had activities with English-speaking peers while others mainly stayed at home to enjoy themselves or to rest.

The six Japanese expatriate students attended three middle schools that were located in different cities as described earlier. Table 6 shows that each school had distinct characteristics from the others. Dartmouth Middle School, where four students attended, had the largest number of students in total and the ratio and the number of Asian students were also the largest among the three schools. Whereas White students were the least among the three, they were still the majority. The school was also located in the wealthiest district among the three.

Miles Middle was the smallest school with only 350 students and White students comprise almost 80% of them. There were the least number of students with limited English proficiency among the three schools. Considering that Shoji’s closest friend at this school was a boy with a Mexican background, Shoji and his friend belong to the smallest minority groups in this school.

Hillsdale had only seventh and eighth grades since all sixth grade students in the district went to another school only for a year. Still, the school had more than 700 students in one building next to which there was another middle school in addition to two track and field stadiums and a baseball field. Ethnically, Hillsdale had more Black/African American and Hispanic students than the other two schools whereas least
Asian students but had the least number of Asian students. From the perspectives of Japanese students, Hillsdale Middle was the most racially diverse of the three schools. Though all the schools were in suburban areas, Dartmouth Middle was in a relatively busy neighborhood with a shopping center nearby whereas Miles Middle and an elementary school were in a quiet residential area. Although Hillsdale Middle was located in the city where per capita income was the lowest of the three, the area around the school did not appear to be much different from the other schools because it was situated in a large complex of school buildings that included the department of education and a large sports field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Grades</td>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>Hillsdale</td>
<td>Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average daily student enrollment</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School performance index (out of 120)</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>101.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Demographics of the three middle schools which Japanese students attended (2009-2010)

4.4.3.1. Waking up and getting on school bus

Every student in this study regularly attended their schools without absenteeism or any strong resistance although some of them did not want to go to school at earlier
points of their new lives because of the difficulties they faced. Especially Noriko, who was not able to make friends even with her Japanese peers, had such difficulty during her elementary school days. Overall, however, the students were satisfied with the lives at school with a range of likes and dislikes and attended classes almost every day from Monday to Friday.

Because of the distance from school, the students used school buses which were not usual in most parts of Japan. Shoji, Yasushi and Daisuke had someone to talk to in English while they were on the bus, although not regularly, whereas Ryu, Chisa, and Noriko did not have such friends while they were on the bus. Daisuke spoke mostly in Japanese with Yasushi during his 30-minute ride with some occasions to talk in English with someone interested in Japan. Although peer relationship during bus rides was mostly stable, there were occasional changes in the students’ networks on the bus. Shoji developed a new friendship on the bus at the time of study.

Interview with Shoji (IS02042010154; my translation)

1 Shoji: Well, these days I’ve got friends with Mike, hmm, well, sometimes I’ve been friends with Mike. He lives over there, but we ride the same bus and we get noisy all the way on the bus [chuckles]. Yeah, some guys are close to me…Mike sometimes talks to me on the bus, and I guess, we came to talking terms with each other just this year, or we started to talk longer, hmm, anyway, we are friends these days.
On the school bus, some Japanese students had opportunities to interact with local peers but others did not. Even when there were English-speaking friends around, the connection between Japanese students was stronger than the relationship with the less close English-speaking peers.

4.4.3.2. Meeting at home base

After getting off the bus, the students in Dartmouth Middle went to their “home base,” where everyone in their team got together before going to their first class. This was where the students met their friends and teachers at the beginning of a day. However, the students did not have much time to get socialized in English because they usually had their Japanese friends around at this point.

Interview with Daisuke (DI0201201012; my translation)

1 Daisuke: There is a morning gathering, no, not morning gathering. When we get to school, we go to our home base and watch a news program that Dartmouth makes.

2 Shima: Is it on TV or something?

3 Daisuke: Yes, it is.

4 Shima: Wow, your school makes a TV program.

5 Daisuke: No. It’s just news.

6 Shima: What news did you have this morning?

7 Daisuke: Well, what did we have today? I was absent-minded. What was it? But we have lots of news, for example, the results
of the football games played by Dartmouth and news like that.

The students had to listen to their teachers as they needed to know the recommendations of the day although these students did not regard everything that the teachers said as important. They listened to their teachers in the room and the principal on TV. When the first period began, the students were dispersed to their classes.

4.4.3.3. Classes

In many parts of the world, including Japan, classes are supposed to be places for learning where conversations not related to teaching and learning are usually prohibited. The American schools that the Japanese students attended also had the same policy in general. When I asked the Japanese students what opportunities they had during classes, their interactions were categorized into four types: (1) answering teachers’ questions, (2) asking questions to teachers or friends next to them, (3) exchanging questions and answers in group work, and (4) chatting with close peers. The Japanese students except Shoji tended not to talk to their peers in class, especially with local students, unless they needed to do so. Daisuke usually avoided talking to his local peers close to him partly due to his deep respect for rules and regulations in class and partly because he felt these conversations to be unnecessary. Chisa also chose to talk to her teachers rather than to the peers nearby when she had questions. When I asked her why she chose teachers instead of other students, she said teachers were a hundred percent trustable. To the question of whether she had asked her teachers in elementary school in Japan, she succinctly answered “I did not have to ask questions.” Her confidence in Japanese contrasted with her lack of confidence in English.
Since the policies and philosophies in class varied depending on teachers and school, the students’ commitments to their classes also varied. Classes, especially ESL ones, were nevertheless the primary opportunities for the students to learn English. These classes constituted the core of the students’ L2 environment in America because of the larger time and amount of exposure to English compared with other settings. Though some of the Japanese students spent a month of their summer in Japanese schools between June (i.e., the end of school year in America) and July (i.e., the end of the first semester in Japan), American local school played the most important role for the Japanese students’ learning in general.

Generally in mainstream classes, teachers had a firm control over their classes where there was not much time allowed for young students to talk freely. Showing a smile with a glimpse of fear on her face, Noriko clearly denied that she had any time to chat with her peers around in class because she would be scolded (okorareru) by her teachers. Yasushi and Daisuke also told me that they only answered questions asked by their teachers. The boys had little time to talk with other students in class except on special occasions such as when their teachers finished what were in their lesson plans. Ryu told me that he was usually drowsy in classes although I was not sure if he was just exaggerating the boredom in class. Whether or not he was really asleep, it indicated that he had no energy to talk with others during class and preferred to save his energy in case he gets asked a question by his teacher. Though observations of the actual classrooms might have come up with a different conclusion, my interviews with these students indicated that the students had peer interactions under their teachers’ control. The rare occasions for verbal exchange were cursory and the students had conversation only when
they had group projects, which rarely happened in their schools. The students remained quiet most of the time in class, sometimes asking their teachers questions, answering their questions, and once in a while, presenting in front of their classmates by reading from prepared manuscripts.

Shoji was the only exception among the Japanese students in that he had casual interaction with his peers during classes. Although “there is no sharp segregation between practices of ordinary talk and interaction and the practices of talk in institutional settings” (Schegloff, Koshik, Jacoby, & Olsher, 2002, p.11), Shoji had a clearly different sort of talk with his local friend, Carl, which was not usually supposed to happen in structured classes. While strict teachers may find their students’ chatting problematic, such casual interactions had an important meaning for Shoji’s social relationships at school, and for his ego identity. When the two boys were in the same group to conduct science projects, Shoji had interesting casual conversations with Carl although it often delayed their work in class. With chuckles and smiles, Shoji illustrated what the relationship was like between him and the local boy.

Interview with Shoji (SI1192009104; my translation)

1 Shoji: [smiling] We changed seats yesterday in science, and I was next to Carl. He was noisy, sticking his nose into my work, and maybe he cheated in the test [laughing]. He sat next to me and I was all aware that he was looking toward me. ‘Give me a break,’ I thought, and I put my pen case [pointing to his left] here. I thought ‘I’d better finish it as soon as I

昨日、理科の席替えがあって、Carlと隣の席になって、あいつ、授業中うるせえんだよね、ちょっとい出してきて、でもって、多分テストもカンニングしてるから（笑い）、隣でね、俺なんかこっち見てるなって言うのはずっと分かってるんだけど、ちょっと待ってよって思って、ここに筆箱置いたらけど、いや、でも、と思って、早く終わらせるかって早く終わらせて、
can,’ and I did. Well, he won’t do his assignments. He is helpless. He makes me tired when I’m with him [still smiling].

2 Shima: How many turns do you have when you talk with him?

3 Shoji: I talk with Carl for quite long. Maybe not as long as Manuel. Oh, maybe as long as Manuel these days. Yes, these days.

4 Shima: What do you talk with Carl about?

5 Shoji: Well, something like, “Do you like some girls?” and “Did you do your homework?” [laugh]. I asked him today and he said he didn’t. So, I said, “you moron,” and asked, “what grade did you get?” He answered, “I got an F.” I said, “okay,” and the talk was over…In Language Arts, when I was trying hard to finish my task, Carl told me to come to him. On his desk, there was a sheet of paper that I didn’t know what it was. I said to him, “What are you doing?” And he answered, “Nothing” [chuckles]. I said to him, “Do something,” and he said, “I don’t want to do anything.” I said, “You never want to do anything.”

In this casual relationship between these boys, there was no superiority of a native speaker over a non-native speaker, or an American domestic student over a foreign
student. Compensated with this relationship, Shoji asked Carl about many small issues in English without hesitation and Carl told Shoji the meanings and pronunciations of some words when Shoji had to answer in front of the class in science class. Shoji even favorably accepted Carl’s mocking his foreign accent, saying “Only close friends can do it, right?” and Carl did not go beyond the limit of offending his Japanese friend. Though such close friendship could develop during classes, Shoji was an exception in this study. He started to have this friendship at this level in his third year of his stay although he was already surrounded by the people who were generally friendly to the Japanese.

While it was rare to have such casual relationship in mainstream classes, ESL was the most enjoyable class for the newcomers with little knowledge in English because it was the only class that was barely understandable to them. Even Ryu, who was the most distanced from the Japanese community and who had the best proficiency of the six students, used to experience this limitation in mainstream classes.

Interview with Ryu (RI0125201049; my translation)

1 Shima: Were you placed in ESL at first in elementary school? 小学校のとき最初は ESL だったの？
2 Ryu: Yes. No doubt. ESL、確実に
3 Shima: How did you like it? どうだった？
4 Ryu: That class was the only fun class at school. まあ、そのクラスだけが楽しみでしたね

Yasushi got out of ESL before this study started but he was struggling with the harder assignments in the mainstream Language Arts class after ESL and the stories of his struggle even made his Japanese friend, Daisuke, want to remain in ESL.

Interview with Daisuke (DI02012010358; my translation)
Daisuke: Because Yasushi told me that Language Arts was hard, I want to stay in ESL as long as possible. Recently, Yasushi’s grade was C+ and he said it was hard. He had many projects and had to read many books. Because I’m not good at reading books, I don’t want to go to the class unless I have to.

In addition to the protection from mainstream pressure, ESL was also described as the place for caring relationship among students and between teachers and students. All of Chisa’s non-Japanese friends at school were in ESL and she even included her teacher in her ‘friend’ category. Daisuke also told me how his ESL teacher tried to build friendship among the students by having them actually do something to show their care for each other. The safer environment in ESL also encouraged the students to speak in English more than in the other classes. Even for Shoji, who had many American friends in other classes, ESL was the class in which he communicated most at school.

Interview with Shoji (SI1105200958; my translation)

Shoji: In ESL, I have only taken Mr. Matsui’s lessons. Since we don’t have any project in ESL, we don’t have time to goof around like in science, but it’s fun because ESL is the class where I speak most.

Despite being comfortable in an ESL classes, students do not necessarily want to stay in the courses forever, because the status of being in an ESL class evokes ambivalent
feelings that damage one’s sense of self-esteem and security. Japanese mothers often explicitly praised other children who had finished ESL classes in a short period of time for having accomplished an important achievement. Their praise for other children suggested that there was a hidden competition for speedy progress in English, while at the same time implying that the students who stayed in ESL classes longer than the “good” students were covertly stigmatized as “not smart.” Nevertheless, Japanese students with few chances to interact with English-speaking peers outside the classes benefited from this safer environment.

4.4.3.4. Moving from class to class

When one class was over, the students moved to another class. This practice was different from the schools in Japan where students stayed in the same classroom for most of the day and teachers moved from classroom to classroom. In the American schools, the Japanese students moved from one class to another during recesses and the halls around the lockers were the places where students only briefly exchanged information about the next classes or just said “hi” to maintain their not-so-close peer relationships. Since breaks between classes were only for a few minutes, which were a lot shorter than the ten minutes in most schools in Japan, the students were busy moving and talking. When I visited Shoji’s school, the students who were at one moment buzzing at their lockers disappeared when I came back two minutes later.

The students in this study tended to spend time with their Japanese peers during this brief period especially when they had Japanese friends in the previous class. When the students did not have their Japanese friends around, they moved to their lockers or directly to their next class alone or with relatively close non-Japanese friends. The
interactions with their peers in this busy period tended to be cursory where they simply exchanged brief greetings and information. Even Ryu, who had no choice but to talk to local peers, said he almost always exchanged routine short phrases of greetings during these intervals.

4.4.3.5. Lunch period

When morning classes were over, the students had lunch at the cafeteria. Their networks of friends in this period were generally stable. The students usually had their lunch with the same friends at the same tables. There were occasional talks between groups but mostly each group maintained its boundary. Even when their friends passed by the table, the students talked to them only briefly.

Shoji sometimes wandered around to talk with his friends at another table of boys but when two girls joined in the group, Shoji started to avoid dropping by at the table.

Interview with Shoji (SI02042010120; my translation)

1 Shoji: I don’t hesitate to join in, but, well, I need a chance to join in. Yeah, it’s hard to join in. Well, if Luke asks me about soccer, I can seat myself at that table without any problem but we have no topic lately [chuckles] because Luke doesn’t come to soccer practice. I can’t play soccer either because my leg hurts.

Luke was one of Shoji’s soccer mates and he often invited Shoji to join his lunch table.

Shoji usually just sat at the table and enjoyed their conversation over the issues between boys and girls, a common topic for adolescent students. While Shoji had a connection
with his friends, topics of conversation determined his opportunities to join in the group or not. The interview continued as follows:

Interview with Shoji (cont.) (SI02042010120; my translation)

2 Shima: Okay, then, soccer is one topic あ、じゃ、サッカーやつながりというトピックは一つ

3 Shoji: Yes. That’s one reason. Also, when he said he didn’t do his homework in social studies sometime ago, I gave him a few answers to fill in the blanks, but that’s all. Luke is relatively disciplined, in homework and so on. He does not ask me like Carl and we don’t have so much to talk about.

4 Shima: You don’t talk about TV since you don’t watch TV.

5 Shoji: Well, the team at that corner does not talk about TV either. Team… I mean the group.

6 Shima: What does the group at the corner talk about?

7 Shoji: Something dirty (eroi koto) [laughs]. Yes, yes, yes. Even when girls are there, they talk about sexual stuff without hesitation, and the girls also talk about it without problems. So, I said to myself, [chuckles] are you guys serious?

Such dirty talk was not special to Shoji at the local school since he was used to it with his peers at Japanese Saturday school, too (also Eder, 1995, for other middle school boys).

Shoji liked dirty talk even in English when there was no girl at the table, but he hesitated
to join in the group once the girls were there, partly because he refrained from
interrupting the good atmosphere between the local boys and girls. Shoji tended to keep a
distance from many local girls although he did not keep distance from Japanese girls at
the Saturday school.

Such gender divisions were common for the Japanese students in this study. In
many situations for the Japanese students, their peer groups were gendered. Similar to
Shoji, who kept a distance from most local girls, Yasushi and Daisuke talked only to boys
during lunchtime and Chisa and Noriko formed female groups only. Shoji found no
problem to be with Japanese girls but his distance from local girls was much larger. Ryu
was the only Japanese student in a mixed gender group at lunch table in this study. He
even started to go out with a local girlfriend about the end of this study although he spent
most of his after-school life with his male friends. With half pride and half hesitation,
Ryu told me about his first girlfriend in his fifth year in the U.S. but he did not want me
to ask about her in depth.

For the participants in this study, lunchtime was when they had time with their
closest available peers. Ryu’s girlfriend was present at his lunch table. Daisuke and
Yasushi were always with their Asian friends at the same table. Shoji was with Manuel,
his closest Mexican friend for three years. Chisa was mostly with her Japanese friends.
However, Noriko, Chisa’s younger sister, sadly told me that her local “friend” got a new
friend and left her behind with only Japanese peers during the last month of her stay in
America. While I was not able to know why the local girl left Noriko’s company, I
understood that such reconstruction of peer networks may happen when new people
appear in a group and where the bonds between members are not very strong.
4.4.3.6. After school

The middle school students’ after school lives were the most diverse in their socialization experiences. The Japanese students and their parents had more control over what to do after school than over the learning happening at school. However, their potential choices were not limitless. Available information, access to resources, and future plans as well as the students’ daily burden at their local schools affected their choices of activities. Moreover, involvement in multiple activities made the students’ after-school lives busy.

There were mainly two after-school activities in which the students were engaged. One was sports clubs and the other was tutoring sessions. Shoji belonged to a soccer team and practiced when the weather was not too bad. Daisuke belonged to a baseball team which kept him and his mother very busy in the spring. These students had the greatest advantage of playing in a team because they had local friends to talk with regularly over common topics. In addition, being good at sports helped the students in having and keeping a high self-esteem because of praises from teammates and adults around them. Whether the boys were proficient in English was not an important issue because the language used in those physical activities were not very descriptive but limited to commands to other players and listening to their coaches without asking them questions. One of the students in Kanno’s (2003) study also enjoyed popularity on a swimming team in America, but a drawback of this was that his swimming practices did not contribute to his L2 development. Since Shoji and Daisuke’s activities did not require players to be very verbal, these activities did not seem to directly contribute much to the students’ linguistic development.
However, the relationship built through these activities helped the students familiarize with other scenes with American friends. Shoji was often invited by one of his teammates to join them for school lunch and took part of the conversation with others. Although Daisuke’s mother was concerned about his introverted, homebound nature, he was finally invited by one of his local teammates after having several games together, to spend fun time with him at home. On the other hand, the students who did not engage in club activities had little interaction with local peers after school. Though Yasushi, Chisa, and Noriko occasionally participated in activities such as tennis and horseback riding, the activities were more individualized and not held as often. Consequently, their opportunities to be with same-age peers were limited. When there was no after school activity, the students spent most of their time at home where they did their homework with and without tutors, read books and Japanese comics, watched YouTube, etc.

In terms of after-school peer relationship, Ryu was an exception. He had developed a close relationship with his local friends from elementary school and spent time with them in their neighborhood park. When I asked Ryu what they usually did when they got together, he had difficulty in answering the question because what he describes as “just hanging around with buddies” has no special purpose. The group, consisting of five or six boys who had nothing else to do after school, got together, had casual conversations, and looked for something fun to do together. In such relationship, the boys often cursed to make their talk more enjoyable and formed closer relationships together.

However, such gathering without particular purposes, aside from having fun just by being together, made Ryu’s mother worried about the boys’ activities. When Ryu
uttered to her, “Did you know lighters were not sold to children?” his mother suspected that he might be involved in delinquent activities such as smoking. Ryu explained to her that he wanted to do a (science) experiment. As the winter cold passed and his friends had resumed their lacrosse practices at school, Ryu spent his after school with his little brothers at home and in the neighborhood. Just as the other Japanese students, he also had tutors including myself to help with his homework and to prepare for the *Eiken* test. He spent the time playing computer games, which his mother sometimes considered him to be addicted.

4.4.4. Access to media

As for life at home, most English input came from various media such as television and the Internet. How and how much the students had access to them varied depending on their preferences, economy, availability of information and materials, and family policies.

4.4.4.1. TV programs

TV programs and video are important sources of pop culture which is often a source of difficulties for ESL students. Pop culture’s sociolinguistically and culturally complex information is a factor that hinders ESL students’ comprehension in addition to the different life patterns of mainstream domestic students and access to resources at home. In her essay, Duff (2002) cautions teachers to be aware that pop culture does not have global access and that there are ESL students who do not share the sociocultural background with other mainstream students. The Japanese students in this study also did not watch TV programs and video very often, which corroborates Duff’s cautions. Still their L2 environments were connected to this medium to a certain degree. All of the
Japanese students in this study reported that they did not talk about TV shows at school regardless of the density of their network. Although Duff (2002) discusses teachers’ reliance on pop culture for rich resources, how pop culture appeared in peer conversation seemed to be different. The interviews with the Japanese middle school students and the audio-recording of peer conversation at Shoji’s lunch period did not find knowledge of pop culture to be important.

Nevertheless, some students enjoyed TV programs in English. Chisa and Noriko regularly watched television in the morning, and Noriko found *Martha Speaks*\(^\text{11}\) especially fun to watch. They watched this linguistically educational program where a talking dog introduces English words such as *innocent, fiction, toil*, etc. in a short skit with humans. Their father turned on this program for no particular reason and the girls found it fun to watch this kids’ animation. Since then, they watched other programs in the morning, too. Although Noriko started to find one of the programs too childish and stopped watching it, she kept watching *Arthur, Curious George*, and in particular, *Martha Speaks* every day for a year as long as time allowed in the morning. Noriko did not know if their friends watched the same programs since she had never talked about them with her friends. Chisa, two years older than Noriko, also found *Martha Speaks* fun.

Whereas Chisa and Noriko had regular access to TV programs, other boys did not watch TV as often. Daisuke sometimes watched *SpongeBob*, a cartoon about marine creatures in an underwater city. Although Ryu generally did not think American TV programs entertaining, he watched some programs because his youngest brother often

\(^{11}\) This show is broadcast by PBS Kids. Some videos are available at their website (http://pbskids.org/martha/).
watched TV. Despite general boredom, Ryu found *South Park*, an animation for relatively mature viewers, particularly fun to watch. However, he also complained about his mother allowing his youngest brother to watch the program that has much bad language and satires. Since Ryu was more inclined to watching movies with violence and vulgarity, he was not particularly fond of watching TV programs and he told me that his friends at school and after school did not talk about TV programs either. Shoji and Daisuke were occasional viewers of certain TV programs particularly sports, since Shoji belonged to a soccer team and Daisuke played in baseball teams. Because of the boys chose the programs just to watch games of soccer, baseball, and football, they did not pay attention to comments in English during the games on TV even though the boys were exposed to English while watching sports on TV.

However, Shoji was once interested in language on TV. An episode where he watched President Obama’s speech during his visit to Japan indicates an important role of TV for Shoji’s L2 development. While Shoji watched the presidential speech in a Japanese program with simultaneous translation, he was impressed with the Japanese interpreter translating for half an hour without a break. Furthermore, Shoji started to be interested in a career as an interpreter for sports players or international conferences because of his mother’s positive comments on interpreters’ earnings.

As Shoji’s episode shows, the availability of Japanese programs had an impact on the Japanese students’ linguistic activities. However, not all experiences were directed to L2-related activities and motivations. Japanese TV programs were usually the Japanese students’ imaginary enclave where they enjoyed a Japanese culture and society transmitted from Japan. Whereas Daisuke liked to watch Japanese dramas thanks to his
access to Japanese TV programs in America, he did not watch American programs as often. Yasushi used to watch American programs for the first one and a half years of his residence in the U.S. When his family came to America, Yasushi and his mother often watched American TV programs so that they could get used to English. But these ardent TV watchers stopped watching TV once his mother had learned that Japanese DVDs were available in town. When I met them, only Yasushi’s 6-year-old brother watched English language programs. Yasushi, insisting that Japanese programs were more fun, watched Japanese DVDs on TV. He watched Japanese comedies and listened to songs streaming on the Internet. As a device of linguistic input, TV sets did not play significant roles for the boys since all the boys found Japanese programs to be more enjoyable than American ones.

4.4.4.2. Videotapes and DVDs

For the learners in EFL contexts, videotapes and DVDs are an important source of learning about how people interact with each other in the target language. However, the students in this study did not watch videotapes and DVDs in English since their parents did not rent or buy them at local stores. Although the students in this study were not ardent watchers of movies, Ryu was an exception. Ryu enjoyed watching movies like Terminator in Japanese dubs before he came to America and he was still a fan of action movies in the U.S. At the time of the interview, he said he liked an American movie, Crank, which I, as an adult who was a former teacher in Japan, did not think very appropriate for a middle school student. Interested in Ryu’s linguistic exposure, I asked him to lend me the movie and I borrowed it for a week. Before I borrowed it, Ryu seemed to enjoy talking about the story, but when I asked him to lend it to me, he hesitantly
said that I should see something milder as a starter and recommended another movie. I explained my aim and convinced him that it was for research purposes. I understood the reason for his hesitation when I watched the movie since it was R-rated with nudity, drug use, strong violence, and offensive language, mainly constituting of F-words.

Since I was not very much used to watching violent scenes with gun fights and blood, it took me some effort to keep watching the movie at home and also had ethical concerns about Ryu’s watching this film, especially in light of its rating. But when I learned that this film was R-15 in Japan, 14 in Italy, and 12 in France, my ethical concern, as someone who was in the education track, was alleviated to some degree. I wrote down the expressions frequently spoken in the film and returned it to Ryu the next week when I reported that the movie was interesting. When I told him that the film was rated R-15 in Japan, he showed a smile as if his burden had been lifted off, which gave me an impression that he had identified himself as a “bad” teenager watching an R-rated film. He said to me, “then, I’m going to be 15 soon.” Ryu enthusiastically spoke about the language used in the movie. I was even surprised that he even remembered the word “epinephrine,” the name of the drug the protagonist needed for his life, although he cautiously refrained from saying the F-words so frequently used in the movie. Ryu told me that he learned the words just naturally by watching the movie several times.

4.4.3. The Internet

The advent of the Internet drastically changed communication across countries in the world especially for the people in diasporic communities (Androutsopoulos, 2007). The Internet was a vital part of the Japanese expatriate students’ life in the U.S. However, while they had access to information in their own language, it was not simple to identify
in what ways and how much these early teens relied on this convenient tool and for what purpose. As for the effects of online connection on expatriates, Fry (2009) suggests that the use of such tools as the Internet by expatriate students in multicultural London allows connection with their home country and give students feelings of strong identities as Japanese. But it hampers their development in English nonetheless.

In the current study, however, the students who had relatively stronger connections with their American peers and who possessed a relatively higher proficiency in English also used the Internet more than the others. Ryu, Shoji and Yasushi used the Internet for various purposes; their uses were broadly categorized into (1) networking, (2) entertainment, (3) information, and (4) other uses. Ryu and Shoji—the students who were highly socialized with local peers—made use of the Internet for networking, as represented by their use of email and Facebook. The others did not use the Internet as much for this purpose. Shoji told me that while many local peers were in his friend list, not many Japanese students were familiar with Facebook.

Yasushi, Daisuke, Chisa and Noriko did not use Facebook or other similar online social networking sites. As the interviews only elicited what the students did rather than what they did not do, I did not know why they did not use these sites. Maybe the students did not have to use the sites because their Japanese friends did not use them. Also, as I sometimes heard when I was working at a Saturday school, the teachers at the Japanese Saturday school discouraged—or at least cautioned—middle school students’ use of email and social networking sites due to potential online bullying (ijime) and other safety concerns. Although Ryu and Shoji did not care much about issues of personal information and safety on the Internet and enjoyed the benefit of Facebook, they were not
totally dependent on it either. Shoji had less than ten fan pages which indicated that he did not explore much of the site’s functions. Ryu had less than this number. Both boys distanced themselves from Facebook after a phase of initial excitement. Shoji said its chat program was too slow on his computer and Ryu said it was just not fun any longer.

Emails were another use of computers for networking. However, the students in this study did not use emails so often as I had thought they would. The reasons were different depending on the student. Ryu and Shoji did not use emails because they used text messaging services that came with their cell phones instead. The other four students did not use either emails or text messaging services. They used emails only when it was necessary, which was quite rare. Particularly, Chisa did not use email service for a year because of her account problem and still she did not seem to care much about it. Yasushi, Daisuke, and Noriko sometimes used emails but they did not have friends with whom they had to have contact so frequently as Ryu and Shoji.

The second type of Internet use was for entertainment. Except for Chisa and Noriko who seldom used the Internet, the Japanese boys enjoyed using the Internet for pleasure such as watching videos and listening to music. In particular, Ryu, Shoji, and Yasushi tended to watch video and listen to music both in English and Japanese while they preferred Japanese shows, music and animation. As for English content, the boys often randomly watched available video clips on YouTube. Yasushi started to listen to Michael Jackson when he learned about his death in winter 2010. Ryu searched for information on YouTube about customizing Grand Theft Auto, which was his favorite, crime-themed computer game. Except for Daisuke, the boys sometimes spent hours on the Internet including sites such as YouTube and Facebook. Ryu’s mother, in particular,
complained about of his addictive use of the computer all day long although he was mostly playing offline games.

The third type of Internet use among the participants in this study was for research purposes. All the students except for Noriko used the Internet for this purpose and to fulfill their school assignments. They mainly used Google to find whatever necessary information the search engine could locate. Sometimes, Wikipedia helped them greatly because it often provided explanations in both English and Japanese. Daisuke appreciated the information in Wikipedia provided in multiple languages because he encountered many unknown words in social studies. On the other hand, Shoji avoided using Wikipedia because his science teacher discouraged his students to use it due to potentially unreliable information which Shoji called “lies” (*uso*). Online dictionaries were also helpful in students’ homework assignments. When Yasushi had assignments in Language Arts, he used an online dictionary to look for words’ meanings, synonyms, and antonyms. Since I tutored him during this study, I taught him how to use an online thesaurus and he was able to complete his assignments by himself afterwards.

4.4.5. Activities in English

4.4.5.1. Reading in English

Although the students had to read in various situations during their stay in the U.S., such as reading signs at school and brief instructions, they generally disliked conventional reading. As the students did not read newspapers, most of their conventional reading experiences came from assigned readings in ESL, other textbooks at school, and websites to fulfill class assignments. While Noriko showed strong aversion to reading, except for Japanese graphic novels (*manga*), Chisa sometimes read the novels which her
Japanese friend gave her before returning to Japan. At the time of the interview, she was reading *Skating Dreams*, a story of a girl skater, for her own pleasure. Chisa got several books from her Japanese friend, and she often read them at the study center when she finished her assignment.

Daisuke sometimes flipped several pages of his brother’s sports magazines but never the books from the library. Yasushi and Shoji mainly read their class assignments and *Eiken* textbooks. Ryu “only sometimes” read books of his own choice in the library. Still, he was good at finding information in manuals and the Internet. Except for school assignments, most of the students’ reading experiences in English were tied with the Internet which enabled the students to find necessary information for their class projects.

However, distance from books did not necessarily mean that the students were away from reading in English at all. One month before returning to Japan, Noriko went shopping for books with her family so she could read them back in Japan. Noriko bought a comic strip *Calvin and Hobbes*. Her selection came from her positive experience in reading one of the series in her ESL classroom. She read it when she did not have homework during the period at study center and found the series’ funny and adorable. Noriko was not able to follow some of the stories in the comic strips since they had many coined words and scientific onomatopoeia in addition to culturally distinct humor. But she was overall charmed by the stories and pictures.

Noriko’s interest in the comic strip was understandable. She also liked to read Japanese graphic novels (*manga*) as her mother did emphasize that Noriko read “only manga.” Therefore, it was not surprising that Noriko chose to read those comic strips rather than books full of textual matters. However, her choice of comic strips also seemed
to have linguistic reasons. As Liu (2004) argues, comic strips boost comprehension with repetitive information through text and picture and they are beneficial especially for low-intermediate readers. In this regard, it is understandable that Noriko was attracted to comic books (*manga*) in Japanese and in English considering her struggle in both languages.

On the other hand, Chisa, who was two years older than Noriko, tended to read books even though Noriko showed a better result in an *Eiken* test. Chisa did not find Noriko’s comic books very interesting and she did not even know how to read them at first because American comic books read from left to right whereas Japanese ones read from right to left. In addition to this confusion, she did not identify with the humor, which she called “jokes,” in the comics. These students’ reading preferences indicate that not only linguistic factors but also cultural barriers and ideological inhibitions (e.g., comic books are for children) constitute reasons for the choices of reading materials.

4.4.5.2. Songs

Whereas reading is largely related to the processing of visual information, listening to and singing songs deal with acoustic information. The students with easy access to the Internet were able to enjoy songs, both in English and Japanese, because the Internet enabled the students to have access to various kinds of music according to their preferences. Yasushi, a big fan of *Arashi*, a Japanese pop idol group, listened to this group’s songs in two languages of obscured linguistic boundaries (cf. Moody, 2006). Moreover, when Michael Jackson died in winter 2010, Yasushi started listening to his songs and learned new expressions from them. Shoji started to listen to American singers about a year after his arrival and Ryu randomly listened to English songs on YouTube as
well. On the other hand, Daisuke, Chisa, and Noriko were not ardent listeners of pop music.

Although some of the boys listened to music on the school bus, they did not usually have time to sing. In this regard, Chisa had a different experience from the others. Chisa belonged to a choir at school and learned over thirty songs in English for the two years of her residence. In addition, she took singing lessons at home and learned to sing both in English and Japanese because her instructor was Japanese. In the choir at school, she learned a variety of expressions and vocabulary when an American teacher explained them to her students.

However, Chisa’s knowledge of English through singing practices was not necessarily transferable to her daily life. When Chisa learned to sing a song in Annie, a Broadway musical which was also popular in Japan, she did not know the meaning of the word “sorrow” but she mistook it with “swallow.” Because of the similarity in pronunciation—at least in their perception—Noriko insisted that the meaning of the word was to “take in” (nomikomu) as in “swallow,” but Chisa felt it strange because the meaning did not correspond with the interpretation of the song that her teacher provided. Chisa solved the confusion by attributing the discrepancy to archaic expressions found in many songs and left the problem alone for two years. She (accidentally) noticed her misunderstanding while she was answering my questions in the interview.

Interview with Chisa (IC03292010329; my translation)

1  **Shima:** Did you learn words from these songs?  こういう歌で結構言葉って覚える？

2  **Chisa:** Yes, I did. But the words in songs  ああ、覚え、うん、覚えた、でも、でもな
and the words in texts have different meanings sometimes.

3 Shima: I see.

4 Chisa: I don’t know what they mean or maybe I know them [chuckles].

5 Shima: Do you get confused?

6 Chisa: Confused, yes, confused.

7 Shima: You wonder if the meaning is different from the song.

8 Chisa: My sister said that sorrow (soro) was to take in, but in the song, the word means to get rid of everything bad. It means something totally different, but the spellings are the same, and I don’t care a bit.

9 Shima: Oh, swallow (suwaro). I see.

10 Chisa: [singing] Swallow, swallow (suwaro), to get rid of something bad?

11 Shima: Well, what is the song?

12 Chisa: Tomorrow

13 Shima: Tomo-, I see. It’s Annie.

14 Chisa: Annie. The musical.

15 Shima: #After a few turns# Do you remember the part of the song around swallow?

16 Chisa: No, I don’t [laughs].

17 Shima: You don’t.

18 Chisa: Oh, I do.
19 **Shima:** You do? Can you sing it a bit [laughs]?

20 **Chisa:** [laughs]

21 **Shima:** You don’t have to sing it, but can you tell me the lyrics?

22 **Chisa:** Well

23 **Shima:** If you think it’s better to sing, then do so.

24 **Chisa:** Because I learned it with melodies, I can’t say without strange tones.

25 **Shima:** I’d rather listen to you sing, then.

26 **Chisa:** [singing] some-, sorrow, sorrow, sorrow, (just) talking about tomorrow ( ) away the ( ) and a sorrow

27 **Shima:** Oh, sorrow.

28 **Chisa:** It’s not swallow, is it?

29 **Shima:** I see.

30 **Chisa:** I guess they are spelt the same. When it’s said, the pronunciations are the same and I thought the spellings were the same. They are different, aren’t they?

31 **Shima:** I see. Do you know this meaning?

32 **Chisa:** Yes. To rid of something bad.

Chisa noticed her misunderstanding because I accidentally pointed out that Chisa was saying *sorrow* not *swallow* (line 27). However, her misunderstanding was maintained in line 30 because I did not explicitly teach her the difference between the two words.

Maybe this misunderstanding came from the way Chisa learned the song. Since Chisa did
not consult her dictionary when confronted with unfamiliar words, she negotiated the meaning with her sister, whose English is almost equal to her sister’s. While both girls knew the general interpretation of the lyrics, their lack of knowledge of a particular word confused Chisa and misled her into historical explanation of the discrepancy.

4.5. Network of people

This chapter has so far discussed the Japanese expatriate students’ patterns of life and their access to English in each setting. This study found three elements essential to the students’ L2 learning; namely, space (e.g., school, home), materials (e.g., computer, books, TV set), and people. Among these three elements, this section focuses on the people with whom the Japanese middle school students had contact in L2 English.

Personal networks are important in language learning as Minoura (1984, 2003) suggests. In her study, the relationship with peers played a significant role in the development of Japanese expatriate children’s L2 meaning system. Similarly, Jia, Aaronson, and Wu (2002) argues that parents’ L2 proficiency has much to do with the Chinese immigrant children’s L2 proficiency although exposure to the language through various media also has great importance for a wider range and variety of linguistic items. The interaction with people and observation of the interaction between people enable L2 learners to understand, with limitations, how they should use language and what values particular features of language have in society. In general, the Japanese students’ personal networks in English consisted of a variety of people, such as local and international friends, other non-Japanese adults, the students’ own siblings, parents, and other acquaintances. In addition, Japanese peers and adults also played important roles in the expatriate students’ L2 ecology even though they spoke in Japanese.
4.5.1. Non-Japanese peers

Non-Japanese friends and acquaintances played an important role in their casual use of English since Japanese expatriate students did not usually speak English with other Japanese. However, the quality and quantity of interactions with non-Japanese peers varied among the middle school students in the study. Although the students’ knowledge of English seemed to be related to the size of their network and the quality of interaction, there were other elements comprising these differences. The opportunities to meet people had to do with the location of their residence, school demographics, and non-linguistic activities like soccer and baseball. The Japanese students had different chances to know people around them according to the environment they lived in. The relationship with the people of their generation (see Table 8) also had different strengths in its bonding, as generally described as clique, gangs, peers, acquaintances, etc. The students in this study also had a range of relationships with a variety of people in their environment and the peers were the most important people for the students whose parents did not speak English at home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ryu</th>
<th>Shoji</th>
<th>Yasushi</th>
<th>Daisuke</th>
<th>Chisa</th>
<th>Noriko</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closest peers</td>
<td>Locals</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Asians,</td>
<td>Asians,</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Locals,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (years)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary group</td>
<td>Locals</td>
<td>Locals,</td>
<td>Asians</td>
<td>Asians</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Mixed,</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Size</td>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools for</td>
<td>Cell phone</td>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Phone,</td>
<td>Phone,</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connection</td>
<td>phone</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Initial guides</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 An overview of the six Japanese students’ peer networks

Ryu was the only participant that was deeply grounded in the local peer network although he also studied in a Japanese Saturday school and juku. The other five students were oriented more or less into a Japanese community and non-local peers. Overall, the students who were more proficient in English had closer relationship with non-Japanese and local peers. Proficiency was one of the requirements to be a constructive part of a group but someone who guided newcomers into his or her group was also important (cf. Minoura, 1984). For example, Yasushi and Daisuke had a proficient Japanese boy who introduced them to an existing group. Even after the boy returned to Japan, one Asian boy in the group maintained the friendship. Ryu had a Japanese friend who accompanied him for the first few years. Ryu also went to school with all the sixth graders in the district for one year before middle school and made friends with many local peers.

In the case of Shoji, a Japanese girl who sat next to him in elementary school helped him with school life. Although Shoji did not become part of her group, he found such a guide among non-Japanese students while he developed his network in a soccer team. Chisa initially had a Japanese friend who connected her with other local students. However, Chisa lost the connection when her friend went back to Japan. After that, she mostly spent her free time with Japanese peers at school. Noriko was not even able to find such a connection as she did not have an initial guide who helped her join in any network. There were Japanese students in her elementary school but Noriko could not develop good relationships with them because of compatibility and gender identity.
For the Japanese expatriate students, whether they could be in a group of peers partly depended on luck because sojourner students like them came and left constantly and Japanese friends were not necessarily able to connect newcomers with their existing networks of local peers. Also, the students’ networks of friends were not static as the networks changed their sizes when new members joined in and old ones left. The quality of interaction with others changed as the students developed their L2 and when other aspects of their life changed such as taking new classes in new school years. For instance, during the period of this study, Shoji made closer friends with a local boy, Carl, to the extent that Shoji told me in a cheerful tone how he learned English while he enjoyed classes with the boy.

Interview with Shoji (SI1112200939; my translation)

1 **Shoji:** When I talk to Carl, I sometimes learn from him [giggles] these days.

2 **Shima:** What do you learn?

3 **Shoji:** Well, some difficult words, well, yes, this week I learned a weird word. It means underpants are caught between the butts [giggles]. What did he say? Starting with w- and something like wi-, anyway yes, I learned it. When I asked him what it was, then he said, oh, you don’t know it.

4 **Shima:** When did you have the conversation?

5 **Shoji:** When we’re in Language Arts [laughs]. We’re not doing our project. We’re just having fun. He suddenly said it
then, and I asked him what it was...yes, I learned a lot of English then [giggles].

After three years in America, Shoji had little difficulty in understanding what others said. But he also thought that his American friends were reserved and they chose easier words when they spoke to him. Shoji described Carl as “dame” (loser) in Japanese because Carl never did his homework and asked Shoji what to do in class. However, Shoji also felt that Carl treated him equally and taught him many things without hurting Shoji’s self-esteem. Shoji had fun with the boy who never did his homework. Through this friendship, Shoji learned non-textbook English expressions like his local peers.

Despite his closeness with Carl, Shoji did not have access to particular local peers. He used the word level to explain the existence of a transparent wall between him and those he could not be friends with.

Interview with Shoji (S1112200986; my translation)

1 Shoji: After all, I cannot talk to people so casually unless they are close. Well, yes, they have to be as close as Carl. Carl, or Luke are maybe good these days. The relationship needs to be at some level. Unless we are on that level, I cannot [chuckles] speak well. I want to speak to the guys on the upper level, but my mouth stops moving.

2 Shima: You just said upper level. What level is it?

3 Shoji: Well, I wonder what it is. The level...
of being friendly with me? The level of understanding me, maybe. I wonder what it is. There are guys in the upper level at school. Well, cool guys get together with cool guys and popular guys are with popular guys. And I’m not in good terms with those guys. Well, John and Luke are some of them. But only those two, if I talk to the guys on that level. I don’t talk to the others so much.

4 Shima: So, John and Luke are in the American group but they come to your side at lunch.

5 Shoji: Ah, I guess that’s me. I think I move to their side. They don’t move a bit, but they say “come on, Shoji,” and I move to their side often.

6 Shima: Could you explain a bit more about the people you cannot talk to?

7 Shoji: Well, American, well, I wonder what it is. When I look at them, they have auras [chuckles]. Those great guys, those who are good at every sport and popular among girls. I cannot be in good terms with them. I have never talked to them either. And there are girls who have such auras [chuckles] and they are the same though I don’t talk to girls at school. I
cannot talk to them much.

The inaccessibility and distance to particular people were not unique to Shoji who saw “auras” surrounding certain people. Other students also had their networks of friends. Ryu identified his group as school haters whom the teachers did not like and separated themselves from “good kids.” Chisa and Noriko did not have very close connections with local students. While Yasushi did not give me enough information about his not-so-friendly people, Daisuke had a close bonding with his tennis mates but had strong antipathy against noisy boys at the nearby table at lunchtime.

As there were group boundaries among students, it was important for some students to maintain group solidarity. Yasushi and Daisuke played tennis with their Asian peers once or twice a week and Chisa and Noriko met their Japanese friends at Saturday school. In addition to direct contact, only Shoji and Ryu used cell phones for personal connections and they relied mainly on text messaging. For the first month, both boys were addicted to text messaging and they were in trouble because they texted a lot without monitoring the number of texts they exchanged. In the first month when their fathers bought cell phones for their sons, Shoji’s father had to pay $100 for Shoji’s bill and Ryu’s father $500 for Ryu’s bill. Their fathers prohibited the boys to use cell phones for a while but it does not mean the boys were no longer text addicts as their parents eventually switched to unlimited plans.

Both boys frequently exchanged messages with friends. These messages were often short in English especially after they switched plans. For example, when I was interviewing Ryu one day, he exchanged text messages with his friends. When I asked him what he received and what he sent back, he told me that his friend asked what Ryu
was doing, to which Ryu succinctly replied, “watching TV” and to the subsequent text “k” for okay. Such brief and simple messages were probably not significantly related to the boys’ syntactic development and increase in academic vocabulary in English but the language used in text messaging was sociolinguistically important for the maintenance of their networks with their friends as well as the Japanese students’ social identities.

Ryu’s mother well understood the importance of her son’s connection through the cell phone and she used it as a pretext to admonish Ryu’s misbehaviors. One time when she was furious with Ryu for not submitting his assignment and receiving a call from school, she attributed his deteriorating grades to constant text messaging. She threatened her “laid-back” son by telling him that she would ask his father to prohibit him from using his cell phone. Ryu’s cell phone and his constant maintenance of solidarity with his friends became “a hostage” for the mother to make her son study harder.

4.5.2. Japanese peers

Japanese friends were important for the Japanese expatriate students not only when they talked in Japanese but also because Japanese friends extended their connections with local peers to newcomers. In addition, Japanese friends were also newcomers’ models and teachers in the new linguistic environment. Among the six Japanese students, Chisa benefited the most from her Japanese friends who were more proficient in English. When she told me about her horseback riding camp during the previous winter break, she talked about her learning experiences in her relationship with a Japanese friend.

Interview with Chisa (IC03292010021; my translation)

1 Chisa: [A girl] went there with me. She あ、一緒行ったんだけど、その子が、
came to America about the same time as me but she is better at English.

2 **Shima:** Is she good at English?

3 **Chisa:** She’s good. So, I watched her, and “oh, well,” I thought, “why don’t I imitate her?”

4 **Shima:** I see.

5 **Chisa:** To take good parts from her.

6 **Shima:** Do you mind talking a little more about what you imitated?

7 **Chisa:** Well, what were they? Something like grammar was good, or anyway, that was great. Oh, I thought “that’s great.” I don’t remember what she said but she was talking so fluently and I thought, “oh.”

8 **Shima:** And you listened to her and you thought you could imitate her.

9 **Chisa:** I thought, “I said this in this way and she said that in that way.”

Chisa consciously compared her knowledge and ability in English with her friend’s whom she thought was better than her. Although I could not determine what had constructed Chisa’s guidelines of good grammar from the interview, at least Chisa thought her friend’s English different as well as fluent. Moreover, Chisa appreciated her friend’s English as good enough to be imitated. While it is not known whether or not Chisa’s command of English developed through her direct contact with other speakers of English, Chisa experienced internal tensions between her own language repertoire and her peers’ uses of English. This awareness of a gap from other speakers is necessary for
L2 development; otherwise, even instructional recast may be unnoticed by L2 learners (Long & Robinson, 1998). In terms of raising awareness, Chisa’s friend was a good teacher for Chisa.

While the other participants did not report this kind of interaction in their interviews, Chisa even spoke to her Japanese peers in English. Not only did she learn English from her Japanese peers through observation, but she also actively tested her new linguistic knowledge with them.

Interview with Chisa (IC03292010112; my translation)

1 Shima: How about (the opportunities of speaking English) at lunch period? えっと、あとランチタイムはどう？

2 Chisa: At lunch period, hmm, so-so. ランチタイムは、んー、まあまあ

3 Shima: Who were with you? あの、まわり、一緒にいる人誰だったっけ

4 Chisa: Well, Japanese girls, Saki and Yoko. えっと、日本人の女の子たち、Saki ちゃんと Yoko ちゃん

5 Shima: I see. Then, you speak Japanese all the time? あ、そっか、ていうことは、日本語ずっと話してる？

6 Chisa: Hmm, mostly, but sometimes I talk in English. んー、大体は、うん、たまに英語で話をする？

7 Shima: On what occasions do you talk in English? どんなことになると英語で話することになる？

→ 8 Chisa: Well, when is it [chuckles], well, I say abruptly “how do you doing” and they respond to me. なんだろう、（軽い笑い）、なんかね、あたしがね、急に、how do you doing って言うから、ま、英語で返してくる

9 Shima: I see. ああ

10 Chisa: But I don’t understand what they say, and so, I say something at some point でもなんか、話がよくわからないから適当になんか、話して、たまに、わかんな
when I don’t know how to say something, I say it in Japanese, and then English, English mixed with Japanese [chuckles].

11 **Shima:** Well, you mean, it’s not like you speak English because you don’t know Japanese.

12 **Chisa:** I use Japanese because I don’t know English. Sometimes I speak in English.

13 **Shima:** Is it more or less like practice? When you use English.

14 **Chisa:** Practice, hmm?

15 **Shima:** Or jokingly.

16 → **Chisa:** No, like, today, I say something with the grammar I had learned in ESL.

17 **Shima:** I see.

18 **Chisa:** I wondered if I could make myself understood.

19 **Shima:** Oh, I see. Then, you wanted to use the new things you learned.

20 → **Chisa:** I wanted to realize them (*jitsugen shiyo*) rather than use them.

As Chisa said in line 8, she greeted her Japanese peers in English. The mistaken expression “*how do you doing*” is not a very important issue in this discussion. Rather, Chisa’s attempt to talk to her Japanese female friends in English needs to be examined as her friends also greeted her back. Such casual greetings in L2 among close peers may happen to proficient bilinguals as code-switching practices. However, Chisa here greeted
her Japanese peers in English because she wanted to use English. As she explains in line 16, she used English when she wanted to put her new knowledge into practice. She switched codes from Japanese to English not because she lacked the knowledge of either one of the languages but she wanted to make certain if she could make herself understood in English with the new rules of the code in her interaction with her Japanese peers who were more proficient in English. Although switching to English for practice may often be seen in EFL classrooms where students learn to use L2 through interactions with their peers, Chisa actively carried out the practice in casual conversations with her friends at lunch. In other words, Chisa’s linguistic environment in the U.S. was more like EFL once she left classrooms.

The significance of Chisa’s two Japanese female friends was that they, especially Saki, who responded to Chisa’s sudden switch to English in the same code, were more proficient than Chisa. From the perspective of community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991), the female friends took the role of a guide to the center of the community of English-speakers by giving Chisa opportunities to test her linguistic knowledge. What Chisa said in line 20 was important to understand her relationship with the community of practice. Chisa rejected my suggestion of the word tsukau (use) for her knowledge (i.e., use new knowledge). Instead she chose another Japanese verb jitsugen suru (実現; realize as in “realize a dream”) to express her desire with the new linguistic knowledge. In her definition, using linguistic knowledge and realizing linguistic knowledge were separated. She was able to use English as superficial knowledge, but it did not necessarily mean to her that she “realized” her language. Her new linguistic knowledge was “realized” by using it with her Japanese peers who were different from her peers in ESL
classroom where they used the linguistic knowledge in this artificial space of language learning.

In classroom learning, there are many occasions where learners use an expression without realizing it in “real” life. In other words, her distinction between “using” and “realizing” new knowledge is equivalent to the difference between her identities as a learner of English and as a legitimate English speaker. The difference between her two identities indicates the significance of her linguistic environment surrounded by local English speakers rather than learning with EFL textbooks. Chisa was able to develop her identity as a legitimate English speaker by “realizing” new linguistic knowledge through the interactions with more proficient Japanese peers, who may also be at the periphery of their imagined communities of English speakers. By assigning a position closer to the center to her Japanese peers, Chisa tried to “realize” her linguistic knowledge as a legitimate speaker of English.

However, Chisa was an exception in this regard. Since the Japanese expatriate students came to America in their middle childhood, they usually did not speak English to their Japanese peers. When Daisuke and Yasushi talked to each other even with the other Asian boys during lunch, they spoke in Japanese with each other. Shoji talked to his Japanese friend at school in Japanese to the extent that a local girl in their school even complained about it. Noriko ignored her sister when Chisa greeted her in English and did not tell me any similar episode as her sister. Although the students avoided speaking English to other Japanese peers, they usually heard their Japanese peers speak English to non-Japanese people. These instances were occasion of learning consciously and unconsciously from their peers. By providing the Japanese students positive and negative
examples of English through observation, Japanese peers were also important players in
the students’ L2 ecology.

4.5.3. Non-Japanese adults

The Japanese middle school students in this study interacted with the people not
only of their generation. Adults also played important roles in the students’ L2 ecology.
Non-Japanese adults consisted of (1) teachers and coaches, (2) tutors, and (3) neighbors
and occasional visitors. They created the students’ L2 ecology differently according to
their roles in given contexts.

*Teachers and coaches*

The Japanese students’ relationship with their teachers was not simple as is often
the case for many adolescent students. Each student had their liking and disliking toward
their teachers whose ways of teaching their subjects affected their popularity. Regardless
of their popularity, the teachers usually taught their subjects in English. Written materials
such as textbooks, handouts and other supporting documents were also written in English.
Whereas teachers gave instructions to their students, the students answered the teachers’
questions and asked questions if they had any. However, the Japanese students did not
have direct contact with their teachers aside from classroom instructions, especially with
the ones in mainstream classes. Even in classes, answering questions and asking
questions were the only opportunities for the Japanese students to have linguistic
exchanges with their teachers. In general, the relationship with teachers—and coaches in
Shoji and Daisuke’s cases—was unidirectional. The Japanese students tended to just
listen to what the teachers and coaches said and the students usually asked their friends
for help if the students did not understand. The students had to ask their teachers if such close friends were not present.

The relationship with teachers outside classes was usually distanced except for ESL teachers who actively talked to the students with limited proficiency in English. Still, the students sometimes needed to go to their teachers to ask for help. For instance, Shoji went to his gym teacher one day with Manuel to ask for help. In this instance, a non-classroom interaction with a teacher expanded Shoji’s linguistic environment. Both of the students had trouble understanding the teacher but it was not because of their lack of English proficiency in general but it was because the teacher used a special term for his gym classes.

Interview with Shoji (SI119200993; my translation)

1 Shoji: …yesterday, I was playing badminton with Manuel, alone with him. The basket ball [goal] is usually pulled up but it was half down, and we were playing in the court under it. And we put our shuttles twice on the goal. Then, Manuel and I went to the gym teacher. He’s a funny teacher, and, well, there was a long T-shaped bar and they use it to get the shuttle. He called it Mr. T, and told us to grab Mr. T. I asked Manuel if he knew what Mr. T was and he said he didn’t. He asked me if I did, and I said not at all. So we asked the teacher, and he told us to ask the guy over there, and it turned out to be
In this episode, “Mr. T” was only communicable around the gym teacher and it did not reflect the entire “society” of English speakers although there certainly were people to whom “Mr. T” made perfect sense however few they were. The group of people who understood “Mr. T” was not an entity with boundaries like a nation, a village, etc. People were connected by the knowledge of “Mr. T”, which was a mere T-shaped bar which might have otherwise been used in different contexts. Being aware of the bar and learning about it from “the guy over there” was to become part of the group that knows about “Mr. T”. This episode indicates that language socialization is to expand one’s linguistic environment by sharing knowledge of language with someone else rather than to enter a homogeneous group of particular speakers in imagination.

Although such accidental talk with teachers should give the Japanese students opportunities for L2 socialization, the Japanese students’ relationships with their teachers were mostly distanced, except for Chisa. Teachers, especially in ESL, were Chisa’s beneficial conversation partners in English and they were important people in Chisa’s network because Chisa did not develop close relationship with her local peers after three years of residence. While reading and writing could be done without a partner—whether it may be motivating or not—speaking English needed a partner with whom she could talk. In this regard, Chisa’s network of friends was limited to Japanese peers and other international students in ESL who were not close enough and did not frequently speak to her outside classes. Probably to counterbalance this limitation, Chisa included teachers in
her network of “friends.” Chisa remembered an interaction with her ESL teacher as follows:

Interview with Chisa (IC04052010265; my translation)

1 Shima: Okay, how about the opportunities to speak English?
   えっと、あと、話す機会というのは
2 Chisa: Opportunities to speak, hmm, not much
   話す機会、んー、あんまりないかな
3 Shima: How about to your ESL teacher?
   ESL の先生とか
4 Chisa: I speak to her
   は話す
5 Shima: What is your ESL teacher like?
   話す、ふん、ESL の先生どんな先生？
6 Chisa: Well, she’s sort of kind.
   んー、なんか優しい
7 Shima: Is she easy for you to talk to?
   うん、話しやすい？
8 Chisa: Yes, she is.
   話しやすい
9 Shima: I see. What sort of things do you talk about with your teacher?
   ふうん、どういうこと話すの？先生と
10 Chisa: Well, yes, today she said she went to Florida. So, I said to her, “yaketane” ("you’ve got suntanned/sunburned.")
   な、なんだっけ、あ、今日ね、先生がフロリダに行ったって言うから、焼けたねって
11 Shima: #several turns to confirm the English words for “yaketane”# I see. What else?
   （中略；「焼けた」の意味を確認）なるほど、うん、他には？
12 Chisa: Hmm, well, what do I talk to her? [chuckles]. I talk with her often, but I don’t know what we talked about. It’s something meaningless.
   んー、なんだろ、何話してる（軽い笑い）、なんかよく話してるけど、内容がよくわからない、くだらないことしてる
13 Shima: Then, you talk something meaningless back to her, too?
   じゃあ、自分もその、ある、くだらないことを話し返してことかな？
14 Chisa: I said to her that my locker did not open today and she asked me why. So, I
said, I was at a wrong locker number, and laughed. [laughs]

15 Shima: Yeah, that kind of conversation is important, isn’t it?

16 Chisa: What else, hmm, yes, I said to her, “I got a good score on the test.”

17 Shima: Then, what did she say?

18 Chisa: She said, “Good job.”

19 Shima: I see.

20 Chisa: Well, the score wasn’t so good, but, I wonder why I said good. I forgot why [chuckles].

Considering that the other students in the interviews did not tell me about their casual conversations with their teachers, Chisa was an exception among the participants in this study. It was interesting that the student who had the smallest peer network in English told me about her casual conversations with her teachers because probably the other students in ESL classes also had similarly casual interactions with teachers.

Compared with the other students, Chisa recounted more episodes about talking with mature people such as horseback riding coaches and teachers but not with her local peers. In short, the absence of close relationships with her English-speaking peers highlighted her friendly relationship with her teachers.

Non-Japanese tutors

Outside school, the students had teachers (sensei) who were called “tutors” in English. The Japanese sojourner families usually hired tutors who were the first
significant helpers for the children with little knowledge of English when they came to the U.S. The parents had their views and reasons for choosing tutors—in addition to a tutor’s availability. Their ideal tutor was a local person who also understood Japanese to help the mothers read letters from school and see to school paperwork. When such a person was not available, the next choice was a Japanese tutor who also could help the mothers. The purposes of hiring tutors varied depending on the periods during the stay. I worked for Japanese families, except for Daisuke’s, toward the end of their stay when they expected to restart a life back in Japan soon. Knowing that I used to teach in Japan, they hired me mainly to help their children prepare for the Eiken test.

While the families relied on many Japanese tutors, American tutors played a better role in teaching students how to speak English. Ryu’s tutor, a son of immigrants from the U.K., taught Ryu for four and a half years. Although Ryu had two other American tutors and two Japanese ones during different periods of his stay, he appreciated the relationship with the first tutor. This tutor in his early 20s taught Ryu from the alphabet and color terms to grammar. At the time of this study, he helped Ryu in the preparation for the Eiken test. When I asked Ryu how he learned English, he answered as follows:

Interview with Ryu (RI02012010146; my translation)

1 Ryu: I learned English naturally at school and my tutor also taught it to me. But rather than saying I learned English from my tutor, it was more like I learned it while I was talking with him.

学校で、自然に身についたっていうのと、あと、チューターに教えてもらったり、でも、なんとなく、チューターとも、英語を教えてもらって学んだっていうよりは、チューターと話している間に学んだって感じますね
Although tutors could provide opportunities for interaction in English, not every student in this study was able to make use of the time and relationship. Daisuke’s parents generally hired non-Japanese tutors with whom Daisuke developed close relationships. When I visited him during one of his tutoring sessions, Daisuke talked to the tutor almost always in Japanese while the tutor talked to Daisuke in English. It was amusing to watch them discuss *Eiken* questions in that way as they were communicating with each other in two languages quite naturally. Such conversations were possible because the tutor had studied the Japanese language when he worked in Japan after college. Shoji and Yasushi had American tutors as well at the beginning of their residence. However, the tutors were required to understand Japanese to be able to communicate with the mothers. In the latter halves of their stay, the students’ tutors were all Japanese. Therefore, the students did not have many opportunities to use English when they were tutored.

*Neighbors*

The families in this study lived in neighborhoods where few Japanese people were around. The children met their Japanese friends on weekends when they sometimes spent a night together in a group at their friends’ houses. However, the students did not have Japanese friends within a walking distance. Besides, the children did not have opportunities to interact with people in the neighborhood in English. The children tended to avoid answering the door and phone and meeting occasional local visitors. Sometimes, this attitude frustrated their mothers because they struggled more with English than their children after three years of residence. While Shoji and Ryu helped their mothers in need, the other students were often too much reserved or introverted to meet strangers to help their mothers.
However, there were some occasions when Daisuke’s mother tried to set up opportunities for her shy son to have social interactions in English. When the active mother was shoveling the snow in front of the next door, an old lady next door told her to make Daisuke do it. After Daisuke did as he was told, she invited him for tea to thank his effort. Daisuke’s mother happily told me about her son’s relationship with this retired high school teacher next door and stressed how she perceived the importance of children’s independence in American society through her neighbor’s attitude. Though Daisuke’s experience was one of the rare interactions for adolescent expatriate students with their neighbors, it provided him with an opportunity to expand his L2 ecology. More importantly, such an opportunity was possible because Daisuke’s mother was able to speak English. In other words, she guided her son in her network in the neighborhood.

4.5.4. Japanese adults

The Japanese middle school students had no opportunity to speak to Japanese adults in English although they sometimes talked about English. The students developed knowledge in English and values about the language as well as themselves as its speakers through talks with adults in Japanese. However, the adults around the students were not as diverse as local adults because those Japanese adults’ social roles were limited in the foreign country in addition to the limited places where the students interacted with Japanese adults. The Japanese adults in their networks were mostly limited to (1) parents, (2) bilingual aides at school, (3) teachers at Saturday school, and (4) tutors.

Parents

In L1 socialization, parents or caregivers are primarily important for language input. In second language learning, parents are often not the significant sources of
linguistic knowledge since parents are also struggling with the dominant language in their host countries. However, the roles of parents in L2 socialization were not negligible in this study because parents were often the ones that gave permission to their children’s access to particular linguistic resources. As for the parents in this study, their will in addition to the information available to them determined where to live in the area. These decisions formed the ground for the environment to which their children had direct access. At the same time, the parents made efforts to make their children’s stay meaningful. Daisuke’s mother, in particular, set up many opportunities in which Daisuke would have contact with the locals where he used English to communicate.

In L1 socialization, parents usually have control over what is good and what is bad in language use especially for young children. As for the Japanese parents, they did not have such criteria regarding their children’s L2 English. Even if they had had such a criterion, their attitude may appear to be generous to many local parents. Ryu’s parents, for instance, did not care about the variety of language their children were exposed to through mass media which often censored language with high beeps or at least cautioned viewers over profanity. In lines 20 and 23 of the following excerpt of an interview, Ryu and his mother negotiated the values of parental guidance.

Interview with Ryu (RI0222010187; my translation)

1  **Shima:** What video did you say you were watching?
2  **Ryu:** Crank
3  **Shima:** Would you tell me more about that?
4  **Ryu:** About?
5 Shima: Did you watch movies like that?
Ryu: Yeah, I did.

6 Shima: What kind of language? What kind of movie was it?
Ryu: Well, something like an assassin keeps killing people to save himself.

7 Shima: I see. Then, PG again.
Ryu: No, it’s R already.

8 Shima: R, R-rated
Ryu: R

9 Shima: Do your parents, mother and father…
Ryu: They don’t say anything about things like that.

10 Shima: Where do you buy such movies?
Ryu: My dad bought that movie when he went to (indistinct) so I could watch it.

11 Shima: Oh, so your dad bought it for you.
Ryu: My dad.

12 Shima: But your dad doesn’t know about R or PG.

13 Ryu’s mom: [to Ryu] About what?
Ryu: He knows. He knows it but he doesn’t care about it. [talking over to next room] Mom, you don’t care about it, do you, mom?

14 Ryu’s mom: [to Shima] I care about

15 Shima: But your dad doesn’t know about R or PG.
them. Although I care about them, I let him watch [laughs].

While the Japanese parents provided little linguistic input to their children, they did not restrict linguistic input either. However, the parents still played the key roles in determining the language ecology for their children through parental investments in the child’s L2 learning. The concept of investment here is different from Pierce’s (1995) original use. The parents had their expectations about their children’s future (cf. Haneda & Monobe, 2009; Langager, 2010) and they tried to set up the best environment for their children’s linguistic development according to their beliefs in the best balance between L1 and L2. The parents did not contribute much to their children’s L2 development in the sense of traditional language socialization where both children and parents use the same language but they contributed to the construction of their children’s L2 environment.

Bilingual aides at school

Only Dartmouth Middle School had the budget for a Japanese bilingual aide who helped Japanese ESL students at school. Ryu and Shoji did not have such support although Shoji’s ESL teacher was a Japanese man who also taught at Saturday school. The bilingual aide helped the students on many occasions, not only in English but also how to thrive at school. Because there was only one aide, the amount of assistance was limited for each student to receive. Thus assistance was usually limited to newcomers as Noriko, who had already spent in the U.S. for two years before starting middle school, did not even know who her bilingual aide was. Chisa remembered that her aide helped her at the initial phase of her stay by teaching her necessary phrases for her school life.
When I asked Chisa about the appropriateness of English, she talked about her bilingual aide teaching her how to speak appropriately.

Interview with Chisa (CI03292010; my translation)

1. **Shima:** Are there any other English expressions that you think you shouldn’t use?

2. **Chisa:** Ah, “Can you, Can you go to the bathroom” isn’t good. “May I” is, oh, that’s “Can I, May I” is better [chuckles]

3. **Shima:** “Can I go to the bathroom”

4. **Chisa:** I feel I shouldn’t use “Can I” to my friends and someone superior and I don’t use it often

5. **Shima:** So, you don’t use it with your friends either.

6. **Chisa:** I don’t use it with my friends. “Can you” sounds like, “can I go to the bathroom?” and so “May I” should be used, I think.

7. **Shima:** Well, who told you that? How have you come to think like that?

8. **Chisa:** I was taught that “May I” is politer

9. **Shima:** By your friend?

10. **Chisa:** No. By a teacher.

11. **Shima:** Oh, I see. ESL?

12. **Chisa:** No, hmm, maybe ESL, a teacher [chuckles]

The interview later clarified that the “teacher” she had in mind here was actually a Japanese female bilingual aide. Since the adults who teach at school were usually called
sensei (teacher) in Japanese, there was no distinction between teachers and aides in Chisa’s mind.

**Saturday school teachers**

The Japanese Saturday school had many adults, young and old, who enriched the expatriate students’ lives in America. Some of them were international students from Japan and others were working at US companies. Although many of them were skilled speakers of English since they were also exposed to highly advanced English at college and beyond, the school aimed to maintain and develop the children’s Japanese skills while they lived abroad. Therefore, the school was not an environment for English learning except for some high school students who took classes for basic grammar and TOEFL preparation.

To elementary and middle school students, Saturday school aimed to simulate Japanese education. The school had limited core classes and practices that replicate the Japanese curriculum under the administration of principals hired by the Japanese Ministry of Education (MEXT). The students in this study reported that they never used English while they were at Saturday school although they encountered a few students who spoke English during recess. One exception for such exclusive use of Japanese was cuss words. Yasushi told me about cussing among Japanese boys at Japanese Saturday school with a grin in his final interview. When asked if he had any knowledge of foul language, or cuss words, he described the talk among his male friends and their accidental uses of cuss words. The boys laughed at the users of cuss words in the Japanese environment and pointed it out by saying “kasutta” (you cussed) which was the
combination of *kasu* (cuss) and a Japanese auxiliary verb -*tta*. Chapter 5 will elaborate cussing-related ideologies among the Japanese expatriate students.

Although the middle school students did not learn English at Saturday school, at least in formal ways, Shoji learned English from an adult who was related to the Japanese school. As the Japanese school used the building from the local school Shoji attended, the wife of the principal came to the school and taught Shoji basic English grammar almost every day when she came to America with her husband. Shoji appreciated her teaching because it was his first time to be aware of third person singular –*s* and other rules of grammar with logical explanations.

*Japanese tutors*

Tutors were the first major helpers of the expatriate children with little knowledge of English. Moreover, Japanese tutors contributed greatly to the children’s L2 development by teaching them English. It was not through interaction in English but through explanation of English in Japanese. Furthermore, some tutors designed their teaching to be entertaining from the perspectives of L2 learners. In an interview, Noriko showed me some games and told me how she and her sister enjoyed them. A tutor who taught Chisa and Noriko gave the sisters a few card games and board games for vocabulary learning and they played together during the first few years. They played in Japanese while they were learning English words in the games. The tutor explained the words that the sisters did not know, which contributed to the sisters’ vocabulary building.

As for the other students, Japanese tutors helped them finish their homework by providing Japanese translation although they usually refrained from giving the children specific answers to the questions. Japanese tutors were mainly employed for homework
but they also taught daily expressions as the following excerpt of Shoji’s interview. Shoji asked his earlier tutors questions about his peers’ English.

Interview with Shoji (SI11122009138 my translation)

1 Shoji: Well, when I’m doing something I like, the English expressions that I use while doing the things I like come in first. For example, when I was playing soccer, I learned “I garit” and when I was playing something during lunch break, and I wondered what they were saying, but my dictionary didn’t have such a word. So I asked my tutor and he told me they were saying, “I got it,” hmm [chuckle] and I thought, I see. Then, I realized that they say words without breaks in English… My tutors had to be able to speak Japanese because my mother wanted them to read the letters from school and I have got three Japanese tutors after (the second tutor). I asked my tutors a lot of questions. I had expressions that I wanted to know. I wrote down the expressions my friends said and asked the tutors what they meant [chuckles]. It helped me a lot.

2 Shima: #2 turns later# So, you asked the tutors at the beginning.

3 Shoji: Yes, I did. I asked my tutors often.

4 Shima: You don’t ask me now
As Shoji explained in line 1, a dictionary is useless when L2 learners do not know how to spell the words and when they do not know what their peers are saying. The fastest way to learn the expressions is to directly ask the user of the expressions, which is only possible if the learner can ask the user of the language. However, not all contexts allow learners to ask questions to speakers. Thus more proficient people can be of great help in this case. Indeed, Japanese tutors helped Shoji in the initial stage. Once Shoji developed proficiency in English and friendship with local peers, tutors were not for such questions but for the problems of academic contents.

4.5.5. Siblings

Coincidentally, all the Japanese middle school participants except Noriko had one or two younger siblings. The mothers of Ryu and Shoji reported that the brothers sometimes talked in English whereas Daisuke, Yasushi, and the sisters did not. Only a few times I was able to hear Ryu talking with his middle brother in English and never did I hear Shoji talk with his brother in English when I visited their houses for tutoring and interviews. One time Ryu swore in English to his middle brother but they did not say much more than swearing. Although Ryu told me that he switched to English when it was
natural to him, he could not explain when that was and he also said there was nothing he could learn from his brothers in terms of English.

Interview with Ryu (RI02012009240; my translation)

1 Ryu: When I have quarrels with my little brother, I frequently use English.

2 Shima: Really. When do you have quarrels?

3 Ryu: Well, quite often. I use bad language [chuckles] then.

4 Shima: Don’t your parents say anything? When you use bad language

5 Ryu: No. They don’t understand it, or they don’t care anymore. Maybe they care about it but they don’t say anything.

Whereas Shoji and Ryu used English when they had quarrels or some kind of fights with their younger brothers, the other students did not use English with their siblings. In particular, Daisuke had negative attitudes toward bad language in addition to his feelings of inferiority regarding his younger brother’s advanced command of English. Yasushi’s little brother was too young to have quarrels with him and they did not have much to talk about together. Chisa tried to greet Noriko in English, but Noriko ignored the greeting and did not respond. Furthermore, with regard to swearing, they did not belong to a society in which they curse each other in English.

Even though Japanese students did not have interaction with their siblings in English, it does not mean that there was no language socialization in English between them. Noriko learned some of the songs when her sister was singing it. One time they
ended up confused and negotiating a misunderstood word. They did not get out of their small world of English language by consulting a dictionary or asking other speakers of English.

Interview with Noriko (CI03292010224; my translation)

1. **Shima:** How many English songs do you have in your repertoire?
   そっか、どのくらい歌のレパートリーがある？

2. **Noriko:** Well, my sister has a lot.
   えー、うちの姉だったらある

3. **Shima:** How about yourself?
   あ、のりちゃん自体は

4. **Noriko:** Well. #I interpreted her utterance as “Not many”#
   うん

5. **Shima:** You don’t know so many songs. Well, do you learn to sing English songs?
   あんまり、たくさん、え、歌を知ってるというわけではないの、そっか、どうなんだろう、その、歌って、英語で結構覚える？

6. **Noriko:** I have. One.
   覚えた、一曲

7. **Shima:** Really? What is it?
   あ、ほんとに、何、それ

8. **Noriko:** *Tomorrow* あ、Tomorrow っていう
   アニーの

9. **Noriko:** *In Annie?*

10. **Shima:** Yes.
    うん、そう

11. **Shima:** When did you learn it?
    いつ、これ、いつ覚えたの？

12. **Noriko:** Well, it’s long ago.
    えー、もう、もうずっと前

13. **Shima:** When you just came to the US?
    ずっと前、来たぱっかりの時？

14. **Noriko:** Well, it’s long ago.
    えー、なん、なんかう、前

15. **Shima:** Oh, before coming to the US?
    あ、来る前？

16. **Noriko:** About two years after we came here I had learned it.
    あの、来て、え、もう、2年くらい経ったらね、もう覚えた

17. **Shima:** So, when you went to see it in Broadway?
    あの、ブロードウェイに見行った

18. **Noriko:** I learned it when my sister was
    うん、あの、うちの、うちの姉が歌ってて
This excerpt consisted part of the episode when the sisters had mutual understanding after
negotiation the word “sorrow” in the song discussed earlier (cf. 4.4.4.5). Although their
knowledge of the word “sorrow” was the result of misunderstanding, the mutual
development of knowledge was also a process of socialization considering that the two
learners brought their background knowledge which was developed in the societies they
had lived in. After settling on their definition, they formed an image of society where
their definition would be accepted. Unexpectedly, the interaction with me gave them
access to another society in which their definition did not work, which led to Chisa’s
(partial) reconceptualizing of the words and the lyrics. Overall, the interaction in English
between the Japanese students and their siblings was limited in its functions and little
new knowledge seemed to be exchanged between them.

4.6. English in Japan

The importance of English has been widely acknowledged in education in Japan
to the extent that English has been adopted as the primary foreign language taught at
schools. The middle school expatriate students in the U.S. were not free from discourses
in Japan about the importance of English. The students learned English from Eiken
textbooks and correspondence materials which were designed for Japanese learners of
English. The variety of English found in the learning materials was based on the standard
grammar and orthography in the U.S., and at the same time it was re-imported from Japan.
Although linguistically they did not have much discrepancy from what students had
learned in America, there was some discrepancy in how language was used in those
materials. The discrepancy made Daisuke, a serious user of correspondence, feel
awkward in answering the questions in his monthly correspondence materials. Although he was using “high level” materials, it was “high” for first year learners of English in junior high school in Japan.

Interview with Daisuke (DI01112010312; my translation)

1. **Shima:** So, you use “high level.”
   で、ハイレベルを取ってるんだ

2. **Daisuke:** Yes.
   はい、ハイレベルで、を取っています

3. **Shima:** What do you think about this? Is this level high [for you]?
   どうこういうの見て、ハイレベル？

4. **Daisuke:** I don’t know.
   わかんないです

5. **Shima:** I see.
   ああ、なるほど

6. **Daisuke:** Well, but perhaps, if I were still in Japan, not coming to America and choosing this, I might think the level is high. If I didn’t know any word and saw these questions, I would think the level is high.
   あ、でも、うん、もしかしたら、もし、僕が日本に、まだ、アメリカに来なかったときの、時に、これを選んだらハイレベルかなと思う、単語とか全く分からないときに、こう、パッと出されると、ハイレベルかなって

7. **Shima:** What do you think now?
   今はどう？

8. **Daisuke:** Very easy.
   いや、まったく簡単です

9. **Shima:** I see.
   なるほどね

10. **Daisuke:** But, I don’t know what to say, there are Japanese ways of asking questions, aren’t there? I think I have to get used to them.
    でも、なんてんだろ、あの、日本の問題の出し方とかあるじゃないですか、そういうのは慣れないと馴目かな、って思っています、うん、なんか

11. **Shima:** For example.
    たとえば

12. **Daisuke:** For example, how to translate sentences.
    たとえば、ま、訳しこと

13. **Shima:** I see.
    うん

14. **Daisuke:** And filling in the blanks. They
    あとなんかこう、入れるやつとか、なん
are kind of troublesome.

The feeling of necessity that Daisuke described in line 10 derived partly from the way Japanese EFL learners learn English. Daisuke had already crossed the line of beginners by taking classes, interacting flexibly with peers, and observing people in America. He found that the ways of presenting his knowledge in English were different in Japan than what he was used to in America, and he needed to learn the ways to answer the Japanese-style questions. Whereas filling in the blanks may also be common in ESL contexts, translation is almost unique to EFL contexts. In addition, other students who studied for the *Eiken* test reported that word arrangements questions were like puzzles to them.

Song (2011) reports about Korean returnees’ struggles with tests at school in their home country. She points out that the sources of difficulties lie partly in being literate in the Korean language, and partly in the discrepancies between the conceptions about language skills in the two countries. Indeed, Chisa heard a similar account from her friend who had got a bad grade in English in Japan after learning English in America for several years.

Interview with Chisa (CI0405201304; my translation)

1. **Chisa:** Well, not recently, but one of my friends who went back to Japan last year told me that she was disappointed because she got 75 on the test for the second year students in junior high school, while others got grades in the 80s and 90s.

2. **Shima:** uh-huh, what do you think about it?

}
3 Chisa: I thought, well, it’s a pity.

4 Shima: What do you mean by “it’s a pity”?

5 Chisa: It’s a pity [laughs]. She was asked, “Are you really back from America?” She told me so. It’s a pity [weak laughs].

6 Shima: I see. Something like that happens.

7 Chisa: It does. She told me that she didn’t understand the meaning well.

8 Shima: Are you talking about grammar?

9 Chisa: Grammar, well, she talked about pronunciation. It was a word like excuse, saying –cuse louder. While she was here, she used English like normal, but she wondered why do they do something like this in Japan.

10 Shima: So she said. Was she your friend?

11 Chisa: Yes, a friend I met here.

12 Shima: I see.

13 Chisa: She’s smart.

14 Shima: Do you say she’s smart because she is good at English?

15 Chisa: She was splendid at English. She was my friend in horseback riding club.
She was here for three years, as long as me, but she was able to speak so well. But she was shocked at her score, 75.

Chisa felt bad about her friend, who she thought more proficient than her, getting a bad score in an English test in Japan. Besides, the friends’ authority in English was questioned because of the test with which neither Chisa nor her friend were familiar. As the test in Japan asked metalinguistic knowledge of English, the students who were used to the test format had an advantage over the students who used English in their daily lives in the U.S. Daisuke’s caution and Chisa’s sympathy suggest that English for L2 learners in Japan had different features from what the students encountered in their daily lives.

_Eiken_

All the students in this study were used to the format in the _Eiken_ test through exposure to and practices of reading, writing, and listening that were different from the students’ daily experiences. The _Eiken_ test is administered by the Society for Testing English Proficiency, Inc., three times a year for Japanese learners of English.

Approximately 2.3 million people take the test every year in seven grades from Grade 5 for beginner learners to Grade 1 for highly advanced learners. As chapter 5 will critique the test from language ideological perspectives, this chapter introduces the relationship between the Japanese students and the educational test of English proficiency in Japan.

The _Eiken_ test largely consisted of four sections although there were differences between grades: short sentence completion to test vocabulary knowledge, grammar, and phrases; long texts for reading comprehension; writing; and listening (Appendix F for a sample of Grade 2). The situations in the questions covered various areas such as home,
school, workplace, phone, lectures, announcements, and other public places. The topics were also wide: art, history, education, environment, medical issues, technology, business, and politics. As the test is graded largely corresponding to Japanese education system, lower grades below Grade 2 are aligned with school grades and the test contents are linguistically highly controlled. Higher grades such as Grade 1 and Pre-1 are inclined to real life contexts where examinees find reading questions on academically advanced topics.

Because the test was used for certification, there were many practice textbooks available in bookstores in Japan. The students learned how to answer questions as well as new vocabulary and reading skills while answering the questions in the past tests. Textbook practices were significant opportunities for those who wanted higher grades than their current proficiency levels by increasing their vocabulary and background knowledge. The practices were helpful as the students were not familiar with questions and contents of reading comprehension. The students needed clarification from tutors, and, if they were proficient in Japanese, they read Japanese translations in the textbooks by themselves. The students had trouble understanding some written explanations because the topics were too unfamiliar to middle school students.

The test had social importance especially for Japanese mothers who were worried about their children’s life back in Japan. The test had culturally high values since the test was indirectly associated with acquiring a certificate in “English proficiency.” By extension, the values were corroborated through high school admissions. However, the testing organization designated suitable education levels for each grade specifically in the context of Japanese education rather than conducting pure linguistic evaluation for
middle school students. In other words, certificates for higher grades such as Grade 1 and Grade Pre-1 did not necessarily mean that the students developed the proficiency accredited by the testing organization purely from their lives in America.

For example, Ryu easily passed Grade 2 without any preparation. However, he studied for Grade Pre-1 for about a year while using the Japanese textbooks for practices. Furthermore, while he was preparing for Grade 1, which was generally regarded as suitable for college students, he had difficulty with a great number of unknown words, unfamiliar reading topics, and formal discourses of writing which he never learned in middle school (Appendix G for sample vocabulary question for Grade 1). As for writing, Ryu did not find many problems with Grade Pre-1 writing because it asked examinees to write a response to a friend’s questions in an email format. Although the topics might not be common for middle school students, writing emails did not seem to be greatly unfamiliar to him considering his frequent uses of emails with his friends. However, Grade 1 required him to write a 200-word essay discussing, for example, government policies on alternative energy resources and welfare. In this section, Ryu did not have a clue on how to develop his argument because he had never learned to write such essays in middle school.

While the language the students encountered in lower levels often overlapped with their daily life, the language in higher levels was not familiar to the students who surely read school textbooks but not newspapers and weekly magazines catered to mature readers. Although the language in Grade 1 and Pre-1 was used in higher education, it did not appear in the environment with which the middle school students had direct contact.
every day. In fact, the statement of the validity argument by the institution manifests its strong ties with education in Japanese society:

From their outset, the tests explicitly aimed to enhance positive washback and contribute to the improvement of language education in Japanese society, as well as create positive attitudes towards learning English. This manifested itself in two ways: a commitment to maintaining maximum accessibility, and a strong focus on interacting with and understanding the needs of teachers and educators in order to make the content of the tests as relevant as possible to learners. The commitment to accessibility is one reason behind the decision to adopt a levels-based framework of separate tests. (Nihon Eigo Kentei Kyokai, n.d.c, Introduction to validity research concerning the EIKEN tests section, para. 4)

From one perspective, the test assumed to represent the entire society where English is used for communication, but from another perspective, the test was a cultural artifact that binds the users of the test together in the Japanese education system. Although some language socialization studies focus on personal dyads for the cultural ways of language learning, L2 development in society needs to include testing as an important aspect of L2 socialization since ideological aspects of testing play a great role in constructing imagined communities of English speakers which is important for language socialization. Chapter 5 further discusses the roles of the Eiken test in the Japanese expatriate students.

4.7. Discussion

While some students had limited social networks in English, others enjoyed friendships with their non-Japanese peers. The network was initially constructed through
the guidance of someone in the network as Minoura (1984) suggests. The children who came earlier formed a bridge between the new ones and their existing networks where eventually some newcomers stayed while the old ones left. Interestingly, the students who maintained their networks kept their first non-Japanese friends after their Japanese guides went back to Japan. Before earlier arrivals eventually returned to Japan, the newcomers needed to strengthen the bonds with others. Chisa and Noriko were not successful in maintaining the bonds with non-Japanese students whereas the boys, especially Ryu and Shoji, enjoyed their friendships with local students. Although school demography and personal traits had an important role in networking, adolescents’ gender-related patterns of group-making (e.g., Eder, 1995; Hewitt, 1986; Woolard, 1997) also seemed to be partly related to the networking of these Japanese boys and girls.

The four boys had broader networks where the relationships with their close friends were emotionally engaging. Nevertheless, their networks of non-Japanese friends had limitations. While Ryu identified his group as school haters and enjoyed such an identity through constant cussing among friends, Shoji hesitated to mingle with particular groups because their “levels” were high. Yasushi and Daisuke’s close peer network consisted of all Asian peers which might not be unavoidable in their school. In short, the boys’ networks were more or less distanced from the mainstream according to the school demographics. Whether such limitations were the result of their proficiency is not explored here as this study did not survey the details of their proficiency in relation to their psychology. Overall, the density of network with non-Japanese people was affected by the school demography. As Dartmouth Middle—the school of the four students except Ryu and Shoji—had relatively many Japanese students in the same situation, Ryu and
Shoji’s schools had a lot less. In particular, being the only Japanese student in his school, Ryu had no choice of being with other Japanese students at school.

The difference of networks was also partially determined prior to the students’ arrival to America considering that the parents had some information on the environment and other concerns over their children’s education. However, Chisa and Noriko’s mother was caught off guard by the difficulties in the new life while she had no knowledge about the presence of other Japanese in the area. The lack of information led the family to experience great initial struggles. Although the elder sister, Chisa, somewhat benefited from the presence of other Japanese students, Noriko still experienced the hardship of being without close Japanese friends.

The illustrations of the Japanese expatriate students’ lives in this chapter have answered the major part of the research questions posited in chapter 2 even though the answers to the most important question still have to wait for the later chapters. There were some common patterns among the six Japanese students’ constructing their microsystems since the students lived in a similar environment due to similar reasons (e.g., fathers’ job, status as aliens, school-aged children). The students were in a sense embedded in similar social systems in America, particularly in the legal one. The system, first of all, constrained the students and parents’ agentive choices of their linguistic environments. For instance, there were not many alternatives for the parents due to legal requirements. While the families’ transitions from Japan to America were rather automatic, the families simply assumed that the children were required to receive education at school, and therefore, they had to send their children to local schools due to the unavailability of full-time Japanese schools in the area. Those Japanese schools
would have been available in a larger city with a larger population of Japanese like New York, Chicago, or Los Angeles, but the expatriate students in the area of this study had no other alternative but to accept whatever was available.

However, accepting whatever was available does not mean that the parents would have sent their children to Japanese schools if any were available. As seen in Ryu’s parents purposefully choosing a district with few Japanese around, the experiences in the English-dominant country was regarded both as a challenge and a chance for the young students to grow and learn in an international context. Ryu’s mother regarded their stay in the U.S. as a chance for her son because she believed in his achievements in English—a status language in Japan—and the automatic development of his Japanese language.

The students’ lives in the American education system were overall the same throughout their stay. The students woke up in the morning, went to school, attended classes, had lunch, attended afternoon classes, came back home and did their homework assignments. There were occasional events, such as canteens, school celebration day, etc., where the students spent time together with their close friends. There were several differences in the school systems between Japan and America such as the use of school buses, length of time between classes, and after-school activities.

There was an individualized microsystem for each student within the broad framework. Each student constructed his or her own microsystem of L2 English through interactions with the environment; that is, a variety of people at school and access to many linguistic resources. Not only local peers and teachers but also students from other parts of the world as well as Japanese peers and adults constructed each Japanese student’s microsystem. Although the students uniformly lived in the “American society,”
individual microsystem and the interrelating external systems varied as each student’s linguistic environment was different from each other.

Taking these individual differences into consideration, this study found largely four domains in the Japanese expatriate students’ microsystems; namely, (1) home, (2) school, (3) peer, and (4) media. These four domains largely corresponded with Giddens’ (1989) agencies for socialization; however, this study employs the label “home” rather than “family” for the agency of socialization considering the importance of the space for tutors and self-instructional materials.

The home domain was a world where Japanese language dominated because the parents in this study did not communicate with their children in English. Because of this limitation, the parents had to pay for certain English resources at home like their counterparts in Japan. While the expenses for tutors were covered by some companies that sent the families abroad, not every company had such a policy, and whether the mothers could get an ideal tutor for their children and for themselves was a result of personal connections and luck. The textbooks for Eiken were ordered from Japan with extra costs of shipping if used textbooks were not available in the local community bookstore. These linguistic resources were prepared for the students according to their future plans in America and in Japan.

The home domain also had much overlap with the media domain since, technically speaking, every material of reading and watching—whether online or offline—was the production of mass media. With the materials available at home, the students prepared for the Eiken test where English was standardized based on American literacy conventions. The topics were often related to life in Japan, particularly in the
sections for oral and written productions (see chapter 5.3.2.2. for further discussion).

Other than the access to English through the media, the students learned English from their tutors, although not everyone had American tutors, who focused on productive skills. The home domain overlapped with other domains, too. The school domain protruded into the home domain when the students did their homework assignments at home.

Communication with friends over the Internet was a mixture of the home, peer, and media domains. Although exchanging language with their siblings and tutors is a pure example in this domain, the talks with siblings were mostly limited to cussing where there was not much learning from such output.

In contrast, tutors provided a number of opportunities for the students to interact in person. Interactions with peers were not the best opportunities for the students to try what they had learned elsewhere, because their peers had their wills and intentions during conversation, which did not usually give English learners a safe space to interact with them. Tutors usually helped the students by providing scaffolds for school subjects and by dissecting the students’ problems in understanding the contents. American tutors were generally advantageous for early language learning and culture while Japanese tutors were appreciated for complex contents and finishing up school projects on time.

As for the school domain, initial options were only available if the parents were informed of the neighborhoods before moving and if an ideal house was available. Parents’ network and information was thus important for their initial choice of environment. Once the students started their lives in their new schools, it was more or less a matter of luck if they had someone who could connect the newcomers with existing groups. In the school domain, the students were primarily in contact with English through
interaction with other people, such as teacher, peers, and other staff. Access to written English in textbooks and handouts was also significant. The written materials were prepared and mediated mostly by teachers and peers for better understanding of the subjects. This is the domain where English dominated the students’ lives although the Japanese students used Japanese when they talked to their Japanese peers. Including the use of Japanese, the use of language was institutionalized in a varied degree. For example, students were discouraged to use bad language at school but they occasionally used it for solidarity when their teachers were not within earshot. There was a model of English presented by the adults and the children were collectively labeled as “students” in opposition to “teachers.” The students called on their teachers with prefixes such as Mr., Mrs. and Miss, while the same circumstances would have demanded the Japanese students to use the word “sensei” regardless of the teachers’ gender and marital status.

The Japanese students had the most difficulties in the school domain due to its emphasis on literacy and academic language despite various support from school (cf. Thomas & Collier, 1997). However, the difficulties in the school domain were alleviated by the influence from other domains, particularly the peer domain, where the students made friends with someone through non-school activities without having to use much English. Shoji and Daisuke owned their sports since they played them back in Japan. The two boys took advantage of the sports to be accepted in a peer group. However, not every student had such activities that would make them popular among the peers. Chisa learned horseback riding and swimming for limited periods but these activities were individualized and did not contribute to expanding her peer network. Although she had good friendship with adults in the horseback riding club, she did not have contact with
them often, needless to say the extension of the friendship to the school domain. Ryu was able to expand his peer network without belonging to such activities due to his experience in the sixth grade when all the student in the district were gathered in one school and when he was forced to finish ESL.

The peer domain was also mainly driven by interactions with other English speakers of their generation. This domain overlapped with the school domain since school was itself incorporated various activities involving peers. But the peer domain included many activities outside school such as baseball and soccer team, swimming, and so on. In addition, “hanging around” was also in this domain as the students got together to maintain solidarity and have fun together. The peer domain was also interpersonal as in the school domain but the primary goal of the peer domain was networking rather than acquiring language. The language use in the peer domain was mostly functional which helped students convey their demands, intentions, and requests in efficient ways while building friendship by understanding others. However, effective use of language, or higher proficiency, was also required in the peer domain if the students wanted to expand their networks into the core of the mainstream students whom Shoji described as “higher level.”

In the media domain, the students mostly chose their favorite programs and activities by their own will. However, as the boys told, there were not many attractive TV programs for the Japanese students who were used to Japanese entertainment. Instead, the students made use of the Internet to find entertaining video clips and music. The computers were not personally owned by each student. They were set up in the living room or in the basement where the students used the Internet accompanied by parental
control. In contrast, Japanese girls enjoyed TV programs rather than the Internet. The
Internet required the students to be skillful to use it. Without the knowledge to solve
problems and to find the right information, the students’ world on the Internet was
limited within their technical capacity.

It depended on the policy of the family regarding what kind of activity was
allowed in the media domain. However, most parents had neither knowledge nor strict
guidelines over language in this domain. Thus the media domain was primarily driven by
the students’ voluntary actions. Unlike using English through interaction with other
people, watching TV and listening to music did not involve other people directly in their
language use. However, the Internet allowed the students to use English interactively
through chats, emails, and social networking sites. Even searching the Google site was an
opportunity for interaction with the computer.

The school and media domains overlapped when the schools assigned homework
that required the students to use the Internet and when teachers showed videos to their
students for a variety of purposes. The peer and media domains overlapped through
online communication tools such as Facebook. Linguistic ecology in the media domain
was diverse due to the variability of media and the programs within it. While the students
had access to academic discourses from Wikipedia for school projects, they also used the
Internet for entertainment. TV programs and videos also provided linguistic exposures
according to each student’s preference. Different from the school domain, the students
were able to choose what to watch and what not to watch. If a program seemed too
immature or vice versa, they just turned it off. But maturity level was not just a matter of
language, but also the sense of humor and intellectual curiosity. Humor competence
(Wulf, 2010) was required to accept some media contents as part of the students’ linguistic ecology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Dominant language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>- Money (tutor, textbook)</td>
<td>- Availability (tutor, textbook)</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>- Information</td>
<td>- Availability (housing)</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>- Language skills</td>
<td>- Availability (after-school activities)</td>
<td>Depends on student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- (Physical skills)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Japanese peers with connection to existing groups</td>
<td>- Compatibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>- Money (PC, video)</td>
<td>- Policies (Rating, online access)</td>
<td>Depends on student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- PC skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 Requirements for and constraints on accessing L2 resources in the Japanese expatriate students’ L2 microsystems

Figure 5 represents the interdependent relationships between the four domains in the Japanese expatriate students’ microsystem. While the four domains are overlapped with each other, each of the four domains affected the students in the other domains. For instance, an increased amount of assignments at school forced the students to study at home longer than usual. When the students’ parents prohibited them to use cell phones, it affected how the students stayed in contact with their peers and vice versa.
The four domains in the Japanese middle school students’ L2 microsystem in the U.S.

The students’ engagement in L2 in these four domains changed as time went by, which highlights the importance of the chronosystem of Bronfenbrenner’s (2005) ecological model of development. There were historical changes while the Japanese expatriate students stayed in the U.S. The changes did not only occur to the linguistic knowledge of individual learners but also interpersonal relationship and the way the students were connected to linguistic environment. For example, Yasushi stopped watching American TV programs after he gained access to Japanese DVDs at local stores.
Shoji became aware of more cuss words as he was enrolled in middle school. Ryu started with Grade 2 of the *Eiken* test and started to prepare for Grade 1. Chisa lost her contact with a local peer as her Japanese friend went back to Japan. Ryu’s friends resumed their lacrosse practices in spring and Ryu started to spend more time at the home domain. The historical changes in one domain also changed how the students were engaged with L2 in the other domains. A summer break in the school domain led to the increase of time in the other domains which implied a decrease in the use of English, for example.

4.8. Conclusion

This chapter has illustrated the L2 ecologies for six Japanese middle school expatriate students in the U.S. based on reflective interviews. Perspectives of L2 ecology and socialization have provided a variety of scenes for the Japanese students to learn and use English in their host country. The Japanese students learned English through interactions with a variety of other speakers of English as well as other Japanese people. Furthermore, L2 learning involved not only humans but also various cultural artifacts. Some artifacts were used in the U.S. while others were imported from Japan to be in two educational contexts while they were abroad. Although the language materials in Japan contained English, there was a local learning context that was exported to another context where the local consideration did not necessarily make sense, While people in the students’ environment interacted with each other, learning contexts also interacted with each other.

The L2 ecology for learning English for the Japanese expatriate students was thus complex. The chronological view indicated that the exposure to English had already occurred prior to coming to the U.S. in addition to being familiar with loanwords and
Japanized English often heard in pop songs. While the importance of such prior exposure in their life abroad was not clear, agencies for socialization such as family, school, peer groups, and mass media were not independent from each other. Mutually influencing each other, these agencies affected the linguistic development of the Japanese students in the U.S. and provided them with various opportunities to interact with others and with different materials. The view over the learners’ past and future and the dynamic relationship between the agencies at the present consist of the whole ecology for the learners. How each learner interacts with the environment—humans and physical objects—is also a part of the ecology which changes dynamically over time. This chapter, however, has only illustrated the social domains in L2 development for the middle school students. Illustration of the students’ L2 ecology is not complete and the next chapter moves to other aspects of L2 socialization; namely, language ideology and identity.
Chapter 5: Japanese expatriate students’ ideologies of English in the United States

5.1. Introduction

Based on an ecological perspective, the previous chapter illustrated a potential learning space for six Japanese middle school expatriate students. In their ecology of English, the students constructed their own microsystems with a variety of socialization agencies. Each Japanese expatriate student had an individualized language environment even though the students were from similar backgrounds and had similar future plans.

This chapter discusses the ideological aspects of L2 socialization of Japanese expatriate middle school students in America. The six students, who planned on returning to Japan to be enrolled in non-compulsory high schools, were in the US education system where high school education is compulsory. This chapter illustrates how the gap between the students’ present lives and their future complicated their L2 socialization at the level of language ideology. As discussed in chapter 4, those six middle school students had access to English not only in America but also in Japan. Even though American English was the standard English both in Japan and in America, the values, beliefs, and assumptions attached to the norms were not altogether the same because the people in the two countries espoused different ideologies regarding the English language.

The United States has its unique history in relation to the English language. English has been the dominant language among diverse groups (Wolfram & Schilling-
Estes, 1998) even though there are ideologies of monolingualism and standardness that can be traced to 17th century Europe. Ideology of monolingualism through the rise of consciousness of nation-states after the 17th century is aligned with standard language ideology (Farr, forthcoming) with “a neutral, emblematic value centered in the unity and identity of the nation-state” (Silverstein, 1996, p. 298). Standardness of a language is maintained through “ideology of contempt” (Dorian, 1998) over other languages where other non-standard language varieties are undervalued and the possession of standard language becomes a commodity. “Folk meta-pragmatics” (Silverstein, 1996) convey iconic values of both standard and non-standard language varieties across people who evaluate the speakers of those language varieties. In short, ideology of standard language embraces attitudes against non-dominant language varieties where people support this ideology by espousing a single variety of a language as being correct. Milroy and Milroy (1999) point out the connection between literacy and orality in the formation of standard English ideology by tracing the history of uniformity of written English through the advent of printing. Milroy (1999) argues, “[t]he chief characteristics of a standard ideology is the belief that there is one and only one correct spoken form of the language, modeled on a single correct written form” (p. 174). In other words, literacy entails an ideology that is relevant to morality and symbolic property (Graff, 1979/1991) which in turn determines the values of standard language.

Standard language ideology is not reflected in an equal way to countries with different sociohistorical backgrounds. Wiley (2000), for instance, argues that the ideology of monolingual English speakers in the United States was pushed forward with English-only ideology through the assimilationist policies of Native Americans.
deculturation in the 19th century and the acculturation of European immigrants in the early half of the 20th century (also Pavlenko, 2004). Comparing the standard language ideologies between the U.K. and the U.S., Milroy (1999) argues that the ideology of standard English in America, due to the history of racial discrimination, is racialized rather than being class-based as it is in the U.K. Lippi-Green (1997) points out how particular accents are marginalized from public broadcast systems and argues that accents are used as an excuse for racial discrimination. She reveals discriminatory hiring practices based on accents and points out the association between non-mainstream accents and villains in a popular Disney movie *Aladdin*. Whereas negative preconceptions about other language varieties stigmatize their speakers, there are also political movements advocating for non-dominant varieties. The most heated debate took place in 1996 when the Oakland school board passed the controversial resolution that recognizes Ebonics, or to use a less controversial term African American Vernacular English, as a distinct language from English seeking for the same benefit provided to other foreign languages (Collins, 1999). Although the verdict turned out against the vernacular speakers, the case highlighted the fact that educational institutions are the site of politics over language. Furthermore, the distinction between a language and its varieties can also be ideological and political.

Whereas there are ideologies of English in the United States, there are also ideologies of English in Japan. Emphasis on literacy in English education, for example, is found in Japan, too, when we consider the imbalanced emphasis on reading and writing in English education and admissions to colleges and high schools. However, ideologies of English in Japan are different from those of America due to their different sociocultural
backgrounds. English has been the most commonly taught foreign language in Japan since the late nineteenth century after two centuries of a self-imposed seclusion policy. Partly due to its acceptance in formal education, English in Japan has tended to be associated with generally positive characteristics. English has been positively accepted in advertisements and public media where English loanwords are adopted into Japanese language. This usually happens to give extra effect in advertisements even though it sometimes causes friction with the conservative public (Tomoda, 1999). Furthermore, despite the high status of English, there has been a limited awareness of the language varieties of English in Japan—an awareness which does not exceed the British-American English distinction.

I was interested in how the circumstances in these two different countries affected the development of values and beliefs of English among Japanese expatriate students in the U.S. By analyzing these Japanese expatriate students’ values and beliefs, this chapter aims to understand the relationship between L2 socialization and language ideology. As discussed in chapter 4, each student constructed their individual L2 ecology where they maintained access to both Japanese and American environments in their language ecology; namely they maintained interdependent relationships in their personal network and access to linguistic materials. This chapter, bridging over Japan and the United States, describes Japanese students’ ideologies of English developed in those circumstances.

5.2. An overview of the ideologies of English in Japan

Before discussing Japanese expatriate students’ language ideologies, I find it helpful to illustrate ideologies of English in Japan. It is generally recognized that English is the most influential language in the world today considering it has the largest number
of speakers and learners (Crystal, 1997, 2008). Japan is not an exception in this regard; however, we need to take into consideration Japan’s own historical background.

5.2.1. English in the world

When the role of English is examined in global political history, two opposing views over this role are worth examining. On the one hand, there have been critical views over the universal role of English in the world. This position espouses a top-down view in the spread of English. For example, Phillipson (1992) in Linguistic imperialism argues that English has become a global language because of a colonial history and the current marketing of English through education industry. In this global spread of English through education, norm-creating countries often receive advantages in many local teaching and employment practices while English speakers in other peripheral countries may have to accept some disadvantages (McKay, 2000). On the other hand, there are views that assign more agency to local learners of English in the world. For example, as Fishman (1996) argues in Post-imperial English, “socioeconomic factors that are behind the spread of English are now indigenous in most countries of the world and part and parcel of indigenous daily life and social stratification” (p. 639). Similarly, Brutt-Griffler (2002) contends that English “owes its existence as a world language in large part to the struggle against imperialism, and not to imperialism alone” (p. ix). Looking at the history of English in Japan, the second view is more relevant to the Japanese context considering how people adopted western languages—Dutch and English—to obtain the knowledge of western technologies. Still, the first view applies to certain contexts where the values of norm-creating countries are uncritically accepted.
Although there are opposing views over the roles of English in global politics, scholars support the position that English is widely accepted as a primary or additional means of communication in many parts of the world (e.g., Gottlieb & Chen, 2001; Leith, 1996; Ricento, 2000; Silver, 2005). Crystal’s (2008) rather generous estimation of two billion English speakers in the world also suggests the significance of English in many aspects of international relations. Despite the great number of English speakers in the world, their positions toward English are not uniform. From a global perspective, English is not as highly emphasized in Japan as in many other countries with colonial pasts in the world because most people in Japan are not required to use English in everyday life. Kachru’s (1992) three circles model represents the divisions across countries with different orientations in English. In his model, the Inner Circle, which consists of traditional norm-creating countries such as the U.K. and the U.S., is in the center surrounded by the Outer Circle and the Expanding Circle. The Outer Circle includes the former colonies of the U.K. (e.g., India) as well as other countries that have adopted English as an official language (e.g., Singapore). The rest of the countries including Japan are categorized in the Expanding Circle wherein English has no official status and therefore not used as an everyday communication means.

Kachru’s model, however, does not monolithically apply to everyone in each circle (Cran, MacNeil, & Buchanan, 2005; Michieka, 2009). Moreover, clear demarcations between each circle are also challenged when regional varieties of English in the Outer Circle is recognized with more favorable tones and when there is continuous influx of immigrants to the Inner Circle countries (Yano, 2001). Furthermore, some countries and regions move from one circle to another such as Hong Kong (Evans, 2000,
for a historical review) and South Africa (Kamwangamalu, 2002, for a historical review). In these contexts, simple divisions and dichotomies between ESL and EFL do not make perfect sense (Nayar, 1997). Despite such porous boundaries and inner heterogeneity between the two domains, Kachru’s model is still insightful in conceptualizing the world that is related to the English language. Particularly, Kachru’s model is helpful to understand how people and their governments view English as an additional language in their countries.

5.2.2. Social context of English ideologies in Japan

If we apply Kachru’s framework, we can place Japan in the Expanding Circle since English does not have an official status and the majority of people do not use English to communicate with each other. Although Japan experienced seven years of occupation by the General Headquarters—which was in reality the United States—after an unconditional surrender in World War II, English has been largely absent in most interpersonal communication of everyday life. However, there were debates over making English as an official language when an advisory committee of then Prime Minister Keizo Obuchi proposed officialization of English in 2000 (cf. Kawai, 2007 for details). Although the proposal was rejected, the debates acknowledged the significance of English in the world today (“21-seiki Nihon no koso” kondankai, 2000) and recognized that the power of English would allow Japan to exert greater influence on global politics and economy.

The debates over the officialization of English reveal a variety of ideologies of English in Japan today. Although the adoption of English as an official language seem to be an outward movement to the world, and thus, open and liberal, Kubota (1998) points
out that the movement is back-to-back with an inward movement; that is, closed and conservative. She argues that the Japanese policy of kokusaika (internationalization) has been promoted hand in hand with the policy of nationalism as observed in the ethnocentric discourses of nihonjinron (theory of Japanese). Moreover, “the discourses of nihonjinron and kokusaika promote both strengthening Japanese identity based on nationalistic values and learning the communication mode of English” (p. 302) by positioning Japan in the hegemonic grip of the West. In this hegemony, English has particular symbolic statuses rather than a pure communicative medium which influence the people in Japan politically and ideologically.

Kubota’s view is one of many discourses in the debate over the officialization of English in Japan. Kawai (2007) analyzes two texts on officialization to see how the Japanese government and the general public view English. She compares two sets of texts, one from a report by the advisory committee and the other from a collection of 390 public opinions on a website of a national newspaper. She concludes: “[w]hat emerges in the governmental discourse is a ‘new’ type of Japanese nationalism, while in the public discourse an ‘old’ type of Japanese nationalism coexists with the new nationalism” (p. 49). What Kawai views as “old” nationalism is ethnic-genealogical where “the Japanese language is essentiaized as the embodiment of Japanese-ness” (p. 49) and thus, the officialization of English is unacceptable. On the other hand, “new” nationalism is civic-territorial and de-essentializes the Japanese as a unique group of people. Although discourses of “new” nationalism disavow the semi-traditional nihonjinron discourse, which emphasizes the homogeneity of Japanese people, Kawai points out the “new” nationalism discourse includes only a superficial appreciation of diversity; that is, in the
new nationalism discourse, immigrants are welcomed only if they contribute to the development of the Japanese society. Kawai argues that this superficial appreciation is also found in a popular discourse, “English as a tool that serves Japan,” which encourages English learning to improve Japan.

5.2.3. History of English in Japan

Arguments over the roles of English are not new in Japan. While Japan’s first encounter with English goes back to the beginning of the 17th century, the influence of English along with western civilization was nearly eradicated for the following 250 years. The significance of English in the age of imperialism began to be acknowledged after opening the country toward the world in the mid-19th century. Morrow (1987) claims that the transformation in this period was “linguistically speaking, the most significant period of contact with the west” (p. 50). English replaced Dutch as the primary western language to obtain knowledge about the western world. During the transition, there was a great boom of English learning particularly in Yokohama, one of the earliest ports that opened up to the world in the 19th century. The enthusiasm for English learning continued through the period of rapid modernization around the turn of the centuries until the 1930s, followed by critical reflections over the roles and values of English in Japanese society (Sakuraba, 1969).

The rise of nationalism and militarism in the early half of the twentieth century lead to the oppression of English. Morrow (1987) describes these policy changes among the general public from the perspective of English loanwords.

With this government encouragement, a new attitude of interest and curiosity developed toward the world outside Japan, and particularly about the west. It is an
attitude which persists to the present, and which may account for the rapid assimilation of English loanwords into Japanese…During the 1930s and 1940s, the militaristic government attempted to purge the language of loanwords from ‘enemy languages’. (Morrow 1987, p. 50)

The defeat of Japan the Second World War and the subsequent American occupation led to a sharp increase of Americans on Japan’s land which generated the feeling of high necessity of English among the general public. English education, now streamlined through the linguistic resources from the United States, was implemented in schools. The Japanese society showed effervescence with learning English which Omura (1969) describes as “the second extraordinary English boom in the previous 100 years of English studies in Japan” (p. 42, my translation), the first one being in the early 1870s. English has regained its prestigious and positive symbolic status in Japanese society as a primary foreign language with controversies over the methodologies and effectiveness of English instruction which already existed in the pre-war period.

English is symbolic because the use of English is still limited in Japanese society. Employing Bernstein’s (1971) four basic functions of language, Morrow (1987) argues that English serves a communicative function among the Japanese only in the area of imaginative/innovative function, not the other three areas, which are instrumental (i.e., English is not used even as the medium in English classes), regulative (i.e., all the laws and rules are written in Japanese), and interpersonal (i.e., people use Japanese for communication except for very limited areas such as aviation). In other words, English is often used to give additional and embellishing effects for its speakers and when employed in advertisements and brand names, etc.
5.2.4. Ideologies of English in the use of loanwords

The symbolic uses of English have been studied from many angles. For example, sociolinguistic studies on English loanwords in Japanese (Hayashi & Hayashi, 1995; Hogan, 2003; Kay, 1995; Stanlaw, 2004b; Tomoda, 1999; Takashi, 1990) point out that rather than merely filling in lexical gaps, the uses of loanwords reveal aspects of modernity, youthfulness, informality, and foreignness. For instance, Takashi (1990) argues that English is the language most extensively studied in Japan today while English contributes to the images of modernity and sophistication. Tomoda (1999) draws her study on various surveys on the use of loanwords of western origin (gairaigo) and argues that loanwords are often seen in foreign advertisements, sport, and modern technology and not much in traditional areas. Although Tomoda does not distinguish English loanwords from other western words (gairaigo), the lack of separation of English loanwords from the other western words does not affect the result of his study because English is the dominant source of loanwords in Japanese for the last several decades (Kay, 1995).

5.2.5. Ideologies of English in mass media

Studies on English uses in mass media such as advertisement and pop culture (e.g., Moody 2006; Ono 1992; Takashi 1990; Tanaka 1995) provide an additional perspective about the role of English in the Japanese social life. Due to its symbolic use, the boundaries between Japanese and English are sometimes unclear in mass media. Moody (2006) analyzes how Japanese language and English are used in educational TV programs, which he calls “language entertainment,” for children and adults, and in Japanese pop (J-pop) music. Code-mixing, code-switching, and code-ambiguation
practices in these entertainment programs problematize the separation of domains that are usually considered for each language. For example, in a “language entertainment” program for adults, a TV personality uses the Japanese language for inter-ethnic communication with a Russian where Moody claims that English is usually used. On the other hand, a J-pop singer’s pronunciation of Japanese words sound like English and therefore, listeners are not able to identify which language the singer’s native language is. According to Moody, such uses of languages with overlapping boundaries of languages are emergent in TV programs even though it is not yet a common phenomena.

5.2.6. Ideologies of English in language education business

Studies on eikaiwa (English conversation school or lessons) provide another perspective that critically captures ideologies of English in Japan (e.g., Bailey, 2006; Lummis, 1976; Piller & Takahashi, 2006). One of the earliest criticisms against eikaiwa (English conversation) is made by Douglas Lummis (1976) who started teaching English in Japan in the beginning of the 1960s and wrote Ideorogi to shite no eikaiwa (Eikaiwa as ideology). Lummis points out in his book that there were racist practices in employment in eikaiwa schools, and he also criticizes the projection of American propaganda-like ideals into the teaching of English. Bailey (2006) also critiques marketing practices of eikaiwa business by analyzing the discourses of the advertisements of major eikaiwa schools in the Tokyo area. She points out how those advertisements create “the wonderland” which stimulates Occidental akogare (longings) ideology through gendered appeals to potential customers.

The eikaiwa are marketed as wonderlands: that is, as places (destinations) of promise and wonder, of becoming, of transgression, of unreality. These properties
imbricate both the place and practices of *eikaiwa*. Thus the *eikaiwa* wonderlands become loci situated at a nexus in time and space where heterodoxical, and Occidentalized, ideologies of gender performances are brought into being and are lived out through *akogare* for the practice and simulation of English-learning. (p. 127)

From another perspective, Seargeant (2005) emphasizes the aspect of simulation in English learning and teaching in Japan. He points out that authenticity and nativeness are important concepts in commercialized English such as the *eikaiwa* business even though the concepts of authenticity and nativeness are problematized in the field of applied linguistics today. Seargeant provides an example of British Hills, a type of language institution and foreign village at the same time where visitors can experience “more than real” (or too idealistic) environment than real England. He further argues that Japanese English-related businesses, primarily *eikaiwa* as well as higher education institutions, create a fantasy world of English where a racially, linguistically, and behaviorally idealized world is constructed. He also points out that these social attitudes go opposite to the current TESOL trends that criticize the monolithic, essentialized users of English in English-speaking countries. Such simulations, in short, are a realization of the symbolic aspects of English that deviate from practical reality.

5.2.7. Ideologies of English and the Japanese society

Some studies with feminist perspectives (e.g., Habu, 2000; Kobayashi, 2002, 2007; McMahon, 2001, 2008) suggest that the roots of English as a prestigious symbol have also been nurtured in the Japanese social structure against women. These studies argue that English plays a liberating role for Japanese women who confine themselves
into traditional gender roles in Japan. Some women decide to learn English abroad even by quitting their full-time jobs with little expectation of the returns for their investments. Habu (2000) interviews 25 Japanese female students in the U.K., and points out the social structural factors that push older Japanese women to study abroad. A relatively short working life, pressure to get married, and the lack of fulfillment at their work with no ambitious future are the motivations for these women to seek non-materialistic fulfillment at British higher education institutions. Kobayashi (2007) also reports narratives of three Japanese female students in Canada. While the women she interviewed did not have motivations to study English in anticipation for symbolic and material resources in return for their investment, English gave psychological satisfaction to those women by offering them spaces to exert English-related counter-ideologies against the dominant ideologies that worked against Japanese women.

5.2.8. Ideologies of English and bilingualism

Yamamoto’s (2001) study on the image of bilinguals among Japanese college students shows similarly a positive symbolic status of English compared with other foreign languages and strict criteria for English-Japanese bilinguals. Yamamoto investigates the perception toward bilinguals among 144 college students and finds that Japanese-English bilinguals are most popular among the subjects where 60% of the words associated with bilinguals are positive and only 11% negative. Interestingly, the subjects’ definitions of bilinguals are relatively narrow for English-Japanese bilinguals. Bilinguals in the students’ views are expected to have good command of English at least in speaking and listening and preferably in reading and writing. Yamamoto argues from these results that the students’ images of bilinguals are elite bilinguals not folk bilinguals.
who learn host languages in order to survive. She suggests that the positive image of elite bilinguals derives from the policy of the government which promotes English education in elementary schools.

5.2.9. Ideologies of English and native speakers

Although the studies discussed so far show the symbolic statuses of English in Japan, the statuses today are not necessarily associated exclusively with so-called native speakers. For example, Sakuragi (2008) studies the attitudes of 116 university students (62 male, 53 female) toward foreign language learning, including English, Chinese, Korean, and Spanish with regard to their worldmindedness (i.e., tendency to choose a reference group of speakers of each language as generic humankind rather than a specific ethnic group) and social distance (i.e., the degree of sympathetic understanding). The study finds that English in Japan, as well as French in the United States, lacks association with particular ethnic minority groups and thus distinguishes itself from other foreign languages. Moreover, other studies suggest that there are public discourses that promote English for international communication rather than merely for being integrated into the norms of the U.S. or the U.K. (e.g., Yashima, 2002) in addition to the effort to proliferate such views in education (e.g., Matsuda, 2002, 2003). However, there are also contradictory results in other studies in terms of attitudes in favor of “native-speakers” (e.g., Chiba, Matsuura, & Yamamoto, 1995 in accents; Matsuura, Fujieda, & Mahoney, 2004 in general attitudes; Bailey, 2006 in marketing strategies of English conversation schools).

As these studies suggest, ideologies of English in Japan are multiple and changing. Nevertheless, there are dominant ideologies over English in the Japanese society,
supported by institutional practices, particularly in education and mass media. Some of these ideologies are related to specific features of English as found in loanwords and pronunciation and other ideologies are related to English as a whole system (i.e., Blommaert’s (2006) ‘artifactual’ ideology) as found in the evaluation of bilinguals. Despite the variety of studies related to ideologies of English in Japan, these studies do not represent ideologies of English among those who grow up in an English-speaking country because these views are found mainly in Japan except for the few cases where those values are exported overseas (e.g., Habu, 2000; Kobayashi, 2007). The following sections will discuss the language ideologies of English that Japanese expatriate students had in America. By examining the values and beliefs in English in relation to the expatriate students’ microsystems, this chapter will discuss the relationship between language ideologies and L2 development in society.

5.3. Values and beliefs in English for Japanese middle school students in the U.S.

Chapter 2 already discussed how ideologies are socially shared beliefs and values. It also discussed how individuals develop their senses of who they are and how their identities are influenced by various ideology-laden discourses in society. Ideologies about English are thus reflected in how people see themselves as those who uses English as well as in how they see other users of English. This study sees individual values and beliefs as separate from ideologies considering that ideologies are realized through the collective beliefs and values in society. By doing so, this study explores the links between individual values and beliefs with the values and beliefs in larger, abstract societies of Japan and America. In other words, I am interested in how language ideologies in society are constructed from individual values and beliefs and how in turn, language ideologies
in society affect individual values and beliefs. At the same time, this study views language ideologies with two perspectives; namely, the Whorfian worldviews and ‘artifactual’ language ideology (Blommaert, 2006). The following sections discuss the findings related to ideologies of English in both perspectives. Based on these examples of ideologies, this chapter elaborates these beliefs and values in relation to society and identity and provides a model of L2 socialization in the domain of language ideology.

5.3.1. Language ideologies around cussing and proscription

When I asked Japanese expatriate students when and how they used and learned English in America, topics about cussing often came up. As an international graduate student in America, I knew the word *curse* both as a verb and a noun, but I did not know the word *cuss* until I interviewed the Japanese middle school students who commonly used the word. The use of ‘bad’ language (or swearing, taboos, etc.) is often an essential part of discussions over language ideology (e.g., Benor, 2004; Farr, 2004; Heller, 1997).

While some studies suggest that L2 learners are less inhibitive in cursing than L1 speakers (e.g., Dewaele, 2004; Register, 1996), studying cussing also entails difficulty when children are involved because its profaning effects drive the parents and other adults to avoid using it in front of children (Kroskrity, 2004). Ideologies of cussing are also multiple in that there are different social expectations for different people. This section discusses the intricacy of the ideology of cussing in L2 from three perspectives: gender, social domain, and individual differences.

5.3.1.1. Cussing and gender

While Japanese boys in this study referred to their knowledge of cussing in their interviews, the Japanese girls did not. As Klerk (2005) argues, cussing often plays an
important role to create solidarity among boys by providing them with elements of masculinity. However, cussing is usually discouraged among girls in many societies. In fact, the Japanese girls in this study also seemed to be in a social network that discouraged using and learning cussing. Employing Ochs’ (1993b) model on how language relates to gender, Benor (2004) points out the connection between cussing and masculinity:

Using curse words indexes a stance of toughness, which is associated with masculinity. Frequent cursing can help to constitute masculine identity only because a man appears tough when he uses it and because our society associates toughness with masculinity. (p. 150)

Moreover, Farr (2006) discusses Spanish-speaking Ranchera women in Mexico who defy their sociocultural linguistic order (respeto) by joking and having fun (relajo). The conflict between the local ideology of franquenza, or self-assertive and direct ways of talking, and respeto, which situates women and other people in a lower hierarchy with proscriptions, are challenged through jovial disorderly talk called relajo.

These studies suggest that language ideologies are often gendered (also Eckert, 2000; Farr & Reynolds, 2004; Ochs, 1993b). Indeed, the Japanese girls in this study were also considered to be in such a sociocultural framework that discouraged cussing while the boys did not hesitate to cuss within their peer groups. Considering these tendencies, it would be unlikely for girls to talk about cussing voluntarily to an adult male researcher even if they did cuss in conversations with close female friends elsewhere. In this respect, boys seemed to have less pressure to talk about cussing because of sharing the same gender identity with the researcher.
Although the Japanese boys found cussing funny and important in casual conversations with their friends, they hesitated to use cuss words by themselves in front of an adult interviewer. I asked the boys to write them down or to spell them to alleviate the pressure. Furthermore, the boys did not share the knowledge of exactly what was considered as cussing but the following words were regarded as cussing by at least two boys: *ass, damn, fuck, hell, shit*. Ryu and Daisuke told me that *hell* could be considered cussing depending on contexts. The boys presented four or five words as cuss words in their interviews but all the boys tried to tell me more because they believed that they had learned more cuss words from their friends. In fact, Daisuke admired his close non-Japanese friend who, Daisuke said, knew and used as many as twenty cuss words although Daisuke laughingly called his friend *hentai* (pervert).

5.3.1.2. Cussing and social domains

*School*

Cussing started to be popular among the Japanese boys when they started middle school. Cussing particularly differentiated them from younger students in elementary school. Moreover, cussing separated middle school students from adults in school as teachers never cussed at least in front of their students—except in rare instances. In short, cussing made the middle school students unique, separating themselves from both adults and younger kids. Although some students, like Daisuke, were opposed to cussing, Ryu labeled such students as “*yoi ko*” (good kid) as opposed to his negative ego identity, or self-evaluation at school. This is where the institutional ideology at school and middle school students’ ideology were in conflict. As representatives of educational institutions, teachers discouraged students from cussing and punished ones who openly did so. This
prohibitive practice at school was representative of the emergence of social ideologies against cussing that in turn constructed the social identity of students who cussed. At the same time, students who frequently cussed also gained popularity among other students which also constructed another social identity around cussing. As Ryu and Daisuke feared, speakers of ‘bad’ language might get into trouble if they uttered cuss words in front of their teachers. Students carefully used the words that had negative values at school, carefully watching who were around. In particular, Ryu had great internal resistance to utter the words in front of adults including the researcher. All the Japanese boys learned that it was not appropriate to cuss everywhere from watching someone being caught by teachers and being punished for their misdemeanor. Nevertheless, the boys enjoyed solidarity brought by ‘bad’ language when teachers were not around.

*Home*

All of the Japanese expatriate students in this study had at least one sibling (Table 10) which I found interesting at a time when Japanese mass media reported the graying society of Japan. Whether the students used English at home or not was first determined by the age difference between the siblings. Ryu’s youngest brother and Yasushi’s brother were both very young at the time of the study where English dominated their primary language. Ryu sometimes talked to his youngest brother in English because it was faster and Yasushi helped his mother communicate with his brother who used mixed codes of English and Japanese and sometimes Spanish which he learned at kindergarten. As for the others, the language for communication between the siblings was mostly limited to Japanese. For instance, Chisa lamented that her younger sister Noriko ignored her when Chisa greeted her in English which deviated from their regular practices. All the students
talked with their siblings in Japanese when I visited their houses. Nevertheless, English was used once in a while, according to their mothers, when the boys had fights and played video games. However, the boys told me that their communication in English was usually limited to ‘bad’ language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siblings</th>
<th>Ryu</th>
<th>Shoji</th>
<th>Yasushi</th>
<th>Daisuke</th>
<th>Chisa</th>
<th>Noriko</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age difference (year)</td>
<td>2 brothers</td>
<td>1 brother</td>
<td>1 brother</td>
<td>1 brother</td>
<td>2 sisters</td>
<td>2 sisters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 The Japanese students’ siblings

‘Bad’ language was used only between close-aged brothers. Their mothers overheard the boys cussing in English, but the mothers were not much concerned about it. Shoji explained that he usually cussed to his younger brother in English when they were playing video games together. Ryu and his brother exchanged cussing when they had fights and sometimes they exchanged information in English as a secret code between them in front of their mother. In one of my visits to their house, Ryu’s mother was upset about Ryu’s attitude and she harshly criticized his manners. Ryu uttered seemingly negative comments about his mother audible to his brother nearby but his mother did not understand what he said and her anger was not aggravated. Daisuke did not like to use ‘bad’ language and Yasushi’s brother was too young for such communication. These two boys even avoided showing their mothers that they were speaking English by avoiding answering the doors and by hiding while they were talking on the phone. There was a range of attitudes toward ‘bad’ language in English as well as English alone.

12 Chisa and Noriko are sisters; they have an elder sister but this study does not discuss her for a concern about confidentiality.
Media

Cuss words were usually transmitted to the Japanese boys from their friends, because the Japanese boys in this study seldom watched TV and DVDs in English, especially ones with profanities. However, only Ryu enjoyed violent films like *Crank* (see chapter 4) and adult-themed cartoons like *South Park*. He learned some expressions by being exposed to the media and to his peers’ conversations. Ryu was the most immersed in cussing in his casual conversations with his friends but he was also critical of his mother for letting his youngest brother watch *South Park*. Although strong profanities are censored and beeped on TV, Ryu’s keen senses toward ‘bad’ language were interesting because he developed a moral standing. This moral streak was not acquired from his parents who did not use English at all at home and were even lenient enough to knowingly allow him to possess R-rated film. Ryu used ‘bad’ language when he was with his friends in the peer domain but he developed the values of “moral adults” regarding swearing in English through his experiences outside, presumably in the school domain. His negative value toward cussing and other bad language made him critical of his mother for letting his 5-year-old brother watch *South Park* for fun.

L1 domain

Cussing was not only used in English-speaking contexts but also among Japanese expatriate students in America. As Yasushi explained, the Japanese middle school students sometimes “slipped their tongues” and cussed in English and the others present laughingly pointed it out. In their Japanese community in the U.S., adult admonition of middle school students’ cussing was weaker than the teachers at local schools mainly because of lack of knowledge and shared morality with the locals. Furthermore, as some
studies on L2 swearing (e.g., Dewaele, 2004; Register, 1996) suggest, swear words sound weaker in one’s L2 even though he or she would be embarrassed if these words were translated into his or her L1. Therefore, a social identity attached with cussing was less negative in the context of Japanese communities than at local schools with teachers around.

Nevertheless, cussing was still highly marked among Japanese boys. Shoji’s following view points to the markedness of cussing in English in comparison to Japanese for Japanese expatriate students. When I asked Shoji how he felt about learning cuss words, he insisted that there was no cuss word in Japanese.

Interview with Shoji (SI1122009144, my translation)

1 [Laughing] There is nothing good. There is nothing good, but I think America is weird (kawatteru). In Japan, there is no such word to insult someone as much. Because there is not such a thing in Japan…Oftentimes, Americans ask me if there are cuss words in Japanese and ask me to teach them Japanese expressions [chuckles]. So I answer to them, “there is no cuss word [chuckles]” for the moment. Yes, I think America is weird. In Japanese we only say baka, aho. In Japanese we only say something like “Aren’t you stupid (baka)?” But there are words that are beyond baka here. I was surprised. As a Japanese adult who lived in Japan for more than thirty years since birth, I disagree with Shoji’s claim that there are fewer cuss words in Japan and they are weaker than
English. Shoji’s view was grounded in different degrees of contact with different language ecologies of English and Japanese. Shoji did not experience a variety of cussing in Japanese because the Japanese community of cosmopolitan middle class families of global companies from which Shoji hailed did not appreciate cussing in Japanese. In such a circumstance, cussing in English was highly marked among Japanese expatriate students.

5.3.1.3. Cussing in the peer domain and internal diversity

Japanese boys started to hear cuss words after they enrolled in middle school and they enjoyed when someone in their groups cussed in local schools. Frequent users of cuss words were often in the center of their groups with timely insertion of whatever they found would make their conversations lively. While students took a range of positions toward cussing, it must be emphasized that just hearing cuss words was different from actually using them. On the one hand, Ryu did not mind cussing among his friends although he feared to cuss in front of teachers. His groups at school and after school both liked cussing, and according to Ryu’s observation at his school, there was no gender difference in cussing.\(^{13}\) Ryu explained that they could make their conversations more fun by inserting cuss words anywhere in their speeches and when they wanted. While Ryu saw cussing favorably though he understood contextual restrictions, Daisuke took distance from cussing since he did not want to get into trouble. Although Daisuke heard and learned some of the words from his friends, he regretted learning new words as they

\(^{13}\) This seems to be attributed to the socioeconomic status of the students at Ryu’s school (see chapter 4). Ryu’s school was more for working class than the other two schools with a more middle class population. H city’s (Ryu’s district) per capita income was approximately $28,500 (US Census 2000) while the others were $41,100 (D city) and $35,500 (W city).
were “meaningless” (imi ga nai) in his life. Although he lamented that popular students tended to cuss often at school, he still ambivalently enjoyed how his closest non-Japanese friends cussed in group conversations.

A cussing-related identity develops in everyone who encounters cussing. Listeners, who enjoy and accept their cussing friends, also have their personal identities developed from/into social and ego identities. As Woolard (2007) calls “‘face-to-side’ and ‘face-to-back’ communication,” bystanders in group conversation also contribute to speakers’ identities. Also, bystanders who do not encounter the speaker face-to-face also develop their linguistic identities even though they are only listening to the speaker from the side. Daisuke was agonized by the discrepancy between his social identity he presented in ‘face-to-side’ interaction with his friends and his ego identity on reflection because he was opposed to ‘bad’ language. Due to his personal beliefs and his fear of getting into trouble, Daisuke kept distance from cussing and even regretted learning new words in conversations with his close friends.

Daisuke had at least two antagonizing ideologies about cussing in the school domain and the peer domain (see chapter 4). Because of the conflict, Daisuke had been agonized at the level of ego identity on reflection even though he was able to exert his personal identity that pleased his friends. Particularly noteworthy is that Daisuke’s agony was not the conflict between L1 and L2 identities. It was the tension between his universal moral against ‘bad’ language in his L2. From an ideological perspective, Daisuke’s resistance to L2 socialization was not an influence of his L1 or limitations caused from his linguistic abilities. Rather, there was an ideological base that drove him to resist particular use of his second language.
However, resistance can also be derived from limited social interactions in learners’ microsystems. Daisuke once had an inner dilemma in his relationships with his father. When Daisuke’s father was helping him with his homework about alternative expressions of animals, Daisuke was dismayed at the word *bitch* that his father showed him in his electronic dictionary. Although his father suggested *bitch* could be an alternative of *female dog*, Daisuke had a moral dilemma because he believed that *bitch* was a cuss word. For fear of being punished by his teacher, Daisuke explained to his father that the word should be avoided and he did not use the word for an answer although Daisuke would not have been in trouble even if he had used *bitch* for his answer.

Interview with Daisuke (DI12142009324, my translation)

1 Daisuke: My dad does not know many things, and the word like this is what children know.
   これは駄目だって思ったんですよ、お父さんも結構知らないし、こういうの、子供が知ってる言葉じゃないですか

2 Shima: Well… ほお

3 Daisuke: My dad does not learn this kind of word.
   お父さんはこういうの習わないんで

4 Shima: I see. Your dad. Wait. Why did your dad just show up?
   なるほど、お父さん、ちょっと待ってよ、今お父さんが出てきたのはなぜ?

5 Daisuke: I was doing homework with my dad
   え、この前、宿題一緒にやってたから

6 Shima: Ah with your dad. I see. Then, when you were doing [your homework] with your dad, [you were using] the dictionary
   あ、一緒に、なるほど、あ、じゃあ、お父さんとやってたときに、その辞書を

7 Daisuke: Yes. We were using it.
   そう、使ってて

8 Shima: You were using it.
   使ってて

9 Daisuke: And we came across the word.
   そう、たまたま出てきて、これどう？って
Dad said, “How about this?” I said I can’t use this.

10 **Shima:** Your dad saw it and said, “How about this?” and then?

11 **Daisuke:** There was a cuss word and I said, “This isn’t good. Cuss word is in it.” He asked me, “What is a cuss word?” and I said, “the words that are bad in here.”

The difference between Daisuke and his father was a gap between the L2 ecology for the Japanese middle school student and L2 ecology for an engineer of an international corporate. Whereas the father found the word in the dictionary with no explanation about its social usage, Daisuke learned the word through casual interactions with his peers, while observing them in trouble. Even though Daisuke’s father showed that female dog is *bitch*, Daisuke had learned the word only in the contexts where he would get in trouble, and he could not overwrite the negative connotations of the word. In other words, Daisuke’s authority over language that he acquired in his L2 environment in the U.S. outweighed his father and his dictionary. This conflict of authority was also found between Ryu and his mother who allowed his 5-year-old brother to watch *South Park*.

Gee’s (2001) distinction between primary and secondary “Discourses” apply in a complex way to transnational migrant families. Because the Japanese parents were also learners of English, they were not in a position to convey their values about English to their children even if the parents had moral guidelines in Japanese. On the other hand, while the boys developed the values of cussing to create solidarity in their groups, Japanese middle school boys separated themselves from adults in two ways. One was
from teachers as representatives of institutional ideology and the other was from their uninformed parents. The former helped the students to develop negative values toward cussing whereas the latter provided a place for the students to be aware of their inner moral through their parents’ lack of concern. Although the boys occasionally cussed with their younger brothers as a secret code even in front of their parents, the boys were not very comfortable when their parents were not aware of the morality of language that the boys had developed elsewhere.

5.3.2. Sociolinguistic realities and ideologies about English in tests

The previous section discussed how cussing, a pragmatic feature of English, was accepted by Japanese expatriate students. Values and beliefs about cussing were diverse and intricate among the students as there were contradictory attitudes toward cussing in society. On the one hand, cussing provided the boys with opportunities for maintaining solidarity with local peers as well as Japanese friends. On the other hand, they also learned that cussing should be avoided in institutional settings, that is, in front of teachers at school. As the contradictory values of a particular linguistic practice indicate, a language contains complex systems in it wherein different social contexts induce different reactions to the same words, expressions, and utterances. Whereas cussing was not appreciated in formal settings like school, literacy had a great significance in schools wherein the students read textbooks and other reading materials extensively. At the same time, the students were expected to know how to compose grammatical sentences on many occasions. While moral adults (i.e., teachers) at school rejected cussing, students did not usually reject literacy and grammar in the same manner. This means that literacy
and grammar had similar values in different social domains whether the students liked them and used this knowledge in every domain or not.

Still, the values of grammatical knowledge were different where expectations were different. That is, the expectations of knowing certain grammar in English were not always the same even though people admitted the importance of these skills. As Japanese expatriate students bridged over two countries, the expectations of English were also oriented in the two countries. While the Japanese students learned English in America, they were also learners of English in Japan.

5.3.2.1. Values of grammatical knowledge

As classroom-based form-focus studies (e.g., Harley & Swain, 1984; Lightbown & Spada, 1994) suggest, students who had learned English through daily exposure were not necessarily knowledgeable in structural aspects of English. Because of this awareness of the lack of grammatical knowledge, Shoji and his mother appreciated that the wife of the principal of the Japanese Saturday school gave Shoji individual lessons on basic English grammar. Because the Japanese Saturday school was located on Shoji’s school buildings, she voluntarily came to Shoji’s school once a week to give him individual instructions. Because she was concerned about Shoji’s lack of knowledge in minor grammatical rules such as the third-person singular –s at the beginning of his stay, she used an English textbook for Japanese middle school students that she brought from Japan and taught him what he had not learnt in his daily life in America.

While Shoji appreciated the Japanese-style English instruction, Daisuke expressed distanced view toward another Japanese style. Daisuke received correspondence materials of his school grade every month from Japan to keep up with the other students
in Japan. As his mother proudly stated, he never failed to submit his monthly homework even though his busy schedule caused some delays once in a while. He checked corrections in his correspondence materials and thought that he would need to be careful when he returned to Japan. Daisuke thought that the materials sometimes unnecessarily required that he wrote full sentences when simpler sentences were acceptable in his local school. For example, a one word answer “Yes” was corrected while “Yes, it is” was expected to be the correct answer in his correspondence materials. He was using the materials for the first-year learners of English to “keep up with” the students in the same grade in Japan. Daisuke described the rigid expectation to beginning EFL learners as a difference between Japanese school and American school although, in reality, they were merely different expectations for beginner learners seen from the perspective of an advanced learner.

The stories of the two boys illuminate different contexts of English learning and different values of grammatical knowledge. Whereas Shoji was convinced that grammatical knowledge would be helpful in America even though he learned from textbooks used in Japan, Daisuke found the corrections in beginning EFL materials in Japan somewhat dogmatic. The two views were oriented in different contexts of instruction and instructing material. One of the differences between these boys was that Shoji learned directly from a Japanese teacher while Daisuke did his work by himself without any flexible explanations from someone more knowledgeable. Daisuke’s materials contained many drills such as filling in the blanks and translation into Japanese (Appendix I) as the material was targeted for Japanese students learning English in Japan. Another difference was that the principal’s wife used the textbook so that Shoji could
keep up with American school while Daisuke kept up with Japanese curriculum. In short, Shoji built his knowledge by filling in what was lacking in daily life. Daisuke’s mistakes caused points to be subtracted in the materials even though he had already learned English for a few years in America. Even though both students learned basic grammar with Japanese materials, their appreciation and the values of grammatical knowledge were different. This suggests the importance of appropriate linguistic materials with appropriate instruction in L2 teaching and learning.

5.3.2.2. Eiken, test of English proficiency in Japan

All the Japanese families in this study planned on returning to Japan sometime before their eldest children’s high school entrance examinations. Overall, they thought it was best if they were back in Japan by the beginning of the last academic year of junior high school so they could send their academic reports from the Japanese junior high schools to the high schools in addition to taking advantage of special allotments for returnees. However, special allotments did not necessarily mean that the returnee children were advantaged. Allotments were surely an advantage for the students because it usually assigned them fewer subjects considering returnees’ limited Japanese literacy. But not every high school had such an allotment. Furthermore, competitions for popular schools were still harsher where there were more returnees who wanted to be enrolled. As returnees were more common in some regions than others, the returnees’ experiences of studying abroad had less significance. Competitions among returnees rather than against other Japanese students were a big concern for the Japanese mothers in America.

Japanese expatriate students, thus, prepared for admission styles for both returnees and non-returnees mainly just in case they were not granted special allotments.
Anticipated harsh competitions drove the parents to push their still relaxed children to obtain certificates in English to prove their high proficiency while they were still in America, because the students had to fill in the gap of knowledge in some subjects such as Japanese history and subject-specific Japanese language in most subjects if they were to take entrance examinations like the other students in Japan.

All the Japanese students in this study already took *Eiken*, an English proficiency test administered in Japan, or they were at least preparing for it, partly because I expanded the network of participants in this study while I was tutoring some of the students for the *Eiken* test as well as helping their homework. As the Japanese parents expected me to know more about Japanese education than other Japanese people in the area (as I used to teach at a high school in Japan), they wanted me to teach what they thought their children needed before going back to Japan. The mothers in the study considered the *Eiken* test as one of the important evidence of their children’s linguistic abilities in English even though the mothers evaluated their children’s ability in English in several ways such as observation at home and school report cards in ESL and other mainstream classes. Although the mothers did not directly associate the results of the tests with the children’s proficiency in English in their children’s daily lives, they regarded the test as what proves that their children have benefited from their long stay in America. The necessity of evidence came from the parents’ worries over their children’s future competitions in high school admissions.

Different from the mothers’ concerns over their children’s academic career, the students did not show as much concern about high school as their mothers did. The major reason for the Japanese expatriate students to take the test was partly for their future but it
was also grounded in their linguistic development. For example, Ryu pointed out the discrepancy between his daily learning at school and what he read in Grade 1 test. He explained that, compared with his school textbooks, Grade 1 test was “unnecessarily long and hard to understand” where the questions usually dealt with such topics as environment, science, culture, etc., often found in newspapers and weekly journals. Ryu found school textbooks easier to understand because there were fewer abstract words compared with the first grade *Eiken* test although he had fewer problems in lower grades.

As the test was widely accepted in Japan and many high schools and college admissions regarded it as one of the measurements of students’ English abilities, the test held great meaning to Japanese expatriate students and their parents, too. Higher grades meant higher proficiency in English regardless of their English necessity in daily lives in America and of the test’s relevance to middle school students. Without special preparation, Ryu, Shoji, Yasushi and Noriko passed Grade 2, which the organization considered suitable for high school students. This indicates that the students were considered to have a higher proficiency in English in Japan than most students in the same grade. However, higher grades in the test do not necessarily mean that the students developed their skills purely in America where such level of proficiency was not required in middle school students’ daily lives. Instead, higher grades meant that the students made special efforts to pass the tests.

*Social appreciation of the Eiken test in Japan and outside Japan*

The *Eiken* test is administered three times a year by the Society for Testing English Proficiency, Inc. (STEP), and is intended for Japanese learners of English. Every year approximately 2.3 million people take the test, which has seven grades, from Grade
5 for beginning learners to Grade 1 for advanced learners. While approximately 1.2
million examinees pass their grades, passing rates decrease in the higher grades. More
than 80% of Grade 5 examinees pass their tests every year, 35% in Pre-2, 25% in Grade 2,
15% in Pre-1, and only 9% of Grade 1 examinees obtain certificates\(^\text{14}\). This decrease in
the passing rate is partly attributed to the difficulty of the questions, as the higher grade
tests have longer reading questions with more advanced grammar and more academic
vocabulary. In addition, Grade 3 and above are constituted of two sections each. While
the first section is a paper-based test, which is the same in the lower grades, the second
section is an individual speaking test, which only examinees that have passed the paper-
based test can take. If examinees fail in the second section, they can skip the first section
the next time they take the test.

The graded \textit{Eiken} test has educational objectives that contrast with the objectives
of the other major English proficiency tests such as TOEFL and TOEIC. Because the test
takes into account English education in Japan, linguistic items in the questions largely
correspond to Japanese school curriculum particularly in Grade 2 and below. The test has
established its position in Japanese society because many schools and colleges use the
certificates in their admissions processes. Furthermore, since 2002 an increasing number
of institutions in the U.S., U.K., and Australia have started using \textit{Eiken} as part of their
admissions processes for internationals students\(^\text{15}\). Among 893 schools and institutions,
19 graduate/postgraduate programs and 28 undergraduate programs accept \textit{Eiken} Grade 1
as proof of English proficiency. In addition to the programs that accept Grade 1, there are

\(^\text{14}\) Source: \url{http://www.eiken.or.jp/situation/last3year.html} (Retrieved on April 13, 2011)
\(^\text{15}\) The detailed information is found in STEP’s website (\url{http://stepeiken.org/map};
Retrieved on April 13, 2011)
20 graduate/postgraduate programs and 204 undergraduate programs that accept Grade Pre-1. Grade 2 is separated into two levels, where Grade 2A is regarded an upper level. In general Grade 2A and Grade 2 are not recognized in graduate programs but many undergraduate programs accept them as proof of English proficiency (see Table 11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Pre-1</th>
<th>Grade 2A</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Pre-2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/Postgraduate</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 Numbers of institutions that recognize Eiken in the U.S., U.K., and Australia. Source: http://stepeiken.org/map (Retreived on April 13, 2011)

These higher education institutions will probably provide their ESL programs to prospective students who have passed the required Eiken grade, but do not have sufficient proficiency for regular courses. Certificates above Grade 2 attest to proficiency that is more than sufficient for middle school students in America, considering that institutions in English-dominant countries accept Eiken as a proficiency measurement along with other standardized proficiency tests such as TOEFL, IELTS, etc. Moreover, the Eiken test above Grade 2 does not only test for language ability, but also background knowledge for advanced literacy in journalism and academics. Although it is not too surprising that long-term sojourners pass Grade 1 before returning to Japan, it would be hard for middle school expatriate students who had stayed in America only three or four years to think of studying for the Grade 1 examination as Ryu did.
Although four of the Japanese expatriate students passed Grade 2, which indicates that this grade is suitable for the level of proficiency reached by the expatriate middle school students who studied English in the U.S. for three years, the students also encountered some problems. There is a section of the *Eiken* Grade 2 that test students’ understanding of word order (see the second part of Appendix F for sample questions). The expatriate students commonly expressed difficulties in this section, even though they answered the other test questions without difficulty. The word order questions are like a puzzle where the students build a part of a sentence from five language items. The question was hard for the students because it required them to go through trial and error rather than writing a sentence by themselves. Mathematically speaking, the students needed to find a single answer out of 120 possible combinations of five items. While learners who are used to the questions can make use of their grammatical knowledge, such as verb conjugation and valence, to find cues for an answer, this type of question was not easy for those learners who had not prepared specifically for it. Although this was good practice of L2 grammar for the expatriate students, who do not learn grammatical rules explicitly and systematically, the question also evaluated how familiar they were with this kind of puzzle.

Another problem the expatriate students had with the Grade 2 was its speaking test, where examinees tell a story based on a series of pictures (Appendix H). This kind of test also required practice if the students are not skillful in storytelling. Expatriate students who did not have many interactions with local peers were not used to starting to speak by themselves and continue talking without someone else’s interruptions. While preparing for the *Eiken* test provided beneficial opportunities for expatriate students to
develop their ability in storytelling, the speech skill that they developed in the preparation did not fully represent the development of their linguistic abilities during their stay in America. Although I do not deny the usefulness of the test preparation in the students’ English language development because the students can eventually apply the linguistic knowledge and skills to other contexts, it is misleading if Japanese schools attribute Japanese returnees’ linguistic achievements to the students’ linguistic environments in English-dominant countries. The expatriate students who achieved high grades made greater efforts than other students in the home domain but not necessarily in the other domains.

The discrepancy between the language items included in the contents of the Eiken test and the students’ linguistic environment in America is greater in the grades of the test higher than Grade 2. To begin with, the quality of vocabulary is not what Japanese middle school students encounter in their lives because they are based on English in newspapers and academic articles. Although the questions are grounded in authentic English for mature learners, it is very likely that many middle school students find it difficult to read and comprehend journalistic writings (Appendix G).

When the Grade 1 test of the Eiken is compared with the State’s tests for the eighth grade, the differences were not evident in terms of vocabulary variation.\(^{16}\) However, the texts in the two tests employed distinctly different styles of writing. Whereas the sentences in the Eiken test often started with conjunctions “although,”

\(^{16}\) The Type Token Ratios for the two tests are 0.29 (State’s test) and 0.30 (Eiken Grade 1). In order to approximate the lengths of the texts (7800-7900 tokens), informational texts and literary texts for the past five years of the State test and Eiken’s past three tests in 2010 were compared.
“while,” “as,” etc., and thus they are complex, the State’s tests were mostly constructed by simple and compound sentences. Furthermore, sophisticated transition words such as “nevertheless,” “thus,” and “therefore,” etc. occasionally appeared in the Eiken tests, but were not found in the State’s test. Taking these differences into consideration, it is not surprising that the Japanese students who had only studied English for three to four years were aware that the material in the Eiken tests were different from the English they were exposed on a daily basis, even though the Eiken tests above Grade 2 are based on authentic English. And while some may contend that examinees can answer questions without fully understanding the passage as long as they have required levels of linguistic knowledge, it does not mean that the test is a valid measurement of the average Japanese expatriate middle school students’ linguistic achievements. The test only certifies that the students who passed those grades are more knowledgeable about sophisticated academic topics. Possessing a certificate for Grade 1 and Pre-1 can be a symbol of “elite bilinguals” in Japan who have a command of academic topics. The State’s test, on the other hand, is designed for the students in the local education system where teachers make plans and teach their students according to the test’s requirements.

However, the discrepancy between the test and the students’ lives does not mean that the test are totally irrelevant to Japanese expatriate students’ English development, because the linguistic knowledge that the students learned from the tests and test preparation can eventually help them read “sophisticated” topics. Still, higher grade Eiken tests were mostly irrelevant to the Japanese middle school students’ immediate life in America because the students were still far behind their American counterparts in terms of academic literacy and developed their linguistic knowledge for Pre-1 and Grade
1 mainly in the home domain. Therefore, it is an ideological assumption that young returnees who possess higher grades in the *Eiken* test did better in their school life and in their peer relationships while they were in America. The returnee’s past life in America and their English proficiency as certified by the Pre-1 and Grade1 in the *Eiken* tests should sometimes be separated.

5.3.2.3. Being speakers of English in Japan

The importance of the *Eiken* test was imported from Japan primarily via conversations among Japanese parents, and the value was conveyed to Japanese expatriate students in the forms of persuasion and suggestion. Japanese expatriate students prepared for the test in the home domain in addition to a variety of contact with English in other domains, and they developed English proficiency in different degrees—still higher than average middle school students in Japan—during their stays in America. Despite their proficiency, the students did not highly value their English skills as an asset for their lives in Japan. They surely thought their English skills would be advantageous in the future but their worries about other subjects such as social studies and science in Japanese offset their feelings of advantageousness in English. The students expressed concerns that their skills in English were the result of sacrificing knowledge in other subjects and therefore, they felt disadvantaged. The students wanted to take advantage of being returnees from an English-dominant country in high school admissions but merely being a returnee would not guarantee their admission because of a number of other returnees like them in the age of economic globalization. Japanese families from the prefectures where companies sent many of their employees abroad were more serious in this regard.
Because of the concerns about future competitions, parents pushed their children to take *Eiken* certificates so that their children could claim their higher proficiency in English. However, Japanese children did not necessarily share with their parents the same strength of concerns about their future. Although Ryu’s mother was the most ardent in proficiency tests and certificates, Ryu was not as concerned with his future as his mother, pointing out the irrelevance of English with his potential future career. When I asked Ryu how he could use English in Japan, he answered pessimistically as well as sarcastically:

Interview with Ryu (RI04052010424; my translation)

1. **Shima:** Do you have any idea what you will do with your English after you go back to Japan?

2. **Ryu:** Speaking ill of others, maybe.

3. **Shima:** Speaking ill. To whom?

4. **Ryu:** Well, those who don’t know English. Because they don’t know, it’s okay.

5. **Shima:** #after two turns# So, to whom do you speak?

6. **Ryu:** Nasty person #after 5 turns# as if I’m talking to myself in English

Ryu thought English would not be necessary after he enters college and pursues engineering, which was his favorite subject, and his awareness of the absence of foreigners in his neighborhood in Japan made him think that English was not useful for his future in Japan.

Discrepancy between mother and child was not limited to Ryu. While mothers expressed concern about their children’s future, children were not as much worried about
it, partly because of their busy schedules in their daily lives at school and homework projects. Japanese expatriate students still in early adolescence did not have very clear pictures of their lives back in Japan. Daisuke and Chisa were not yet confident in their English skills, which also affected how they saw themselves. Daisuke often described himself as having poor memory since he remembered less English vocabulary than his younger brother. Chisa regretted not having American friends while she was in America. Furthermore, the threshold for identifying bilinguals is probably higher for these students, as Yamamoto’s (2001) study over the image of bilingual speakers suggests, because the students did not identify themselves as “elite” bilinguals with high commands in the four skills of reading, writing, speaking, and listening. They are the bilinguals certified in higher grades of the *Eiken* test.

Shoji, Chisa, and Ryu, saw their language abilities, whether positively or negatively, in the contexts of their future in Japan whereas Yasushi, Noriko, and Daisuke did not have such clear views. The reasons for not having future views seemed to vary. Daisuke did not have future view because he did not clearly know when he would return to Japan. Besides, his life in America was so active and dynamic that he could not be distracted by his future thoughts. Noriko was still too young to think about her future with English since she was still in elementary school in Japan and was waiting for English classes to start from the beginning when she returns to Japan. Yasushi did not provide much information about his thoughts on any topic.

*Language ideologies and bilingual identities*

The middle school students who stayed in America for several years will be seen as bilinguals in Japan. In the Japanese society where they do not usually use two
languages, their bilinguality is equivalent to the possession of two “artifactual” languages, or “codes,” which have also been a common approach in bilingual studies (cf. Heller, 2007). As possession similar to fashion, this bilinguality determines the students’ social identity. Whereas English is used as a communicative medium in interaction in America, it is not very likely that the students use English in interaction in Japan. Being bilingual is like wearing two clothes on different occasions where the clothes are appreciated depending on the vogue in Japanese society.

*Kikokushijo* (returnees) or the future selves of Japanese expatriates will reflect on the popularity of a non-Japanese language in Japan. How English is appreciated in Japan has been talked about on many occasions during their stay. For example, Shoji’s interest in interpreter’s job when he was watching President Obama’s speech was stimulated by his mother’s remarks about interpreters’ earnings. Indeed, some parents were more informed than their children in the prestige of English in Japan; however most parents were not much concerned about the values of English due to their greater worries over their children’s Japanese abilities and Japanese school subjects. Without corroboration from their parents, the students’ future self images as bilinguals were still poor because being a speaker of English was only realized through interpersonal relationships while the students were in America. Their bilingual speakers’ identities would be more sensitized by experiencing how their certificates and test scores are appreciated in Japan where the students would have no one to talk to in English. Unfortunately, certificate and scores do not necessarily represent what the students achieved during several years of their stay abroad. In fact, Chisa’s close friend was proficient in English in America (at least to Chisa’s eyes) but Chisa felt sad when her friend’s legitimacy as a bilingual speaker was
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questioned by an English test for beginners that required a metalinguistic knowledge for beginners (see chapter 4). The questions in the test were valid in the context where the test was used, that is, for educating very beginner students in class; however, it did not show the same validity to measure a returnee’s proficiency in a different cultural and linguistic framework. The *Eiken* test also validates learners’ proficiency in English in its framework but in order to be validated by the test, the expatriate students had to learn the cultural and linguistic framework of the test at home. As found in the discrepancy between proficiency tests and actual linguistic environment around Japanese expatriate students, being good at English in Japan and being good at English in America are sometimes different.

*Language ideologies in English and the domain of L1 Japanese*

Regardless of their English proficiency, the Japanese students generally avoided using English when they talked to other Japanese people. Although this may appear to be a natural choice, avoidance of English among Japanese people was not only for communicative efficiency but also for ideological reasons. While Ryu expressed his increasing difficulty in speaking Japanese since he almost always spoke English outside home, he was the most vocal in terms of avoiding English in conversations with Japanese people. He insisted that he would feel strange if he spoke English to Japanese people even if they were more proficient in English than in Japanese.

Interview with Ryu (RI03012010376; my translation)

1 Ryu: Hmm, if they can speak only English, if they use English as their everyday language, I guess I could talk to

1

…んー、英語しか話せないんだったら、そ れが、うん、英語を常用語で使ってるの ならば、まあ、話しやすい、話しやすい のかもしれないけど、まず、日本語を話
them with ease but if they can speak Japanese, I wouldn’t understand why we have to talk in English.

2 Shima: I see. So, even if they are better at English?

3 Ryu: Well, yes.

Ryu’s strange feeling seemed to be related to his ideology and identity. In his mind, being Japanese and speaking the Japanese language were not easy to be separated. This inseparability between a national identity and language, which parallels the monolingual English ideology in the U.S. (cf. Wiley, 2000), can also be found in Japanese history. For example, Junichiro Tanizaki, a noted Japanese writer in the early 20th century asseverated that the Japanese language was tied to Japanese national character, saying, “A national language is closely tied with nationality and the poor amount of vocabulary [in the Japanese language] means…that our national character is not talkative” (Tanizaki, 1934, p. 9; translated by me).

Shoji and the other Japanese students in Dartmouth Middle, where there were many Japanese students, did not use English either when they were talking to their Japanese friends. However, their reason for not using English was different from Ryu’s, because they spoke Japanese primarily for communicative efficiency. Nevertheless, there were also ideological grounds for using the Japanese language when they were dominated by English-speaking peers. Shoji usually talked in Japanese while he was with his Japanese friend at his local school although they were required to talk in English even between Japanese students when they were in ESL classes. Shoji’s local female friend once complained of his speaking Japanese with his Japanese friend because she could not
understand what the Japanese boys were saying. Because the girl was close to Shoji, he ignored her complaint with laughter. However, had a strict English-only policy been taken in the school (cf. Crawford, 1992; Santoro, 1999; Woolard, 1989), the Japanese boys might not have talked in Japanese. While restricting students’ linguistic codes at school is ideological, not limiting the codes in institutions is also counter-ideological. Even though Shoji was under pressure to speak English while English monolinguals were around, Shoji’s resistance to the pressure was grounded on the school policy that he could speak Japanese in that specific situation.

5.3.3. Accents and L2 identities

For many Japanese learners of English, pronunciation is one of the most troublesome aspects of their L2 learning due to the absence of the consonants /θ/ and /ð/ as in think and these and the absence of distinction between /l/ and /r/ in Japanese. As Lippi-Green (1997) argues, accents are often racialized and used as excuses for discrimination. Although only a few students in this study expressed their concerns about pronunciation, this does not necessarily mean that the student had few problems with pronunciation in English because the participants’ experiences about accents were not this study’s initial focus. Because accent is an emerged theme in this study, the participants’ episodes were limited; however, their episodes on accents provide important insights about language ideology and Japanese expatriate students’ L2 identities.

This study captured episodes discussing accents only with Shoji, Chisa, and Noriko. Although Chisa and Noriko did not explicitly express their concern about pronunciation in their interviews, they were nevertheless conscious about their position as listeners of different accents, not as speakers of ‘accented’ English. The girls’ mother
laughingly expressed her disappointment while she was talking about the time when they went shopping together and her daughters criticized her pronunciation in English. The mother deplored that her daughters did not address the clerk themselves if they were to criticize her pronunciation in English.

Interview with Chisa and Noriko’s mother (CNMI03222010482; my translation)

1 **Mother:** Sometimes when I wanted to buy twelve corncobs, a clerk at the store asks me how many I gave them. I did not understand what he/she said and asked my daughters “What did he/she say?” Noriko told me he/she said “how many.” She could have told him/her I had twelve cobs by herself since she counted them, but she didn’t tell him [laughs].

2 **Shima:** Oh, to you.

3 **Mother:** [She told me] to say *ju-* “twelve” and when we left the store, she said “Mom, your pronunciation was strange.”

4 **Shima:** I see.

5 **Mother:** Isn’t it awful? She should have told him for me that [we had] twelve. She must have a way better pronunciation but she didn’t say it for me.

6 **Shima:** It’s interesting.

7 **Mother:** Yeah. Then, when I said “hi,” they said “Mom, your ‘hi’ is yucky.” I
was upset.
Her daughters’ sensitivity in accent was evident to her when she saw her daughters expressed their interest in British English accents. When they temporarily went back to Japan and attended a British teacher’s English lessons, the girls found the British teacher’s accent strange although the mother did not even notice the difference in accents between the British teacher and the people in her American life.

Shoji told me about his close friend Carl who gave him “friendly” lessons on his pronunciation. Shoji and Carl became close friends while they were in the same science class during this study (see chapter 4). The relationship between Shoji and Carl was relatively equal despite the linguistic knowledge gap between them because Carl’s laziness in classes gave Shoji a sense of superiority. In other words, these boys were in good terms with each other because of their interdependent relationship where Carl was allowed to criticize Shoji’s pronunciation in English.

Interview with Shoji (SI1105200970; my translation)

1 Shoji: Carl [laughs] teaches me half jokingly. Well [chuckles], when I mispronounce some words, he sometimes teaches me or jokingly, he laughs at me and says, “What did you say?”
Unexpectedly, it helps my learning. At first I could not say blue and these days I don’t like pronunciation. I often cannot make myself understood and Carl often toys with me but it’s good learning.

2 Shima: I see. What do you mean “toys”?
Shoji: [chuckles] Well, when I saw him first, I couldn’t say blue.

Shima: Blue is the blue in color?

Shoji: It’s a color [chuckles]. When I pronounced it, he repeated it and laughed. So, I asked him how to say it and he told me, “You mispronounced it now.” These days, I cannot say #Carl’s real name# either. Because R comes before L, it’s hard to say it and he laughed at me today, too.

Carl’s laughing at Shoji’s pronunciation would have been offensive if the two boys had not been close friends. Without a friendly relationship, Carl’s teaching would have taken the form of unequal, unidirectional lessons to Shoji; however, Shoji accepted Carl’s attitudes as friendliness and thereby, Shoji learned from him. Shoji continued,

Interview with Shoji (cont.) (SI1105200970; my translation)

Shoji: I have many episodes like that but such a thing can be done only between close friends. Manuel, too. Because Manuel is Mexican, he understands me a lot. He says his mother cannot speak English, and they speak Spanish at home when I visit him. I don’t know what they are saying [chuckles] at all but they understand me a lot.
When Shoji said Manuel understood him, he did not only understand Shoji’s English but also how Manuel understood Shoji’s position as a learner of English. The closeness between the two boys gave Shoji a sense of security in speaking English with Manuel.

Shoji’s L2 socialization on the level of language ideology (i.e., conveyance of particular values) was seen in his pronunciation when Carl taught Shoji how to pronounce particular words. Though not maliciously, Carl also conveyed the value that a “wrong” pronunciation sounds funny. Shoji also evaluated other Japanese learners’ pronunciations with this measurement although Shoji’s attitudes were only corroborated by and not solely developed by Carl’s socializing behaviors. In an interview with Shoji, I asked him if he had ever noticed differences in other Japanese people’s English where he pointed out that his “mother’s generation” pronounced *who* and *where* with the initial aspiration of /h/. Shoji found the way they pronounced the words funny since he did not hear it around in America.

**Interview with Shoji (SI0204201045; my translation)**

1. **Shima:** Do you sometimes think “oh, this is the English by Japanese speakers” when you listen to someone from Japan speaking English?
2. **Shoji:** Yeah. I often do [laughs].
3. **Shima:** What is it like?
4. **Shoji:** Well, people in my mom’s generation say “who.” No, what do they say. Mom, how do you say “who”?

3. **Shoji’s mom:** “Who”.

日本人の人が使っている英語とかを聞いて、なんか、ちょっと、あの、ああ日本人っぽい英語だって思うことってある？
うん、まあ、それはよくある（笑い）。
どんな感じのこと？
えー、やっぱ母さんの時代の人は、who（フー）じゃないんでなんて言うんだっけ、母さん、なんていいんだっけ、フー、って
フー
Shoji: Then, “where /weə/?” Say “where /weə/?”

Shoji’s mom: “where /weə/?”

Shoji: Umm. I thought there was a word that has totally different pronunciation. What was it?...What was it? There was a way to pronounce a word extremely funny. When I hear that, I assume they are from Japan.

Shima: A word starting with wh?

Shoji: Either wh or th.

Shima: Is it “where /hweə/?”

Shoji: Yes. Something like that. Yes. Something like that, like that [laughs]. They say “whe /hwe./.”

Shima: “Where /hweə/.”

Shoji: They say “where /hweə/.” They told me that they had learned so. So, I was taken aback. I sometimes hear something like that.

In addition to Shoji’s perception of a cross-generational gap, he found Indian students’ accents hard to comprehend like the Japanese accent of an examiner of the Eiken test who pronounced where with an initial aspiration.

Interview with Shoji (SI0204201055; my translation)

1 Shima: So, do you have many difficulties with pronunciation?

Shoji: Yes. Well, as for others, Indians, I can never comprehend what Indians
say…In a class of six…there are two Indians and one black child. I talk with them often but the Indian child [chuckles]. There is an Indian who just came the other day and I sometimes cannot understand what he/she says.

While Shoji understood what local students and teachers were saying, he found particular accents different and hard to understand. Shoji had an ambivalent feeling over the speakers who had different accents from mainstream students because he also had difficulty in pronunciation when he talked to local students.

Interview with Shoji (SI02042010157; my translation)

1 Shima: Do you think American domestic students would see you differently because of how you speak or how you use English?

2 Shoji: Sometimes I’m different. I can never pronounce difficult words. Well, I occasionally avoid [chuckles] the words, but recently Carl has understood me and he corrects my pronunciation [chuckles].

Shoji’s ambivalence contributed to the development of his ego identity as a learner of English. While he knew that his pronunciation troubled local students, he also had troubles understanding non-mainstream students. These experiences made his L2 identity complex and contradictory wherein he felt secured with friendly criticisms while frustrated with the incomprehensible accents of other international speakers of English.
After learning in American local schools for a few years, the Japanese students seemed to have developed a sense of understanding a limited range of accents and were attuned to recognizing deviant accents from their normal standards. When their beliefs about correctness and values in certain accents were in some ways shared in their society, their beliefs and values are equivalent to language ideologies that index particular groups of speakers. Shoji’s reference to the distinction between /l/ and /r/ may index East Asian learners who speak “Engrish” which is a derogatory term referring to this regional variety of English. Unfortunately, this study could not determine how Shoji’s personal values over the distinction were connected with ‘society’ because the interviews only revealed Shoji’s awareness of the distinction through his interaction with Carl. This study could not determine whether Shoji’s awareness developed through certain metapragmatic discourses in society over “Japanese” or “East Asian” accents (i.e., top-down) or developed purely through interactions with other speakers without stereotypical remarks (i.e., bottom-up) when the listener could not understand (and laughed at) what Shoji was saying. Since the lack of distinction between /l/ and /r/ is a topic so commonly heard among Japanese learners of English, I am inclined to assume that Shoji learned about the distinction from other Japanese learners including his parents. Moreover, it was also possible that he learned the derogatory meaning of the distinction from other Japanese learners who highly value the “correct” pronunciation of English like Chisa and Noriko who criticized their mother’s English.

While awareness of the existence of difference is induced by language ideologies (Silverstein, 1979; Irvine & Gal, 2000), positive and negative values attached to particular features of either language are also language ideologies that attract learners to
particular “correctness” or repel them from deviating from the norm. On the one hand, there could be socially shared discourses that see the deviance with contempt where laughter as well as explicit value judgments can be interpreted as discourses of contempt (cf. Dorian, 1998). On the other hand, there could also be personal appreciation of “correctness” that is not related to specific languages but to a universal moral in an individual. While what a learner considers as “correct” depends on his or her linguistic ecology, his or her belief in “correctness” disdains “incorrect” pronunciation. The relationship between the value judgment and ego identity is seen when Daisuke felt negatively about cussing in English because of his universal moral against bad language.

5.4. Discussion

Bronfenbrenner’s (1979, 2005) ecological model places ideology in the macrosystem where it affects the other nested systems. Methodologically speaking, it is in the microsystem (and the other systems) where a researcher can find a variety of ideologies in narratives and in interactions between a child and other people in society. While toddlers at home are in contact with a single language ideology through the primary “Discourse” (Gee, 1992) of their caregivers, older learners are in contact with multiple and contradictory ideologies through secondary “Discourses” of a variety of people outside home. The Japanese expatriate students in this study developed their values and beliefs about language through their interactions with a variety of people such as local students, teachers, students from the other parts of the world, parents, other Japanese peers, mass media, etc.

This chapter has discussed three themes related to language ideologies and L2 development that were depicted in the interviews with Japanese middle school students
and their parents in America. Since these themes emerged through reflective interviews, the ideologies in these themes were considered to be related to the students’ ego identity in Côté and Levine’s (2002) integrative model wherein each person’s ego identity develops through historical reflection to build his or her personality. In this model, individual ego identity may be diffused where there are multiple and contradictory values in society. The students in contact with different value systems of English as well as of Japanese and value systems in America as well as in Japan were also faced with complex social beliefs and values about language and thus, their ego identities could also be contradictory across contexts.

5.4.1. L2 socialization in cognitive-motivational-affective system

As language socialization is a field that investigates language acquisition with a holistic perspective, cognitive aspects are important to understand language development (e.g., Duff, 2007; Watson-Gegeo, 2004). This study on L2 ecology is not one of L2 socialization per se and does not investigate cognitive aspects. Nevertheless, I find Minoura’s (1997, 2003) cognitive-motivational-affective tripartite hypothesis helpful to explain the relationships between language ideologies and L2 development in society. Based on her study of Japanese expatriate children in California, Minoura (1997) separates three internal domains (i.e., cognitive, motivational, and affective) and argues that these three domains develop interdependently but not simultaneously in intercultural contexts. Employing the perspective of psychological anthropology, Minoura (2003) argues as follows.

Living in another culture, people necessarily act within the norms of the host society. Emotionally, however, they cannot accept the norms and feel
uncomfortable. This tells us that culture connects deeply with emotion and motivation. (p. 279, my translation)

Figure 6 is the model where Minoura’s tripartite hypothesis is applied to cussing for Japanese expatriate students. This model has minor changes from Minoura’s (1997, 2003) original conception. As the current study employs Côté and Levine’s (2002) integrated identity model, this study interprets what Minoura calls “meaning system that developed after birth” (*shusseigo keisei sareta imi kukan*) as ego identity while her model contains more detailed explanation about one’s personality. Moreover, what she calls “external rules of expression” (*gaizai suru hyoshutsu ruru*) is regarded as equivalent to the domains in the microsystem discussed in chapter 4. Some of the details in the cognitive, affective, and behavioral domains are omitted for simplicity of explanation.

Based on this model, Japanese expatriate students’ L2 socialization of cussing is explained as follows. Japanese students who had arrived in America when they were still in elementary school first recognized the practices of cussing in English in their middle schools. The students, especially boys, were aware of cussing and learned what cussing meant through direct teaching from their friends; they watched their friends use particular words and getting punished by teachers as a result. Watching their teachers punish someone and hearing some episodes about someone in trouble were interpreted through each Japanese student’s ego identity which caused affective reactions (e.g., fear). Therefore, the students’ negative feelings made them avoid what they thought of as cussing in front of teachers. As other social domains, especially the peer domain, appreciated cussing, the values of cussing separated middle school boys from other generations and nurtured solidarity among them. A solidarity that challenged institutional
values induced funniness when someone in their group cussed even though not everyone
totally appreciated his friends’ cussing but felt ambivalent about it. Not everyone cussed
because their ego identity considered it problematic. Ego identity was nurtured in their
lifetime and it had its own morality regardless of the language being spoken.
Figure 6 Socialization of cussing in L2 English based on Minoura’s (2003) hypothesis

17 Modifications are typed in bold-face to integrate the model to the current study.
Whether someone cusses or not depends on the process of these complex systems involving different levels of identities and different domains of society in a learner’s microsystem. This tripartite model also explains the relationship between L2 socialization and language ideologies in pronunciation/accent, grammatical knowledge and tests; however, cussing is the most conspicuous example to illustrate an individual system of L2 socialization with contradictory values in different social domains. Because the relationships between language ideologies, identities and society are thus complex entities, L2 learners’ investment in learning and using another language should be seen in relation to their multiple identities and language ideologies in different social domains of their microsystems.

Values of particular features of a language transform not only when a person transfers to new environments (e.g., from elementary school student to middle school student) but also when society transforms according to its interdependent relationships among its constituents. For example, mass media spreads positive and negative values about language in movies and songs (cf. Lippi-Green, 1997) while schools adopt particular tests for their admissions. In these interdependent relationships in society, values of language can be contradictory across social domains and within individuals depending on where and how learners are related to others in their language ecologies. Therefore, L2 socialization is not a simple process where a newcomer merely learns to live in a monolithic “society” and where other members homogeneously share the target language with same attitudes toward it. In this regard, Gee’s (1990) distinction between
primary and secondary Discourse is too simple in explaining the interrelated and overlapping domains.

On an ideological level, there are tensions not only between the home and school domains, but also across all the domains. As Kroskrity (2004) summarizes, language ideologies are “multiple and constructed from specific political economic perspectives which, in turn, influence, ‘the cultural ideas about language’” (p. 497). As the Japanese students were socialized into the different domains of their microsystems, cussing had multiple and contradictory ideologies. Cussing has multiple ideologies under political influences from a variety of social agents. The tension between the contradictory ideologies in different domains emerges in the form of laughter, when adolescent students cussed in the peer domain. Cussing challenges the order of society or the authority of school as Bakhtin (1965/1994) claims “[a]buses, curses, profanities, and improprieties are the unofficial element of speech” (p. 220). For the middle school boys, cussing was a breach of formal rules at school and adult society which is what Bakhtin finds in carnival (Bakhtin, 1965/1994) and what Farr (2006) finds in relajo.

5.4.2. Ideologies about English

This discussion has, so far, been limited to the Japanese expatriate students’ language ideologies of particular features of English. In the students’ microsystems, there were multiple and contradictory values and beliefs in different domains. The absence of /l/ and /r/ distinction may not be important in the home domain whereas it can be marked in the peer domain. The lack of third person singular –s is not questioned in the peer domain, but it is questioned in the school domain, where standard English ideology outweighs vernacular language. While each domain has its own characteristic attitudes
toward certain features of a language according to the ideologies of the context, there are also ideologies about a language as a whole in comparison with other languages.

Concepts of ethnolinguistic vitality (e.g., Allard & Landry, 1986; Bourhis, Giles & Rosenthal, 1981; Kondo, 1998; Landry & Allard, 1994; Ros, Huich, & Cano, 1994), integrative motivation (Gardner, 1985), and ideal L2 self (e.g., Dörnyei, 2009; Ryan, 2006; Ushioda & Dörnyei, 2009) are developed on the assumption that people have certain beliefs and values toward a language as a whole.

Developed from Silverstein’s (1996) referential ideology of language, Blommaert’s (2006) ‘artifactual’ view of language is relevant to how people view the users of a particular language. As Blommaert explains, language as an artifact often appears in speech among people.

Such a view would be expressed, for instance, in utterances such as ‘I need to work a bit on my French’ or ‘His German needs some polishing, it is a bit rusty,’ in which ‘a language (name)’ is metaphorically seen as an object one can obtain, possess, manufacture, and improve upon. (Blommaert, 2006, p. 512)

The values of tests are related to ‘artifactual’ view of language because they treat English as a whole, unified system in order to give test-takers credentials. When measured by proficiency tests, Japanese learners of English are assigned particular values according to their test results, social expectations, and the amount of trust put into the tests. As Blommaert argues, “the very existence of ‘(a) language’ is a result of ideological construction and therefore involves power, authority, and control” (p. 512). Moreover, language tests contribute to the maintenance of authority and control over language; however, a test’s authority must be supported by society. Thus there is mutual
dependence between proficiency tests and society. While *Eiken* is supported in Japan through its adoption in school admissions for returnees and other students, it has also been gaining social recognition in the admission of international students. Along with TOEFL and IELTS, these tests with public support maintain standard language ideologies and dictate the values of English learners in many contexts.

While a language test contributes to the maintenance of standard language ideologies, it inherently contains political tensions. Hill (2011) analyzes the validity of the *Eiken* test in the context of a US institution, and although the use of the *Eiken* test in alignment with other proficiency tests for college admissions is validated, it suggests there are potential conflicts between the tests. If there is any conflict of values between different proficiency tests, it will eventually affect students’ bilingual identities. Their social identities as English speakers measured by contradictory proficiency tests will construct complex and contradictory ego identities as bilinguals.

5.5. Conclusion

Woolard and Schieffelin (1994) classify studies on language ideologies into three groups. The first group is related to contact between languages or language varieties. The second is the “historiography of linguistics and public discourses on language.” The third is linguistic structures. The present study primarily belongs to the first group while additional perspective focused on the relationship between society and individuals in light of language ideology as socially shared “commonsense” notions about language. Japanese expatriate students in this study were at the forefront of language contact, wherein the social value of English far outweighed their L1, even though scholarstic attention often goes to the maintenance of their mother tongue Japanese especially for
younger children (e.g., Okamura-Bichard, 1985). Without directly comparing English and Japanese, this chapter focused on language ideologies of English to describe the world each student saw through their language ideologies of English specific to their language ecology.

Focusing on each student’s L2 ecology, this chapter looked at how much individual beliefs and values are related to a generic view of language ideology in a particular community. Whereas “the ethnography of speaking usually attributed to each social group a single, patterned worldview about language” (Gal, 1998, p. 320), focusing on an individual learner’s world with an assumption of heterogeneity illuminates the link between individuals and their society. It also allows us to see how “society” affects an individual learner of another language and how each learner influences the “society” in return. Bronfenbrenner’s (1979, 2005) ecological model suggests that a learner lives in a complex combination of relationships with his or her direct and indirect environment. Each person in these interdependent relationships embraces his or her values and beliefs about English, and these people influence one another to realize shared values and beliefs in a variety of social systems such as laws, policies and regulations, as well as in physical objects such as textbooks and tests. In this complex space, learners of English get ideas about language from their environments, human and non-human, to different degrees. They use English according to social contexts and according to their ego identities, which are not necessarily related to language directly. Furthermore, L2 learners’ linguistic identities can be more complex when a language is dissected into smaller features used in interaction, though bilingual identities are often simplistically described as being in an overlapping area between two generic cultures and languages.
Chapter 6: Interaction and socialization in peer group conversation at lunch table

6.1. Introduction

In chapters 4 and 5, some of this study’s research questions were answered. The question, “How are Japanese expatriate students, who are called kaigai shijo in Japanese, socialized to use English while they stay in the United States? ” was answered with “a dual gaze” (Haneda & Monobe, 2009) toward America and Japan. Chapter 4 described the social boundaries in the Japanese students’ lives in America while their linguistic ecologies were in contact with their future expectations back in Japan. As discussed in the chapter, language socialization was a complex mixture of experiences in multiple settings. Degree of access to linguistic resources and opportunities to interact with more proficient speakers of English depended on the settings. While chapter 4 viewed the Japanese expatriate students’ L2 ecology in a broad perspective to describe the students’ entire experiences in America, chapter 5 focused on the students’ individual values and beliefs in English and saw the role of language ideologies in L2 socialization. This chapter gets a closer look to one Japanese student’s interaction with others in English to examine how L2 socialization was realized in a particular setting.

This chapter discusses how Shoji, one participant in this study, used English when he had informal conversations with his four friends—Manuel, Andrew, Casper, and David—during lunch periods at his local school in America. The primary purpose of this
chapter is to describe how a group of peers in an American middle school have conversations in English with a Japanese student. Student-centered interactions at lunch table were different from teacher-driven classroom interactions. Even though the cafeteria was located inside the school building, the context of conversation was largely in the peer domain because lunchtime peer conversation had less outside control and fewer restrictions than classroom interactions. The presence of teachers in the room and the physical conditions within the school building still constrained the students’ behaviors but the students maintained a space for casual conversations while they were having lunch at their tables. This situation made the students’ use of language a kind of game where the rules in different domains were intricately woven together.

6.2. An overview of lunchtime conversation for middle school students

Before discussing Shoji’s use of English at school lunchtime, an overview of lunchtime for the Japanese middle school students in this study would be helpful to understand Shoji’s relative position in school demographics. Generally speaking, middle school students are different from college students or elementary school students in terms of maturity. With regard to their sensitivity, Shoji described middle school students as “muzukashii” (difficult) for this kind of study. Indeed, the difficulty derives from their tendency to separate themselves from adults to maintain their close bonding (Eder, 1998). Middle school students are different from elementary school students as they can be more rebellious in school and in a larger society. One example of their rebellious characteristics reported in the Japanese students’ interviews is cuss words. The boys started to hear cuss words once they were in middle school. Although middle school students usually cussed for fun, the words could be against the authority of the school as
the students were punished if they used the words in front of teachers. Because of this unique period in life, it is worthwhile to investigate how middle school students conversed with each other and conveyed the values of language in peer conversations, particularly with L2 learners.

6.2.1. Significance of lunchtime conversation

I had expected that the Japanese middle school students would regard lunchtime conversations with the peers as important opportunities to learn English but no student in this study found special significance in lunchtime as such. I had such expectation because English had often been associated with elite bilingualism in Japan (Yamamoto, 2001), and high values of English in Japan were not questionable considering that English was usually a required language and the most important subject for college admissions\(^{18}\). In general, the knowledge of English required for college admissions was related to literacy and structural knowledge rather than oral competence in casual conversations. The discrepancy between what schools taught and what the public perceived important in a rapidly globalizing environment seemed to contribute to the popularity of *eikaiwa* (English conversation) business in Japan (cf. Bailey, 2006; Lummis, 1976). However, the Japanese middle school students in America had been geographically separated from the public attitudes toward English in Japan. The Japanese students in America were not in the environment where English proficiency gave them unconditional credentials such as being “smarter” or “cooler” than others simply by using English. Ryu, for example, did

\(^{18}\) Whereas the traditional academic disciplines are largely divided into *bunkei*, which covers language and literature and social sciences, and *rikei*, which covers natural sciences and medical sciences, a foreign language is mostly required for both groups of disciplines where the majority of the students select English.
not find much importance in his language skills as he saw no relevance of English in his future.

Interview with Ryu (RI02012010180; my translation)

1 Ryu: Well, I don’t think English will be very important although it would be if I wanted to be an interpreter. Until I finish my entrance examinations for high school or college, it won’t be so important.

This lack of appreciation of his English skill was, of course, individually different as Shoji showed more interest in interpreters’ jobs. However, the conversations with peers were generally separated from “English-skills” because it was literacy that was highly valued in the context where the Japanese students learned English.

6.2.2. Gender in lunchtime peer conversation

Despite the perceived insignificance of lunchtime for English learning or perhaps because of it, the students had friendly relationship with their English-speaking peers, if they had any, at their lunch table. Whether the students were with English-speaking peers or Japanese ones, the relationship during lunchtime was generally gendered. While the Japanese students in Dartmouth Middle and Miles Middle had very exciting conversations with their peers, their groups were generally single gendered. This gendered grouping was not limited to the Japanese students but local and other international students’ groups were also gendered. Eder (1998) also found in her study of middle school students that boys and girls tend to build different types of peer relationship.
Since among these adolescents, engaging in collaborative narratives required prior participation in the events recounted, girls’ storytelling tended to involve fewer participants than did boys’. For girls, then, storytelling served to solidify specific friendships rather than strengthen groupwide solidarity. (p. 85).

Eder’s account is convincing for Dartmouth Middle where Daisuke, Yasushi, Chisa, and Noriko attended. Although my observation of Miles Middle, where Shoji attended, did not find as clear separation between boys and girls as in Dartmouth, there was still a noticeable gender separation. In the cafeteria where the largest groups of twelve were all single gendered, there were several smaller groups of a few boys and girls who sat in pairs or in small groups. In large single-gendered groups, a few chatty students usually entertained the other students whereas the students talked more calmly in smaller groups.

6.2.3. Disposition in the cafeteria

The shapes and arrangements of the tables are important elements for a conversation as they affect the ways the students can talk with each other. Shoji’s school used white round tables whereas Dartmouth Middle used quadrangle tables in several orderly long rows and two columns for more students to sit at a time. For a large school like Dartmouth, this orderly arrangement was probably the only way to have every student eat in the hall during the day. In fact, the sixth grade started their lunch as early as 10:30 am while the eighth grade finished their lunch at around 1:00 pm. Accommodating all the students could not have happened if Dartmouth had used round tables in the cafeteria.
When a group of students eat at a rectangular table, the direction of talk is more restricted than at a round table because the students next to each other are difficult to face each other. In particular, when more than three students are on the same side of the table, the student in the middle can become a wall to either side of the student, which hinders his or her involvement in the conversation. When I investigated a group conversation at the Japanese Saturday school prior to the current study, a group of six girls showed this problem as they were at a rectangular table. The most talkative girl was seated in the middle of three girls on the same side while the girl on her left was quiet, and the girl in the middle turned her back when she was talking to the girl on her right. Her shoulder and back became a wall to the quiet girl on the left and blocked her from talking to the group except for the girl just in front of her. A similar interaction was seen at Daisuke’s group whereas the round tables in Shoji’s cafeteria provided more equal opportunities for participation in group conversation than quadrangle ones. In addition, individual students in Dartmouth Middle had smaller space although the cafeteria was larger. Whereas the students in Dartmouth Middle rarely stood up during lunch, it was easier for the students in Miles Middle to walk around and drop by other tables on the way to and back from garbage bins near the wall. The garbage bins were placed at the center of the cafeteria at Dartmouth, between the two columns of tables, and the students walked around more systematically.

6.2.4. Race and ethnicity at lunchtime conversation

With regard to seating in the school cafeteria, Olsen (1997) describes how racial separation at a public high school in the U.S. gave disadvantage to the immigrant students in her study with unfriendly attitudes not only from the mainstream students but also
from the staff in the cafeteria. While I would not necessarily call it unfriendliness, I perceived stronger inclination to ethnic grouping in Dartmouth than Miles but it was partly because Dartmouth had more racial and ethnic diversity. There were not as many ethnic minorities in Shoji’s school, particularly in Shoji’s team. Sometimes, there were students who ate alone at Miles but they were usually racially mainstream students by appearance. Unless Shoji wanted to eat alone, he had few alternatives but eat with racially and ethnically different peers.

As discussed in chapter 4, the Japanese students in this study spent lunchtime with others in their social network. Among the six students, Shoji and Ryu were the only Japanese students in each of the groups at lunchtime whereas the other students had at least one more Japanese student at their tables. Ryu was the only student who was in a mixed gender group whereas the other Japanese students were all in single gender groups. As this study focused on Shoji’s group, the findings cannot be generalized to the other types of groupings and physical characteristics of school lunchtime but Shoji’s group was somewhat close to the ideal for the purpose of this study considering his regular use of English with his peers.

6.3. Miles Middle school

In November 2010, I started visiting Miles Middle school to closely observe how Shoji used English with his peers. I had already known him for about a year because I tutored him for homework and for the Eiken test. As the school year had already started in late August of the year, about two months had passed since Shoji started his eighth grade, the last year of the middle school. Miles Middle was the smallest of the three schools in this study and it enrolled about 350 students for grades six, seven and eight. As
Shoji was in the eighth grade, he was already accustomed to the school practices. He also complained about the bad manners among the new sixth graders over the past two months. Because I did not want this study to affect Shoji’s initial networking process in his new year, I found this delay acceptable though it was due to unexpected delay in initial institutional procedures. As the presence of an adult stranger researcher might have warded off some adolescent students, it was acceptable to start the visit after Shoji’s lunchtime group had accommodated itself according to his new class schedule.

The school was located in a quiet residential area with no busy traffic nor shopping centers and highways. On one side of the a two-way road, there were two school buildings; Miles Middle and an elementary school on one side of the road and a high school on the other side. The middle and elementary school buildings had no second and upper floors and the middle school had less than 20 classrooms in the building. I was already familiar with the building before the visit because the district had rented the buildings to the Japanese Saturday school for several years. I used to teach in the building for the Japanese school for three and a half years, but I had not seen the building on weekdays for local schooling and my first visit to the school gave me a very different impression about the building.

The Japanese community owed greatly to Miles Middle and to the district since it was always a big concern for the executive board to find a place to accommodate five hundred Japanese students in the area. The Japanese school once donated flower beds to the school in return for their generosity as well as in seeking for continuing use of the building. Such efforts of teaching Japanese children in careful negotiation with the local communities were not greatly different from the early days of Japanese immigration to
the U.S. in the early twentieth century (cf. Spickard, 1996). In this sociohistorical context, Shoji attended both Miles Middle and the Japanese Saturday school in the same building. When I arrived at the school, I greeted the principal. Although I met him for the first time in person, the executive board of the Japanese Saturday school had long known him. I came across the Japanese people in the board one day at the school when they came to have some talk with the principal over the building. I also met one of the Japanese teachers several times at the school since he taught ESL classes for Miles Middle.

I noticed that the policy of integration was advertised in school posters although I did not know if the choice of round table in the cafeteria was related to the school policy. On the wall between the student lockers area, there were three big posters against bullying. Two of the posters projected an African American boy seemingly in distress and the other poster had three ethnically diverse boys who were looking straight at the camera with a title, “Don’t stand by—speak up.” Among other flyers advertising donations, club activities, and other event information, these anti-bullying posters were placed in the center of the building so that they could easily be noticed by the students.

**Lunchtime**

Since lunchtime took place at school, it was in the overlapping domain between the school and the peer domains (see chapter 4). One of the friendly staff at the cafeteria told me that the students would not talk as they usually did out of school since there were always teachers around them watching their behaviors. A male teacher told me in this regard that the teachers were there for “mob control” so that the students would not harm themselves even though the teachers allowed conversations that were not too loud. There were always at least three teachers in place watching the students.
When I arrived at the school around noon, I went to the reception first to sign in. There were usually a few seated students in the room waiting for the bell to ring. Occasionally, there were a few students walking in the hall around their lockers but the hall was usually quiet during class time. Eighth graders were split into two teams in the period. One ate lunch at the cafeteria first and the other had free time in the gym; in the second half of the period, they switched activities. Shoji played basketball or badminton in the first half of lunch break. He usually played sports with other boys. There were also students who simply sat on the benches to talk with their friends and to watch the students in the court. After twenty four minutes, the students switched places. There was no other Japanese student in Shoji’s team because the other Japanese boy was in the other team. Although Shoji did not care about being the only Japanese in the slot, he complained about the slot order because Shoji’s group could have talked about games before they played in the gym. The topics at lunchtime always had to be reflections on the games this year because of this order. The boys had made concrete plans and strategies beforehand in the previous year because they were given opposite order at lunchtime.

Shoji usually played basketball and badminton with four other boys: Manuel, Andrew, David, and Casper, all of whom participated in this study. Casper moved to another table when I started to have contact with the students at the table but he came back later to participate in the study. As peer networks among middle school students could be thus dynamic, I tried to avoid intervening in their network reconstruction during the period of observation. Establishing a relationship with the students was difficult although it was interesting. When Manuel decided to participate in this study, he
repeatedly and seemingly jokingly told his friends that I was from the FBI on a mission to investigate him. Manuel even spoofed some girls by telling them that he and Shoji were wearing audio-recorders because they were under my arrest due to theft.

Excerpt 1. The researcher and FBI (02022010)

_Shoji and Manuel come out of the door to vendor and walk to their table_

1 Shoji: oh my god..she’s so retard/

2 Manuel: we told J #girl’s name# that we are under arrest and wear these things/

3 Casper: wait..who (did you tell)?

4 Manuel: J #name#/ <1.1> with A#name #(xxx)…and she believes us/

5 Casper: [chuckles]

6 Manuel: ( ) keep it going just keep it ==going==

7 Casper: ==oh oh oh oh== wait wait what did you say?

8 Manuel: we told her we’ve broken into someone’s house..stole laptop and stuff’ <1.1> and then so instead of going to jail we have to go here but we’ve got to wear these/

9 Casper: <4.5> ==its’ ( )’==

10 Manuel: ==just keep it ==going.. just ==keep it going/==

11 Shoji: ==(we have these)== bracelets on’..so_

12 Manuel: that we have ankle bracelets on_ <1.8> which we don’t but he has a weird thing from <1.7> (I’m sure of that)’

13 Casper: [laughs]

While this excerpt provides my position as somewhat distanced from the boys, it also shows how Manuel led the group conversations by providing fun topics, although he was also a target of scoffs from the other boys at the table sometimes. The boys often put different topics, including FBI stories, on the table to produce cheerful reactions from each other.
Andrew was quite cooperative in this study, and because of his cooperativeness, he became more talkative when the audio-recording started. David was the softest speaking student all the time, and when he spoke, it was with the American boys most of the time. In this observation period, there was no audible direct interaction between Shoji and David. According to Shoji, Casper did not seem to belong to the group because of his “upper level” aura but somehow he ate with the others at the table from time to time. Casper was also talkative but there was not much direct talk with Shoji during the observation period in this study.

I usually arrived at the school just before the first team started their lunch. There were several African American students in the first team who formed a large group at the corner with other students including another Japanese boy. On the other hand, racial and ethnic diversity was less discernible in the second (i.e., Shoji’s) team. The students dispersed to twelve tables in the cafeteria as they wished. Each table accommodated a maximum twelve people where the students had conversations while eating lunch. Figure 7 shows how the tables and students were positioned in the cafeteria.
I seated myself at one corner of the cafeteria near one of the two entrance doors. Although I once tried to be with the boys in this study at the center table, my presence made the table stand out, and therefore, the students stopped talking. As I did not think the boys would get used to my presence and the situation would improve, I decided to stay in the corner and observe them from afar. As there was another table between the table in the center and myself, I occasionally stood up and changed my positions so that I would not put pressure on the students between me and Shoji’s table. I took notes while watching the boys at the center having their conversations. My fieldnotes in the initial period of observation depicted the daily changes of the atmosphere in the cafeteria. On the fourth day, for example, the atmosphere of the lunchtime break was described as follows:
Excerpt from fieldnotes (SF11062000)

When I went into the cafeteria, the first group of students was still having lunch. I felt it was a little noisier than the last three days. There were three students walking on the stage and one student was talking to the teacher at the stage. The female teachers I had seen during the first three days were not present but there were three male teachers instead. I thought that made the students more excited and seemingly less disciplined. I had an impression that female teachers were more “scary” or disciplining than male teachers who tended to be friendly to boys. Whereas I recorded overall atmosphere of the cafeteria, I also kept track of Shoji’s group.

Excerpt from fieldnotes (SF11092009)

Shoji’s group seemed to be a little different today. They were seated almost in equal distance from each other where they composed a right pentagon at the center table. Physically smaller students (David, Andrew, and Casper) appeared to be “less tired” than the last week and exaggerated physical gestures while talking. The interaction among the students appeared to be more equal. There were more interactions between Manuel and the three students, and between Shoji and the three students. Interactions were more clearly seen than the last week. The students were facing each other when they were talking which was not that evident before. The students looked more tired before but I was not sure if it was due to sensitivity toward my presence or due to the “excitement” the female teacher referred to.

Although there were occasional changes, the structure of the lunch periods was mostly the same throughout the observation period. Andrew usually came in as soon as the first team left the cafeteria. He went straight in front of the door at the right back corner where the vendor sold snacks to students. The other students came a few minutes later after visiting their lockers and they lined up in front of the left door where the vendor sold meals. The boys usually waited in line for five to ten minutes, went through
the doors to buy their lunches and snacks, and came out of the door in the middle with their trays of food. The boys in this study always, except once, sat at the table in the center. Andrew, David and Casper sometimes brought their already packed lunches from home, went straight to the table to wait for the other boys, and ate their lunches in the meantime.

Unless there were special events, the boys finished their lunches in about ten to fifteen minutes and they stayed seated while always talking with each other until it was time to go. When the boys were at the table, Manuel was usually at the center of the conversation. In a sense, he was popular but from another perspective, he was often ridiculed by others, especially by Andrew. Still, the group conversations were cheerful. While some other groups in the room, especially big ones, tended to get very noisy, this group was usually calm and exchanged talks in a mild manner. Manuel was in the center of the group in the sense that other students, especially Andrew and Casper, made fun of him while Shoji separately talked with him most of the time.

The group of five boys was often divided into two—Shoji and Manuel often made a pair and three American domestic boys formed a trio. The conversation group constantly split and merged where Manuel usually occupied the center of the topics. Shoji seldom talked to the other students and there were few direct interactions between Shoji and David. However, lack of interaction did not mean that there was animosity or antipathy between them. To the eyes of an outside observer, both Shoji and David were just quiet as they often reacted with laughter, surprise, and so on as the others spoke. Both Shoji and David talked in their split group or pair but Shoji sometimes did not seem to be paying attention to the others, especially while he was eating. It gave me the
impression that Shoji might not be interested in the conversation or did not understand what the others were saying. As for his comprehension, Shoji told me he understood almost everything since he was acquainted with the boys for a long time.

Figure 8 shows the directions and frequency of exchanges of direct talks among the boys at the table. The arrows indicate the general directions of the talk and bolder arrows refer to more frequent interactions between the boys. However, the arrows only indicate the conversations in dyads while the boys also had indirect interactions in a group (cf. Woolard, 2007). The boys who are not connected together or connected with one-side arrow (i.e., Shoji-Casper; Shoji-Andrew; Shoji-David) were also involved in group conversations by giving audible comments to the others and by reacting what the others said by laughing, self-talk, etc. Since even self-talk in the presence of others have social meaning (Wells, 1999), it is important not to conclude that the boys were isolated with each other because they had no direct exchange of conversation.

Symbols:
Arrow-head...direction of talk; Thickness of arrow...Frequency

Figure 8 Direct interactions during group conversations
6.4. Analysis of peer conversation at lunch table

In order to depict Shoji’s linguistic ecology at the lunch table, I analyzed audio-recorded conversations based on the following criteria: amount of utterance, patterns of interaction, and distinct use of English among the boys. These criteria seemed to be related to the direction of socialization because the existence of linguistic gap between the speakers and the relative power differences between them determine one’s move to the other side. If the speakers were using exactly the same speech conventions, there would be no change unless anyone intentionally changes his way of speaking to break the convention.

Shoji’s utterances at the table were limited compared to the other boys’. Manuel and Andrew talked the most and Casper often talked to these two. David did not talk much when the students were talking in the group of five but when he formed a group with Andrew and Casper, he talked to them. In the group of five, Manuel and Andrew made most of the utterances. Casper joined in the group later since he was with the other students for a while. David talked as little as Shoji when he was in a large group; he mentioned the reason behind his little interactions in the interview.

Interview with David (DI12232009)

1  **David:** Um..some of the times I just cannot sit and..you know be quiet and listen to other people_ but sometimes I’ll join in the conversation (for) what they are talking about’
2  **Shima:** Okay could you tell me why you participate in that way?
3  **David:** Ah..oh sometimes like when they talk about something else..I don’t understand’..or not in/..I don’t (really) talk because..I don’t know what they are talking about..(but) you know’ when they’re talking about something like *
As David explained, the topic of conversation was one of the reasons for joining in the conversation. Shoji also gave me a similar explanation for his not talking much at the table. Shoji quietly listened to the other students most of the time except for the time when he talked with Manuel; however, it was not totally clear whether Shoji was fully attentive to the others while listening to them, because jumping in a group conversation would be more difficult than having one-on-one conversations.

Although all the four students spoke rapidly and often sloppily in my view—compared to my classmates and professors at my graduate school—Shoji did not express concern over the speed of their speeches. The American students and Shoji seldom exchanged talks directly at the table unless Manuel was between them. The following excerpt is a typical conversation that involved Shoji. This excerpt can be divided into several scenes (line 1-21; line 22-37; line 42-48 for the scenes that involve Shoji). The first scene from line 1 overlapped with the second scene in line 22 when Manuel started to talk to Shoji in person.

Excerpt 2. A group conversation at Shoji’s lunch table (01212010)

*Manuel was making fun of a boy at the next table over the food he was eating.*

*Someone outside his table asked Manuel about something. Other students were talking to each other.*

1 Andrew: David_ what are you doing?
2 Manuel: #speaking to a boy at the next table# me’ G’#name# no no no/.. K’#name#..M’#name#..A’#name#..A’#name#..and we always make fun of S#name#//.. for no reason//
3 Shoji: <3.0> [eating] no reason?
4 Andrew: Manuel//
5 Manuel: hey// can you see? <2.0> is that where you knocked it down_
6 Shoji: [giggles]
7 Casper: wait// what did he say?
8 Boy: can you see?
9 Casper: no//..what did he say after that//
10 Manuel: is that what he knocked the milk down// whatever he knocked
down//..knocked over// <1.4> I think I hit him in the eye//
11 Andrew: <1.6> wh- whew//
12 Casper: <.7> what did you do to his juice//
13 Andrew: <1.8> Manuel// <1.0> I don’t think he hit his eye because he had the
ice down here//
14 Casper: ( )/
15 Manuel: hey//..where did I hit you//..where did I hit you//
16 Boy   right here ==in the eye==
17 Manuel: ==yes (his)=== eye is red//…hehe right in the eye//…they hurt *me//
18 Andrew: and you’re laughing why?
19 Casper: <1.4> because he’s retarded’
20 Manuel: [pp] no//
21 Andrew: good point he is//
22 Manuel: there she is//
23 Shoji: <.5> huh?
24 Manuel: [to Shoji] there she is//
25 Shoji: <.6> I know//
26 Manuel: yeah//
27 Casper: [to Andrew and David] I said he’s retarded//
28 Shoji: she’s got (curl) or something//
29 Manuel: she what?
30 Shoji: she’s (hair)//== <.9> hair//=
Manuel: air?...she’s the air?
Shoji: <2.4> never mind_
Manuel: oh she’s Andrew’s girlfriend?..or what//
→ Shoji: <.5> no/ <2.5> never mind then//
Casper: I wanna go home to sleep//
→ Manuel: (let’s take) she has school_.probably not_
Andrew: I’m I’ve got a better grade than him and er Swallowing Stones test//
I..I got a better grade ==than Manuel in a Swallowing Stones test==
Manuel: ==no you don’t Facebook==…I don’t feel like texting_
Casper: who
Andrew: I got a better grade than Manuel_
→ Shoji: oh I have a tutor today///
Casper: oh what did you get
Shoji: ==after school==
Andrew: 28 out of ==30._==
Manuel: ==screw your== tutor//
→ Casper: hey Manuel..what did you get on ==the..test//==
Shoji: ==hey hey== hey hey hey…you know’…{[p] my tutor_}
→ Casper: Manuel what did you get on the (throwing) Stones test//
Manuel: on what?
Casper: (throwing) Stones..test//…quiz_
Manuel: I got a C’
Casper: how ==many out of thirty//==
Manuel: ==but I got twenty three//== right//..how is that a C//
Andrew: it is//
Manuel: <.5> out of thirty?
David: <.8> yeah that would be C_
Manuel: shut up//
Casper: <1.6> you suck//
Andrew: I think lower than a twenty is like an...almost an F//
David: yeah//
Shoji: F
Manuel: oh god...aw ah #making funny noise#
Casper: Manuel got er Andrew got a A//...twenty_
Manuel: [interrupting] I was the first one no' I was the second one done//

Casper: twenty eight out of thirty...I wanna flip this at you..hey David//
David: huh?
Casper: can I flip this at you?
Manuel: yes’

#sound of a bottle cap rolling on the table#
Casper: [f] ==wo:w//=
Andrew: ==hey//=..I’d like my water...cap back ==here thanks==
Casper: ==( _ )== wo:: woo_
Andrew: you’re like sound baby:ish’
Casper: not really’.but who cares//
Andrew: ok...alright...ok

While Shoji and Manuel were talking in the first scene, the other three boys carried on the conversation about Manuel. When the communication breakdown between Manuel and Shoji resulted in the termination of the topic in line 35, the conversation was followed by Manuel’s self-directed comment in line 37 and an exchange with someone outside the table. Shoji started a new topic in line 42. While Manuel and Shoji were having new conversation, Casper interrupted to draw Manuel into their conversation in lines 47 and 49. Manuel joined in the three boys while Shoji was left behind to listen to the others. Calling David in line 66, Casper redirected the flow of the conversation to a new topic where the conversation was continued among the three boys.
Although the boys talked in a group, their interactions were complex. The boys frequently broke apart into smaller groups or interrupted another conversation to merge in it. As seen in this excerpt, Shoji did not talk much in the group conversation, but he often made brief comments when the other boys were talking about Manuel who was most of the time the center of conversation and victim of others’ ridicule. Although Shoji’s comments appeared to be directed at Manuel, they were also audible to the others and his comments did not need response from them. Although Shoji’s utterances were not responded to, he showed his engagement with the group conversation in this way. In other words, Shoji’s comments and laughter within the group conversation were directed at everyone but not responded to by anyone. Still, those comments enabled Shoji to show his presence and engagement in the conversation although Shoji never led a group conversation like Manuel and Andrew.

The conversations at the table were frequently splitting and merging among the boys. At one moment, the boys were talking or at least paying attention in group over the same topic and at the next moment, they were split into two to talk about separated topics. Shoji often initiated the split by talking only to Manuel rather than to the other boys. When Shoji talked to Manuel, the two boys talked almost equally in terms of turn-taking and the amount of talk. The dyad was not usually broken by the other boys’ interruption but it continued until it faded away when they concentrated on eating their lunch. Partly because of unfamiliarity with the others’ topics, the boys often stayed away from the other group or pair while the boys had an inside conversation. Andrew often asked Manuel questions about classes which Manuel had taken earlier in the morning and Shoji talked with Manuel over soccer and other daily affairs, which the other boys were
not very concerned about. In addition to unfamiliar topics, quick turn-taking seemed to make it hard for Shoji to jump in on the group conversations because of frequently changing topics and speakers. While the gaps were found between Shoji and the rest of the students in terms of the speed of turn-taking and their familiarity with certain topics, Shoji’s English showed distinctive features that also differentiated him from the other boys at the table—a marker that indicated that he was still a learner of English rather than a full-fledged speaker of English.

6.5. Language socialization at lunch table

Shoji learned to use English through interaction with his peers who were more proficient in English, which is similar to how Ochs (1986) sees socialization as “an interactional display (covert or overt) to a novice of expected ways of thinking, feeling, and acting” (p. 2). However, Shoji’s change in the limited period of this study was very subtle which is different from an adult-child relationship in many language socialization studies situated in traditional communities. Because Shoji had already lived in America for three years, he had already developed basic communicative competence, particularly among his peers. The ways in which the peers treated Shoji during conversations were not noticeably different from how they treated others. Foreigner talk, for instance, is characterized in simplified grammar and lexicon (Ferguson, 1975, 1981), but Shoji’s peers at the table did neither noticeably change their lexico-grammatical features nor did they slow down their rate of speech when they talked with Shoji at the table. Although Shoji thought that his friends in general used only easy words when they talked to him, I did not notice that this was the case during their conversation at the lunch table.

6.5.1. L2 socialization via the key person
The absence of a conspicuously different treatment from his friend does not mean that Shoji enjoyed full membership in the group with regard to English. Most of the time, Shoji maintained connections with American boys mostly in indirect manners, mediated by his closest friend, Manuel. At a glance, Shoji appeared to be having a group conversation with the other four students since he gave timely laughs, faced everyone when they were talking, and uttered something when everyone was paying attention. Nonetheless, Shoji and the American students did not directly exchange talks much, although they appeared to be in the same group conversation. Shoji talked to Manuel, not to American boys, when he wanted to say something. On the other hand, the American boys, especially Andrew, also talked to Manuel while Shoji paid attention to their conversation.

Excerpt 3. Manuel’s role as a connector in the group conversation (01212010)

1  Manuel:  Mr. B// <.6> can I switch languages?
2  Teacher:  <.5> huh?
3  Manuel:  can I switch from French to Spanish?
4  Teacher:  <.5> you switch languages? ..no//
5  Shoji:  [chuckles]
6  Manuel:  I’d be good at Spanish_
7  Andrew:  [f] Manuel// <.5> shut...up//
8  Casper:  <3.0> [laughs]
9  David:  [laughs]

→ 10 Shoji:  [to Manuel] ‘cause you’re Mexican I mean//
11  Manuel:  so?
12  Shoji:  <1.3> because you speak Spanish//
13  Manuel:  ==so==

→ 14 Andrew:  ==Manuel== what language will you take next year//
15 Manuel: Spanish_
16 Andrew: <.6> if they allow you to’
17 Manuel: they should they will_
18 Shoji: <.6> hh. they won’t/
19 Manuel: [p] they will//
20 Shoji: <.9> no:’
21 Manuel: [pp] [ac] (they will)\/
22 Andrew: I don’t think they will//
23 Casper: did you have to take French?
24 David: yeah//
25 Shoji: no you will be like better than teacher\/
26 Andrew: yeah_.because he’s a ==ne:rd of Spanish_==
27 Shoji: ==you will be better== than teacher\/
28 Manuel: so?
29 David: you already know French_
30 Andrew: because I was ..du:h:~. . . .because as Kathy says ==he’s Mexican==/\n31 Shoji: ==I’m better than== teacher’
32 Manuel: dude I should be in your Spanish_ yo- yeah//.. your Spanish
teacher//
33 Shoji: [pp] Spanish teacher_
34 David: [p] (you don’t have to)_
35 Andrew: no/ you should help him he’s so 1A//
36 Casper: [f] hey//
37 Manuel: hehe_
38 Andrew: what// people tell me these things//
39 Casper: I know I am//. . .but still//
40 Manuel: no/ I should be your Spanish teacher//..no ==homework ever==/\n41 Casper: ==hey Charles==//
42 David: thank you//
In this excerpt, a male teacher walked to each table in the cafeteria to pass curriculum handouts to some students. He stopped by Shoji’s table and gave a sheet to Manuel. Manuel asked the teacher if he could switch from French to Spanish (line 1-3), but the teacher rejected the request (line 4). Shoji found the conversation between the teacher and Manuel funny for some reason (line 5). Manuel continued his negotiation with the teacher where he proclaimed his ability in Spanish (line 6). Andrew cut in to stop Manuel’s “vain” efforts in negotiation with the teacher (line 7). While they watched Andrew’s intervention, the other two boys laughed (line 8-9). Shoji implicitly took Andrew’s side by explaining to Manuel why he could not switch classes (line 10). Shoji attributed Manuel’s not being able to switch classes to his proficiency in Spanish, but Shoji first associated Spanish with Manuel’s ethnicity and told him that he could not switch to Spanish class because he was Mexican (line 10). Shoji’s explanation invited Manuel’s blunt reaction, “so?” which implied that Shoji’s explanation was not satisfactory to Manuel (line 11). Shoji did not seem to expect this reaction from Manuel. He paused for a moment and explained again to him that Manuel already had Spanish knowledge (line 12). Shoji’s second attempt led to Manuel’s second challenge who requested from Shoji further explanation why a Spanish-speaking student could not take Spanish class (line 13).
Concomitant with Manuel’s challenge to Shoji’s statement, Andrew asked Manuel what language he would take the next year (line 14) whereby Manuel insisted on taking Spanish (line 15). Although Andrew did not fully deny the possibility, he was skeptical about Manuel’s taking Spanish class the next year (line 16). Manuel tried to convince Andrew that the school would accept his switching classes to Spanish. Manuel first implied the school’s moral obligation by utilizing the modal auxiliary should and then added more certainty by using will (line 17). However, Shoji laughingly denied the possibility (line 18) and Manuel kept insisting that the school will accept his switching language classes (line 19). Shoji ambiguously uttered an elongated “no” to Manuel (line 20). This “no” was ambiguous because Shoji had denied the chance of Manuel switching classes. This “no” was possibly a negative statement to maintain Shoji’s position, but at the same time, Shoji slightly raised the ending tone, which could also imply it was a question. Manuel took Shoji’s “no” as a consistent challenge to Manuel’s switching classes to which Manuel only repeated his position (line 21). Andrew agreed with Shoji by expressing his opinion about the possibility (line 22).

After line 22, the interaction among the students got complex where they split into pairs and sometimes merged back together. Casper asked Manuel a question “did you have to take French?” (line 23). It was David who answered the question (line 24) followed by Andrew (line 26). By appearance, it seemed that Casper asked David if David had to take French but Andrew’s utterances “yeah” and “he’s a nerd of Spanish” indicated that they were talking about Manuel. Meanwhile, Shoji continued talking to Manuel rather than responding to Casper (line 25). Here the group was split into two while Manuel was still at the center of the conversation. Andrew explained to Casper
why Manuel had to take French rather than Spanish (line 26). Shoji waited for Manuel’s response to his utterance but Manuel did not respond to it while Andrew was talking. Shoji repeated the same utterance to Manuel (line 27) and Manuel again succinctly challenged Shoji (line 28).

In the background, David responded to Andrew’s comment “[Manuel] is a nerd of Spanish” by claiming that Andrew also knew French (line 29). Andrew implied that he was not good enough to claim his French knowledge like Manuel did in Spanish (line 30). Shoji was not involved in the American boys’ interactions, and continued talking about Manuel’s proficiency in Spanish. He claimed that Manuel’s Spanish proficiency is better than a Spanish teacher’s since his own Japanese is better than teachers’ (line 31) and thus implying that students with better proficiency than their teachers should not take the language class. Shoji’s utterance in line 31 is grammatically important because there was neither a teacher of Japanese nor Japanese classes in Miles Middle. If Shoji had known the subjunctive mood, he could have said “I’d be better than teacher.” However, his limited grammatical knowledge only allowed him to use the present tense here. This absence of subjunctive mood is further discussed in this chapter later (6.6.2).

While Shoji was talking to Manuel, Manuel was shifting his attention to the other students at the table; following Shoji’s argument about his better knowledge than a Spanish teacher, Manuel told the group that he could be their teacher (line 32). Hearing Manuel’s comment, Shoji mumbled what Manuel claimed to be (line 33). David declined very softly Manuel’s idea to be their teacher—a response that Manuel probably did not hear (line 34). However, Andrew took after David and suggested that Manuel teach Casper (line 35). Casper was offended by Andrew’s evaluation about his Spanish skills
and briefly complained (line 36)—which was followed by Manuel’s laughter (line 37).
Andrew defended his own evaluation about Casper’s Spanish drawing on others (line 38) but Casper was still piqued by the evaluation (line 39). Manuel cut in the two boy’s exchange to tell them that if he were their Spanish teacher, they would have no homework (line 40). Although David appreciated Manuel’s suggestion (line 42), Casper already turned his attention to another student nearby (lines 41, 43, 45). Shoji suggested that the other boys receive money from Manuel who hypothetically teaches Spanish (line 44) but Manuel shifted his attention to the boy that Casper was talking to (line 46).

The group interactions in this excerpt suggest that Shoji was definitely part of the group conversation at the lunch table. At the same time, he kept some distance from the American students or he could not just jump in. Manuel was Shoji’s closest friend but he was also at the center of the group conversation and interacted with everyone at the table. Shoji, considering that he talked only to Manuel but not to others, was at the periphery of the group conversation. He did not directly talk to the other students. Shoji’s comments needed to be picked up by someone for Shoji to be engaged with the group conversation. All of Shoji’s utterances were directed at Manuel where the other students watched their interactions. Andrew joined in the dyad between Shoji and Manuel in line 22 which had a potential to expand the conversation between two to all the students at the table. However, Shoji stayed in the conversation in line 25 limited to the two rather than catching up with Casper’s question. Although Manuel was supposed to have answered Casper’s question in line 23, David and Andrew answered it instead. Manuel could have been drawn to the American students’ conversation at that moment but Shoji pulled Manuel back to his side by repeating the same comment. In line 32, Manuel got out of the bidirectional talking.
and joined in the three other participants in the conversation. Shoji did not participate in the group conversation but only repeated parts of Manuel’s comment. At that moment, Shoji was excluded from the group interaction where he participated from the periphery by mumbling under his breath.

As chapter 4 described, the Japanese expatriate students’ L2 ecologies were dynamically constructed through each individual’s engagement with the environment. Besides, there were different domains in the microsystems of the Japanese middle school students. The analysis of Shoji’s group interaction indicates that the quality of his linguistic environment was dynamically reconstructed moment by moment within the peer domain. Despite the changes in the environment, my observation for five months suggests that Shoji tended to keep a distance from the students except Manuel, and Shoji was unable to fully engage in interaction with every single student at the table. Shoji’s L2 socialization at the lunch table was realized through his connection with Manuel even though the other students also had their styles of engagement in the group conversation.

Excerpt 3 showed that Shoji’s involvement in group conversation had certain limitations. Although not always, Shoji’s direct interactions were limited to Manuel, who was Shoji’s closest friend and who was bilingual just as Shoji was. It does not mean that all the other students interacted with everyone within group conversations. People in general have their styles of engagement in their group conversations depending on the members of the group. Even if one belongs to his or her group of “best friends forever,” each individual has their ways of belonging and connecting to it. Therefore, Shoji’s partial involvement should not necessarily be seen as his marginalized position in the group. In fact, the other students respected Shoji’s physical abilities in sports and enjoyed
playing badminton and basketball with him. In this regard, Shoji had more than full membership; however, as Shoji told me in one of the interviews, he had difficulty in keeping conversations flowing with local students except for a few.

Interview with Shoji (SI020402010164; my translation)

1 Shoji: Well, I don’t know well, but after all [chuckles] there is level of difference. What Manuel says and what Casper and others say are totally different. Unless I understand English, unless I understand English perfectly, I cannot go into Casper’s side. Manuel and the others understand me. Manuel is Spanish [speaker] and that’s where [there is difference], I suppose.

While Shoji had fun in one-on-one conversations with Carl in their science class (see chapter 4), Shoji found it difficult to have such a conversation with the three American students at the lunch table. Such difficulty was seen in how Shoji and the other boys had group conversations at the table. As a result, Manuel played the role of mediator who connected Shoji with the local boys. In contrast to Manuel’s magnetic role at the table, the American students rarely talked to Shoji directly and Shoji rarely talked to the American boys as well. When the American boys talked to Shoji, it was mostly limited to requests for napkins or something else to which Shoji responded by action rather than words. In this group in which Manuel is a member, Shoji could safely participate in the group conversation from the periphery; however, whether his participation was legitimate for him with regard to learning L2 English needs further investigation.
In their book *Situated Learning*, Lave and Wenger (1991) introduce the notion of legitimate peripheral participation where novices learn from experts through peripheral participation in cultural practices. While this notion is helpful in examining how Shoji was engaged with the group conversation, there are also problems in employing it. The notion is originally developed based on traditional closed communities where the expertise of masters is not questioned and apprentices identify themselves as such. It is certain that Shoji had chances to watch other boys interact with each other and to obtain linguistic knowledge from their interactions. But Shoji was already in his fourth year in America where there was not clear expert-novice identification in Shoji’s ego identity. In an interview toward the end of his stay, Shoji stated as follows:

**Interview with Shoji (SI0121201099; my translation)**

1. **Shima:** Is there anything that you noticed in your school life? Anything that you experienced about English?

2. **Shoji:** Well, I don’t think there is. Yeah, not lately.

3. **Shima:** Lately means after the new year?

4. **Shoji:** Yeah, after the new year.

5. **Shima:** Do you know why?

6. **Shoji:** Well, I have learned through English quite a bit [chuckles]. I mean, I’m used to it. It’s already past three years and I guess I’ve already learned many things in English. So, I have nothing to learn. Not nothing. I think there is something,
but in daily lives, only little amount comes in, and there isn’t much.

7 Shima: Then, what do you think of if you say you study English?

8 Shoji: If I say I study English, it’s grammar, I suppose.

Shoji’s mentioning grammar in this excerpt suggests that he considered his grammatical competence in English to be insufficient. He still thought he needed to study grammar which was used in an abstract, larger community of English speakers where adults and other language experts were included, not for his everyday life with peers. At the same time, he also had the identity of a non-apprentice in English in his daily life. Although his ESL status pointed to Shoji’s apprenticeship beyond the peer group, his ego identity in the interview was contextualized in the peer domain where he did not find anything to learn in it. The two contexts are not clearly separated in terms of language use, but Shoji’s confidence was supported by the other students’ implicit acceptance of his lack of grammatical competence which could be questioned in other contexts. The following excerpt indicates that Shoji was able to participate in a group conversation with Andrew’s cooperation as well as his flexible use of discourse marker *like*.

Excerpt 4. Shoji’s communicative competence (01292910)

1 Manuel: she has two injuries?
2 Casper: <1.3> what?
3 Andrew: Yeah//
4 Casper: <.9> what happened?
5 Manuel: Christine has two injuries’

⇒ 6 Shoji: <1.0> she was like playing like broken arm like a whole game’
Andrew: broke her foot.

In this excerpt, Manuel saw a girl and asked if Christine had two injuries (line 1). While Casper inquired about what Manuel said (line 2), Andrew responded to Manuel and gave a positive answer to Manuel’s question (line 3). Casper made an inquiry about the interaction between Manuel and Andrew (line 4), and Manuel explained what he confirmed in the interaction with Andrew (line 5). But the information “Christine has two injuries” did not seem to be sufficient to Shoji so he added information about her injuries (line 6). As Shoji touched upon only one of two injuries, Andrew added another piece of information without a full sentence (line 7).

In Shoji’s utterance in line 6, the discourse marker *like* played an important role for Shoji’s construction of the sentence which allowed extra time to think before moving onto the next phrases. Andrew and other students also used *like* for pragmatic uses, but Shoji’s use of *like* allowed him to strategically complement his shortage of grammatical competence, or more specifically of his knowledge of prepositions. By inserting *like* where other words should be appropriate, Shoji could present important information without constructing a fully grammatical sentence. In a full sentence, the preposition *with* would be proper before “a broken arm” and *in* or *during* before “a whole game,” but Shoji used *like* instead and conveyed the information “Christine was playing with a broken arm during a whole game” successfully.

In this specific utterance, Shoji’s communicative competence was sufficient for the students at the table. Even though Shoji’s grammatical competence was not full-fledged in light of standard grammar in writing, Shoji’s strategic use of *like* complemented his grammatical competence to make sense in the conversation among
these middle school peers. Furthermore, Andrew’s adding information collaboratively clarified the “two injuries” in Manuel’s question and completed the answer to Casper’s initial question “what happened?” Andrew’s omission of a subject indicates that he continued Shoji’s sentence that started with the subject “she.” In this regard, even though Shoji and Andrew were not directly conversing, they were interacting with each other while looking at the same direction, that is, at Casper.

6.5.2. L2 socialization through interaction

Shoji was engaged with peer conversations through his strategic ways of participation and others’ cooperation. Although there were some direct interactions between Shoji and the local students, most of Shoji’s direct interactions were limited to Manuel. While observing others’ linguistic and nonlinguistic behaviors (e.g., noticeable avoidance, laughter) help L2 learners’ language socialization, direct verbal interaction is also important for L2 socialization. Language socialization studies are often situated in the contexts where there is a generational gap between socializing agencies and socialized children. This gap suggests that clear lines of authority and expertise are needed for clear description of socialization. However, this study focused on a small group of students without a generational gap. In addition, Shoji had already lived in America for three years and had already known the other boys for one to three years. This familiarity among each other made Shoji’s L2 socialization subtle as there was no new “newcomer” in the group. Still, close analyses of their interactions find traces of Shoji’s L2 socialization through repairs of “trouble-sources.”

6.5.2.1. Repair in L2 socialization
Repair is one of the important concepts in talk-in-interaction which is usually analyzed in the tradition of conversation analysis (e.g., Hosoda, 2006; Razfar, 2006; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). Repair does not occur only when there are communication breakdowns between two speakers but it also occurs when a speaker finds problems in his or her utterance and changes it. Wong and Waring (2010) define repair practices as “ways of addressing problems in speaking, hearing, or understanding of the talk” (p. 212). The problems in one’s speech are also called trouble-sources which are defined as “a word, phrase, or utterance treated as problematic by the participants” (p. 213). While repair practices as well as other conversational practices such as recast and explicit corrective feedback in classrooms are relevant with language socialization, this study found self-repairs following open class repair initiators (e.g., huh?, what?) the most relevant in the conversation among the middle school students.

Some communication breakdowns were attributable to Shoji’s lack of articulation and abrupt initiation of new topics in addition to noisy environment in the cafeteria. Though Shoji was usually passive when local students were involved, he often started a new topic when he talked to Manuel. Manuel responded to Shoji with the expressions “what?” and “huh?” when he did not comprehend what Shoji said. As Wong and Waring (2010) explain, open class repair initiators are the weakest set of initiators, and “[i]t is up to the recipient…to figure out exactly what the trouble-source is and how to fix it” (p. 230). This open space was where the students exerted their influence in socialization as it was each speaker that decides what the trouble-source was in his or her previous utterance. In other words, when the students had confidence in their language, they would
not change their previous utterances while the students would change the utterance if they found problems with their own utterances.

Although the changes could be in paralinguistic features such as volume and tone of voice, lexico-grammatical features and phonological features were the aspects in finding Shoji’s values and beliefs in his language in this situation. That is, repair practice showed the speaker’s (i.e., Shoji’s) attitudes toward what he believed wrong or problematic in his own utterance in comparison to his knowledge of the other’s (imagined) speech community. When the speaker assumed that his first utterance was acceptable to the listeners, the speaker would assume that external noise or something else hindered the communication and would not change the linguistic features of the utterance. On the other hand, the speaker would change the previous utterance if he found a gap between his first utterance and what he understood as acceptable to the other.

Thus repair practices after open class repair initiators are considered to be emergences of language socialization where the speaker has their “images of society” (Blommaert, 2006) to which the listeners belong. It is also where the speaker’s agency is exerted in language socialization through his or her decisions. All the five boys in this study repaired their utterances by repeating their previous utterances where repetition was almost the only strategy for the boys except Shoji. Shoji, on the other hand, responded to the other’s “what?” and “huh?” in two ways: (1) repetition and (2) replacement and simplification. When his repair was not successful, consequently (3) Shoji terminated the interaction without solving problems.

(1) Repetition
Repetition was the most common strategy to repair the communication breakdowns at the table. When the listeners did not comprehend what the speaker said, they responded with either “huh?” or “what?” to show their non-comprehension. The speaker assumed that the listener did not hear him and repeated his previous utterances. All the students used this strategy in their conversations.

Excerpt 5. Shoji’s repetition after huh? (01132010)

A girl talked in a very high pitch while Shoji and Manuel are in line

1. Shoji: you know what?...she’s..[pp] annoying/
2. Manuel: huh?
→ 3. Shoji: she’s annoying/
4. Manuel: yeah..now..you just (now) noticed that?

In this excerpt, Shoji and Manuel were waiting in line for lunch when at the same time a girl in front of them was talking in a very high pitch with her friends. Shoji spoke with Manuel (line 1) and told him what he thought of the girl, “she’s annoying,” after brief pauses before and in the middle of the sentence. He said the word “annoying” in a very soft voice so that the girls would not hear him (line 1). But Manuel probably did not comprehend what Shoji said to him and responded with “huh?” (line 2). Shoji assumed that Manuel’s failure of comprehension was due to the volume of his utterance and therefore repeated the same sentence but this time louder (line 3). Manuel agreed with Shoji and told him that he had already known about it (line 4). This type of repair was most common among the other students at the table. However, this repair does not indicate one’s socialization to the other’s speech community because there is no change in the utterances.

Excerpt 6. Andrew’s repetition after what? (01212010)
Andrew: do you think he’s gonna eat everything?

Casper: what?

Andrew: do you think he’s gonna eat everything?

Casper: You won’t

Excerpt 7. Casper’s repetition after huh? (01142010)

Casper: I punched your arm’

Manuel: huh?

Casper: [sl] I punched your arm’

Although the other students also modified their utterances according to the necessity of their interaction, these excerpts 6 and 7 show the speakers’ assumption that modification was not necessary in the given contexts. When the speaker thought that particular modifications were necessary for the others to understand him, he changed the previous utterances with new and extra information. The modifications were usually made in terms of information rather than rectifying structural problems.

(2) Replacement and simplification

While repetition was often seen in the interactions between any of the students at the table, it was only Shoji who frequently made structural modifications in his repairs.

Structural modification includes replacement of some words with others and simplification which often occurred together. The following examples show Shoji’s repairs with replacement and simplification.

Excerpt 8. Shoji’s modification after what? (01142010)

Shoji: we are doing one..one b- one tomorrow?

Manuel: what?

Shoji: one on one?

Manuel: <.9> yeah//
After the first half period in the gym, Shoji and Manuel were talking about basketball. Shoji tried to ask if Manuel wanted to play one-on-one the next day with him by saying a statement with a final rising intonation. Shoji was not sure of the phrase one-on-one at that particular moment where he almost said one by one after a brief pause instead (line 1). Since Shoji was not fully certain about the phrase, he did not articulate the preposition by very clearly but stopped at the first consonant b-(line 1). As Shoji’s utterance was not very clear, Manuel asked him “what?” (line 2). Different from repetition, Shoji changed the expression to one-on-one and said it alone instead (line 3). Manuel understood what Shoji meant and agreed to his proposal (line 4). In this excerpt, Shoji successfully repaired his utterance by choosing the right preposition.

While this modification may simply be “a slip of the tongue,” this is still an important occasion for confirmation of linguistic knowledge. By presenting his linguistic knowledge in line 3, Shoji was able to confirm that he was in the same speech community with Manuel. Because of this constant confirmation, it is legitimate to say that language socialization takes place in all interactions. Although Shoji was successful to repair his first utterance in this excerpt, not every repair was successful. The next excerpt includes both successful and failed repairs.


1 Shoji: so..were you guys won?
2 Manuel: huh?
\[\rightarrow\] 3 Shoji: <.7> you guys won?
4 Manuel: (   )
5 Shoji: <1.0> [f] did you guys won//
6 Manuel: (in) what//
There was a basketball tournament at school on this day. Following a group conversation among the other three boys about Manuel’s injured right hand, Shoji told Manuel that Shoji’s team lost and there was half a minute of silence at the table while the boys concentrated on eating. Shoji opened his mouth and asked Manuel if his team won (line 1). Since it was after a long pause and Shoji made grammatical errors, Manuel did not comprehend what Shoji meant and asked back with a “huh?” (line 2). Shoji shortened his previous utterance by omitting the initial copula were and asked a question with a rising intonation at the end of the statement (line 3). Although his choice could have still been acceptable to Manuel, Shoji’s mouth was half stuffed with food and Manuel could not catch him. Because Shoji was not understood, he changed his sentence by adding an auxiliary verb did in the beginning although he failed to change the past tense verb won to its root form win in his new question and he kept the same pronunciation one in the new sentence (line 5). However, Manuel understood Shoji’s question and asked him for more information with an utterance “what” with a falling tone (line 6). Shoji told Manuel it was about his game in a simplified two-word message, “you” and “game” with a pause between them (line 7). Even though the past participle won was used where win should have been used in standard grammar, Manuel understood Shoji’s question and answered by providing the scores (line 8).

In this excerpt, Shoji managed to convey what he wanted to ask Manuel through two attempts of repair. As Manuel was already familiar with Shoji’s English and strategy, he understood Shoji even if he did not formulate a full sentence with grammatical errors;
however Shoji’s repair did not always end up successfully even with others’ support. A failed repair and subsequent miscommunication could end up with a termination of the talk over a topic as the next example indicates:

(3) termination

Excerpt 10. Terminated conversation after attempted repairs (01212010)

*Casper and Andrew were talking at the background*

1 Manuel: there she is//
2 Shoji: <.5> huh?
3 Manuel: there she is//
4 Shoji: <.6> I know//
5 Manuel: yeah//
6 Casper: I said he’s retarded//
7 Shoji: She’s got (curl) or something//
8 Manuel: She what?
9 Shoji: She’s (hair)/==<.9> hair///==
11 Manuel: air...she’s the air?
12 Shoji: <2.4> never mind_
13 Andrew: I’m I’ve got a better grade than him and er swallowing stones test//
14 Manuel: oh she’s Andrew’s girlfriend?..or what//
15 Shoji: <.5> no/ <2.5> never mind then//

In this excerpt, Shoji’s pronunciation hindered communication between him and Manuel. In line 7, Shoji made a comment about a girl, seemingly describing her curly hair, but his difficulty in pronouncing /l/ at the end of a word made his word unclear as if it sounded like “goo” or “woo”. Manuel asked Shoji what he had said (line 8), but Shoji again had trouble with pronouncing the word *hair* in addition to a grammatical problem (i.e., “her hair” not “she’s hair”) (line 9). Because Shoji constructed a sentence following
a subject “she,” his utterance over the girl’s hair was mistaken by Manuel as *air* (line 10) which made Shoji give up continuing his comment (line 11) after two communication breakdowns. Even though Manuel tried to understand Shoji (line 14) without rejecting him as an incompetent speaker, Shoji lost his will to continue the conversation (line 15).

In order to make repairs, the speaker has to have an assumption of why there was a breakdown. While the students usually found the trouble-sources in nonlinguistic factors such as external noises and abrupt questions, Shoji sometimes attributed the breakdown to his language and modified his utterances for the listeners to comprehend. In order to make these modifications, Shoji needed to have an assumption about the listener’s linguistic knowledge. A repair with grammatical modifications indicates that Shoji had some knowledge about the listener’s language. When Shoji’s repair was successful, it meant that he was in the same speech community as his listener’s and the repair was a mutual confirmation that they were in the same speech community. However, Shoji was not fully socialized into the listeners’ speech communities when there was no mutual agreement over the meaning which ended up with termination. While the examples above show the confirmation of knowledge about the other’s (imagined) speech communities in dyads, the speaker’s knowledge in assumption was also presented in self-repairs.

6.5.2.2. Self-initiated self-repair

Repairs are not only initiated by the listener, but also the speaker initiate them (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). As for the strategy to avoid communication breakdown and possibly to gain time before finding the right words, Shoji relied on the discourse marker, *I mean*, to control his utterances and engagement with others. Although
Andrew, Casper, and Manuel also used this phrase, Shoji relied on this strategy more frequently than the others. Shoji often used it to narrow down the meaning of the words presented in his earlier utterance.

Excerpt 11. Shoji’s self-initiated repair (01152010)

*Manuel injured his right hand but still insisted on playing soccer.*

1. Shoji: so can you play <.6> games? I mean soccer?
2. Manuel: yeah..I use my feet/..but I can play goalie <1.0> I’m gonna play goalie Monday

In this excerpt, Shoji first used the word *game* but he replaced it with *soccer* since the boys were also talking about badminton before. Since Shoji realized that *game* was ambiguous, he clarified it by saying *soccer*. He did not find the word initially if we judge by his pause before *games*. The fact that Shoji replaced *game* with *soccer* indicates that he was aware of the ambiguity of the word *game* for Manuel, and thus, he showed his discourse competence here. However, this example was not a case of language socialization in the sense that he learned to use English because this repair was made for specifying the content of the topic rather than linguistic problems.

Another strategy was to replace the first word with something else.

Excerpt 12. Shoji’s self-initiated repair followed by *huh*? (02012010)

1. Shoji: he’s weird I mean (idiot)
2. Manuel: huh?
3. Shoji: he’s weird//
4. Manuel: who//
5. Shoji: <3.1> right there//
6. Manuel: yeah//

In this excerpt, Shoji first said *weird* to describe a boy in front of him and Manuel and right after that he replaced *weird* with a word that sounded like *idiot* (line 1). Manuel did
not comprehend what Shoji said and gave him a cue “huh?” (line 2). This cue made Shoji think again about the word and changed the word back to weird (line 3). The phrase *I mean* suggests that Shoji was not certain of which word to use to describe the boy in front of them where Manuel’s cue of non-comprehension convinced him to stick with the first word. This was a combination of self-initiated and other-initiated self-repairs and also a case of language socialization in which Shoji negotiated the meanings of the words with Manuel.

While Manuel and other students used *I mean* as well, their uses were strategically more efficient.

Excerpt 13. Self-initiated repairs by both Manuel and Shoji (03102010)

1 Manuel: we put in our worst goalie/.I../I was goalie’…so we put in our worst goalie’…and they still couldn’t score//

2 Shoji: dude..because

⇒ 3 Manuel: I mean my ==I was defender’==

4 Shoji: ==they’re like B chi:m==

5 Manuel: no// I was ==defender’==

⇒ 6 Shoji: ==or== B team I mean

7 Manuel: no/ I was defender (anything)

In this excerpt, Manuel talked about how he played a goalie when he played against a very weak team (line 1). His turn was rather long. He started with a subject *we* that had a worst goalie and then switched to *I* to mean that he was the goalie. After that, he came back to the first statement to tell Shoji that the other team could not score from the worst goalie, which was Manuel. Although Shoji tried to explain the reason (line 2), Manuel cut in, and tried to make his first turn easier to understand for the listener (line 3). After Manuel used *I mean* “to make a long story short,” Shoji interrupted him to make a
comment about the other team with the pronunciation of a Japanized English loanword, *chiimu*, not team (line 4). Interrupting Manuel’s repetition (line 5), Shoji said the word again with English pronunciation this time, adding *I mean* at the end (line 6). Shoji’s *I mean* was equivalent to the following “I did not mean to say that. This is what I meant” whereas Manuel’s *I mean* was “to make a long story short.” Although both students used *I mean* to avoid potential miscommunication, Shoji’s use was oriented to remedy a linguistic problem while Manuel used it for a discursive problem.

As revealed in these excerpts, Shoji often used *I mean* due to his bad choice of words. Although the first choice of words could make sense to his listener, Shoji tried to be as accurate in his meaning as possible.

Excerpt 14. Shoji’s self-initiated repair (12142010)

1. Shoji: what age group/\(<.7>\) the..Christmas cup or something/\n2. Manuel: group? we don’t have a group/\n3. Shoji: no/\(<.7>\)the Christmas..cup or something/\n4. Manuel: group?...there are no groups/\n5. Shoji: what age/\(<.6>\)..oh oh_\n6. Manuel: I think um fourteen or fifteen/\(<.6>\)maybe sixteen/\(<.6>\)what are you doing/\n\rightarrow 7. Shoji: I don’t know/\(<.6>\)it’s a:ll/\(<.6>\)coaches are deciding/\(I\) mean..like manager thing are deciding/\(<.6>\)we don’t have enough people to pay/\(<.6>\)so_\n
In line 7 of this excerpt, Shoji first said *coaches* and then replaced it with *like manager thing*. Although the first statement would have made a sense in this conversation with Manuel, Shoji wanted to be more accurate and decided to replace *coaches* with another word. However, Shoji was still not sure about who decides if his team participates in a
soccer tournament or maybe he knew who but he did not know exactly what the person was called. Shoji used two words to make the decision-maker vague, namely, using *like* and *thing*. As discussed earlier, Shoji used *like* often to avoid using particular function words. This time, he used it in the sense of “I’m not sure but something like” to avoid clear wording. *Thing* or *thingy* was also his favorite word to avoid specificity. Thus, *I mean* in this excerpt was used in the sense of “I was wrong in the previous word, and this is correct.”

Although other boys said “I mean” when they needed to clarify what they previously said, Shoji employed this strategy more than the others. It once became a mocking target when Shoji was not clear even after saying *I mean*. When Andrew, Manuel, and Shoji were having conversation over a girl who reportedly said that she wanted to have a baby with Shoji, Manuel teased Shoji saying the names of two Japanese girls. However, Shoji could not say the name the girls into a microphone but used pronouns instead.

Excerpt 15. Andrew’s critique of Shoji’s strategy (03022010)

1. Shoji: I don’t like them at all/
2. Andrew: huh?
3. Shoji: oh well _<3.1> I don’t like..her_/ /
4. Andrew: <2.1> you are talking about Christie #girl’s name#?
5. Shoji: I mean them <.6> I mean <.8> her_/ /
6. Andrew: <1.0> I’m confused..all I keeps hearing is..I mean..I mean..I mean..Manuel mean <1.0> just kidding <2.9> Rudolph #boy’s name# says I’m mean_/ /

This mocking was not aimed at Shoji’s strategy to complement his fluency but it sprung from Andrew’s frustration over the vagueness of the personal pronouns, *them* and *her,*
since Andrew did not know who Manuel and Shoji were talking about. Andrew’s mocking, thus, did not change Shoji’s strategy of using I mean as he started to use it just a few minutes later.

6.5.2.3. Asking for repairs

While the repairs initiated by the other students led to Shoji’s L2 socialization, Shoji also responded in the same way when he did not comprehend the speaker. The boys usually just repeated their previous utterances when Shoji responded with “what?” and “huh?” The repetition was merely the speakers’ assumption that Shoji was in the same speech community but Shoji sometimes needed more than repetition.

Excerpt 16. Long-held Shoji’s vague understanding (01132010)

Shoji, Manuel and Andrew were in line for lunch and Manuel was talking to another student telling him that he sprained his ankle in a soccer game.

1 Manuel: Sports barn sucks
2 Shoji: huh?
3 Manuel: Sports (barn) sucks
4 Shoji: sucks? <1.1> I’m not..[f] ==going//==
5 Manuel: ==(that’s)== a real barn//..it was like a literally a rea- the wa- the wa- the walls of indoor?..they’re really made of wall..they can easily break one//
6 Shoji: <1.8> are you kidding me?
7 Manuel: yea- I’m not kidding//
8 Shoji: [f] I’m not going though’
9 Manuel: for our team?
10 Shoji: no//..my team// ==I have different Sunday//==
11 Manuel: ==different sports barn?==
12 Shoji: yeah//..Sunday//..every Sunday I have the game//
While Shoji and Manuel were waiting in line for their lunches, Manuel started to complain about an indoor sports facility, or what they called “the sports barn,” where he played soccer for a tournament. Manuel somewhat mumbled that he did not like the place (line 1) and Shoji could not comprehend what he said (line 2). Manuel repeated the previous utterance but still rapidly as was his habit (line 3). Shoji caught the last word, “sucks,” and understood what Manuel meant (line 4). Shoji’s next response was ambiguous because at the moment, Shoji might have misunderstood Manuel’s utterance. Since Manuel spoke fast and in an unclear manner, Shoji might have taken the word barn as bar. This is confirmed in line 16 where Shoji was confused between the two words, bar and barn. Although “sports bar” was also common for adult audience to watch sports while drinking alcoholic beverages, the following interactions pointed to Shoji’s understanding what Manuel meant whatever it was called. Manuel described how terrible it was to play in the facility (line 5). The phrase “are you kidding me?” (line 6) was one
of the phrases that Shoji often used when he was trying to show surprise to the speaker, just as “seriously?” and “really?” to which Manuel claimed the truthfulness of his description (line 7).

From the available audio-recorded interaction, it was not clear why Shoji insisted on not going to the place, but Shoji anyhow told Manuel that he would not go to the place (line 8). Manuel ambiguously asked if Shoji would not come for his team or asked him to come for his team (line 9). Shoji took Manuel’s utterance as a question rather than request and explained why he would not come to the place (line 10). While Shoji avoided the word barn in his explanation, Manuel interrupted it and asked if Shoji’s game would be held at a different barn (line 11). After Shoji told Manuel that he had games at other places (line 12), Manuel shifted the topic to the name of Shoji’s team (line 13) where Shoji told him his team name (line 14). From the team name, Manuel learned Shoji’s age group and told him that they were in different age groups (line 15). These age groups were important because the facility assigned the dates and the fields depending on the age groupings. Therefore, Shoji interpreted Manuel’s referral to their ages as another invitation to the game. Shoji again expressed his dislikes of the facility (line 16). At the same time, Shoji tried to confirm which of the words bar or barn was to be used for the facility (line 16). Manuel was confused and asked Shoji “what? barn?” (line 17). Shoji got an answer from Manuel’s response and asked him another question which is if his game would be held in the Eastern barn (line 18). Although Manuel acknowledged it as the place he goes to (line 19), Shoji again refused to go there (line 20).

This excerpt of the interactions between Shoji and Manuel contains very subtle miscommunication. It also contains Shoji’s change in using some words. First of all,
Shoji did not know the accurate name of the facility and he was confused if *bar* or *barn* was the correct word to call the place where Manuel played soccer (line 16). Also, Shoji found his answer in Manuel’s question for clarification and started a new line of conversation (line 17-18). Judging from the flow of the conversations, it was not likely that Shoji thought of a sports bar, a place where mature audience enjoy alcoholic beverages while watching sports on a large screen, but it was clear at least that the interaction with Manuel made Shoji conscious of the accurate word to use in referring to the place. While Shoji was not sure whether *bar* or *barn* was correct for the unfortunately inconvenient place for the two boys to play soccer, he kept avoiding using the word to refer to the place. Maybe because Shoji did not have the vocabulary to describe the indoor facility, he consistently omitted the locations in his utterances (lines 8, 10, 12). After he was familiarized with the name of the indoor facility, he used the words *field* and *inside* rather than *bar* or *barn*.

Language socialization does not only occur in the form of telling the norm to the other, but it can also happen when the listener asks for a question about the previous utterance. The question that implies “I do not understand you” is a message that the speaker is not using the language properly according to the listeners’ judgment. The speaker was expected to judge whether the reason for the breakdown was his articulation, grammar, misuse of words, or something else. When the speaker rightly attributed the breakdown to linguistic gaps between the speaker and the listener and when following repair was done successfully, the two confirmed that they were in the same speech community through mutual understanding. The linguistic gaps are more complicated
once the ideological level is taken into consideration as a two speakers’ speech community is hardly ever perfectly identical at this level.

6.5.3. Socializing others through value judgment

Language socialization was not only at the level of lexico-grammatical features of English, but also the boys socialized with each other through the value judgment of language use. The middle school boys maintained a relatively loose linguistic community as they usually did not critique, correct, or guide others into particular ways of speaking. However, there were certain features of language that the students exchanged value judgments over during their lunchtime conversations. Cussing was the most conspicuous example.

As discussed in chapter 5, cussing was generally discouraged at school. However, even though the students were at school, lunchtime was the time for the students to partially maintain the peer domain of their microsystem. The students sometimes cussed in front of other students while their teachers were not within earshot. Although the students were enjoying their peer interactions, the researcher and audio-recorders intruded into their domain to add an aspect of adult society. The boys restrained their cussing sometimes in front of the microphones and critiqued each other’s uses of bad language. For example, Andrew covered his microphone before he cussed. Although David asked if he had to do it and Andrew said no, Andrew showed the language value of another domain in the form of a gesture. Shoji also pointed out Manuel’s not cussing in front of the audio-recorders when he was still nervous about the researcher’s presence in the cafeteria during the first few weeks.

Excerpt 17. Shoji points out Manuel’s changed attitudes (12042010)
Shoji: you are not talking like…when I was…his recording

Manuel: (    )

Shoji: you are not cussing/

Manuel: ( )

Shoji: yeah I mean you’re normally normally cussing like…anytime

Unfortunately, Shoji’s audio-recorder did not pick up Manuel’s voice this time because I was still waiting for his parents’ consent and therefore, I was not allowed to record his voice. Still, this excerpt shows that Shoji’s subtle move to ideologically socialize Manuel into his (imagined) speech community. In Shoji’s microsystem, I was an adult that would accept cussing and my presence did not add much to his regular peer domain. Rather, in terms of cussing, Shoji could be even cooperative as I reassured him in the interviews not to worry about ‘bad’ language. On the other hand, I was still more of a stranger to the other students and I was an adult that put an alien element into their peer domains. My presence transformed the nature of the peer domain during a lunchtime conversation for the middle school students.

Because of different degrees of understanding about my presence, there was a gap between Shoji’s peer domain and the other students’ domain that used to be the peer domain before I took part in their microsystems. Shoji pushed the values of his context (i.e., peer domain) to Manuel (i.e., school domain) by pointing out that Manuel did not cuss as usual. Shoji’s attempt was also a case of language socialization in that he tries to change Manuel’s interpretation of the context and Shoji was exerting agency over Manuel. In this example, Shoji was not the one to be socialized to be part of other’s imagined speech community but the one to socialize Manuel to be part of his imagined speech community. This negotiation occurred at the level of language ideology because it
was over the boys’ beliefs in the appropriate use of language in differently imagined contexts.

6.6. Resistance to socialization

Although the data is limited to the school lunchtime within a limited period of time, the observation found that Shoji resisted the same language practices that the other students commonly performed. His resistance to language socialization seemed to have different reasons but there were two noticeable aspects in Shoji’s language use in contrast to the language use among the other boys at the lunch table. The aspects were (1) attracting listener’s attention and (2) the use of would.

6.6.1. Not saying the name of another person before starting to talk

Although not always, the students at the table called the name of the boy before they talked to him. The boy usually responded with “what” or “huh” to show that he was aware of the speaker. In comparison to the uses of “what” for communication breakdown, the following excerpt shows that “what” prompted a question rather than a repetition of the question.

Excerpt 18. Casper says the recipient’s name before addressing him (01152010)

1 Casper: Manuel_
2 Manuel: <.8> what?
3 Casper: so..what did they say//.what did they say about it/
4 Manuel: it’s a bad injury’ that I can’t play basketball again’

In this excerpt, Casper called Manuel’s name to attract his attention (line 1). Manuel responded by saying “what?” (line 2). After confirming that he grabbed Manuel’s attention, Casper started to talk with a conversation starter, “so” (line 3). The next example also shows the function of saying the other’s name before making a request:
Excerpt 19. Manuel says Shoji’s name before talking more (02232010)

→
1 Manuel: Shoji
2 Shoji: huh?
3 Manuel: hold it..don’t let them get it/
4 Shoji: okay/

Manuel first said Shoji’s name to attract his attention (line 1). Shoji responded with “huh?” (line 2). Then Manuel asked Shoji to keep his thing from others (line 3). Shoji accepted his request (line 4).

Personal names often have important meanings in building personal relationships in the U.S. Thompson (2006), for instance, describes three Korean women’s investment in their English names and the complexity of their access to L2 communities with different degrees of allegiances to their names. As Thompson argues, personal names are part of one’s social identity and they have different meanings depending on the contexts in which they operate. Shoji did not say his peers’ names when he spoke to someone in the group or to any other person when he was waiting in line for his lunch. As Shoji mainly talked to Manuel, it was not usually necessary for him to say the names of the other students. Although Shoji’s not saying his peers’ names may be attributed to his stronger connection to Manuel, it still indicated that Shoji had some distance from the others’ language practice if we consider a personal name an important aspect of L2 society as Thompson argues.

While Shoji maintained his Japanese name, he found it difficult to pronounce his friend’s name Carl, because of the /l/ and /r/ distinction in English. Considering that Carl laughed at Shoji’s pronunciation, it is not hard to imagine that Shoji avoided saying the names of his friends because he did not want to risk calling a wrong or mispronounced
name unless it was necessary. Thus the absence of saying specific personal names in group conversations seemed to be also grounded in Shoji’s beliefs in communication although Shoji did not speak much to the others except for Manuel. Saying someone’s name before talking is not only adopted for the practical purpose of attracting the potential listener’s attention, but also an ideology where a person’s name plays an important role in establishing a personal relationship with the listener. When someone’s name is said before talking, it means that the talk is between the speaker and the listener and the people outside the two can only “jump in” the conversation. The conversation may be overheard but it is basically individualized rather than being open to outsiders. As Shoji often positioned himself as a passive recipient of direct talk with the boys except Manuel, his limiting the people to “jump in” his conversation by saying Manuel’s name would be an unreasonable strategy to maintain the bonds with others and to impress his presence upon them.

6.6.2. Grammar beyond learning

Shoji’s distance from his peers’ language practices was cultural and practical in the aspect of personal names and thus, it can be regarded as ideological. On the other hand, Shoji’s distance could also be attributed to his linguistic limitation. Although he understood what was taking place among his peers and gave timely reactions to others’ comments, Shoji’s grammatical competence was still limited in comparison to the other boys at the table and his participation was still peripheral in many situations. Furthermore, he did not find peer interactions as fruitful opportunities for learning English now that he had lived with them for three years.
Despite his comfort, there were features that Shoji did not share with the other boys at the lunch table. For example, in most of his utterances, Shoji did not form long sentences with conjunctions such as and, but, that, and when. These conjunctions were usually necessary when the boys told their stories to the others and had them listen to the story. The boys except Shoji and David used these conjunctions when they talked about the events in their daily lives. Although the absence of these words does not mean that Shoji could not use them in other contexts such as writing, Shoji’s participation in informal peer conversations did not give him enough time to keep speaking in the rushed dynamics of interaction.

Another difference was found in the use of the modal auxiliary would which is used in the past subjunctive. As depicted in the following excerpt, the boys at the table used would to express either agreement or disagreement by putting themselves in somebody else’s shoes. However, Shoji never used this auxiliary verb to show his position over someone’s actions or opinions.

Excerpt 20. would by Andrew (01202010)

\[1\] Andrew: hey..Casper I would be surprised if he get (to) makes it through to college//

\[2\] Casper: <1.0> what?

\[3\] Andrew: <1.4> because..no him//

The absence of would in Shoji’s utterances was discussed earlier for excerpt 3. Shoji’s use of present tense in “I’m better than teacher” when there is no teacher in Miles Middle suggests that he was unable to use the past subjunctive would in imaginative conditional sentences (cf. Celce-Murcia & Larsen Freeman, 1999) such as “I would be better than teacher (if I were a teacher).” Since the data can only show what was present
within the scope of observation, the absence of *would* in Shoji’s utterances did not necessarily mean that he could not use them in other situations such as in writing. However, this *would* seemed to be still linguistically challenging for L2 learners of English considering that this grammatical feature first appeared in high school in Japanese curriculum of English. Therefore, it is likely that Shoji did not have the metalinguistic knowledge of *would* except for its phrasal uses in polite requests.

Although Krashen (1976) argues that informal, natural input leads to L2 acquisition, there have been opposition to his hypothesis where the importance of output and interaction are also emphasized (Gass & Mackey, 2006; Swain, 1995). Although there needs consideration if the absence of change due to lack of awareness is called *resistance*, it would certainly be if Shoji did not put the knowledge into practice even though he had already have internalized the knowledge of *would* in past subjunctives. Observation at one site cannot determine whether the absence of *would* was due to Shoji’s lack of awareness of his peers speeches or his not wanting to use the knowledge for some (ideological) reason.

6.7. Discussion and concluding statement

Following the previous chapters, this chapter has focused on Shoji and his peers’ lunchtime conversations at their middle school. Communication breakdowns and subsequent repairs were subtle opportunities of L2 socialization for Shoji who had learned English for three years in America and who was no longer a “new” newcomer.

When the students did not catch the speakers at their lunch table, they usually reacted verbally with the words “what?” and “huh?” Expressions like “excuse me?” or “I beg your pardon” were never used among the middle school boys as such expressions
would be inappropriate in the middle school boys’ peer domain. When the speakers thought some noises or abrupt initiation of the turn hindered the listener’s comprehension, they chose to repeat what they said in their previous turn. Only Shoji made frequent modifications, although not always, when he encountered cues from the students—mostly from Manuel. Behind Shoji’s judgment on modification, he had the assumption that his previous utterance had trouble-sources related to linguistic structures rather than volume and timing of speech. At the same time, Shoji also needed both a linguistic knowledge of English to reconstruct his new utterance and an assumption that his next utterance would be accepted by the listener.

As the other students’ individual microsystems also had multiple domains, each student’s range of acceptable English was not identical to monolithic standard grammar in the school domain. Even though the local boys used a variety of “American English” at home, their peer domain at school also included Shoji, Manuel, and other students. Although the boys may have found Shoji’s English different from theirs, the boys at the table maintained solidarity as “students” as opposed to “adults,” especially teachers who used “correct” language in this respect. In relation to “more correct” adults, the local young boys were also at the periphery of a larger abstract speech community of English speakers whose practices and values were systematically proliferated through the education system. In these complex multi-layers of social domains, Shoji’s utterances in English were accepted, ignored and tolerated in the peer domain rather than corrected even when the others found problems in their interactions with Shoji. In other words, the table was a space for the five boys to collaboratively construct their linguistic environment where they respected each other’s background. None of the boys at the table
used what is called “foreigner talk” (Ferguson, 1975, 1981) which is a manner of talking with reduced rate of speech and simpler vocabulary and grammar found in many interactions between “native speaker” and non-proficient language learners. While Shoji was already comfortable in his position in the group after three years of his life in America, Schmidt (1983) reports similar comfort experienced by Wes, a Japanese immigrant to Hawai’i. While Wes did not receive formal instruction and thus he developed strategic competence to complement his lack of grammatical knowledge, Shoji also developed strategies to circumvent his linguistic problems to show his presence at his lunch table. Pointing out the complementary role of strategic competence to grammatical competence, Ellis (1994) argues that:

Learners like Wes who develop high levels of strategic competence may be able to communicate efficiently without much grammatical competence, and so may never experience the need to improve their output in order to make themselves understood. (p. 282)

Shoji already had some extent of grammatical competence in what he produced orally and his friends accepted Shoji as he was at the table, not as a beginner learner with low proficiency in English. He was not in great need of upgrading his grammatical competence to the levels of his local friends at the lunch table. The three American students as well as Manuel did not give any corrective feedback in response to Shoji’s English. Only did their communication breakdowns in their direct interactions provide Shoji with the opportunities to accommodate his L2 to the other’s norms in English. During the four months of observing his lunch table, I did not find a remarkable change in Shoji’s English. This absence of change is partly attributed to the relatively short
period of observation and largely to the time of this study in Shoji’s entire stay as well as to the domain of society under observation. Shoji had already been in America for three years and had developed enough skills to communicate with a limited range of peers. Unlike classroom teaching, the everyday conversations from his peers did not present Shoji with new linguistic knowledge.

Nevertheless, close analysis of Shoji’s interaction in the peer domain suggests subtle traces of L2 socialization. More importantly, L2 socialization was not a process in which Shoji merely learned from others. The analysis of interactions shows that Shoji as well as the other students confirmed that they were in the same speech community where each speaker’s images of society coincide. Shoji also actively pushed his knowledge and convention toward Manuel to convince him that Manuel’s conceptualization of the context was not appropriate. In the relationship between Shoji and the other boys, there were more occasions for the other boys to socialize Shoji into their contexts. This was usually subtly done through clarification requests rather than through exhibiting different attitudes toward Shoji by employing foreigner talk, recast, and other corrections.

Although the power gap between Shoji and the other students was very subtle, this does not deny the power gap between Shoji and the other students in determining the directions of socialization. There were power gaps between Shoji and the other students as seen in Shoji’s modifications but oftentimes the power gap was tactically concealed by Shoji. Shoji’s indirect talk with the American students had hid the power gap between him and the other students. He took part in the group conversation effectively through occasional laughter, attentive listening posture, and maintenance of bonds via Manuel. In appearance, it was the topics that kept Shoji away from verbally joining in group
conversations but in reality, the limitation in Shoji’s English proficiency shackled him from full participation in the group conversation. The power gap was revealed when Shoji and the others had communication breakdowns and when L2 socialization was present for Shoji through repair practices. However, it does not mean that Shoji was always socialized according to the norms of the others. With compromises from each of the members at the table, the students at the table were drawn out of their linguistic backgrounds and constructed instead their own space at the table with their own linguistic norms.

*Conclusion: Language ideology in lunchtime conversation*

The most basic assumption in the conversation at the lunch table was that Shoji had to use English during his peer conversations. It may seem to be out of the question when we take the situation into consideration, but, in the discussion about language ideology, it is important to note Shoji did not attempt to speak Japanese to force the others to understand him; Shoji kept being part of the group through English. Although he had an alternative not to mingle with his English-speaking peers and to sit alone as there was no other Japanese student in his lunch period, he did not choose to be away from English. Shoji invested in English learning by keeping contact with speakers of English. This is not to say that Shoji should have chosen to oppose using English but to point out that his attitudes make us see the insurmountable power gap between Japanese and English in this environment. While the notion of ethnolinguistic vitality is properly employed to analyze bilingual communities in Canada (Allard & Landry, 1994) and in Hawai’i (Kondo, 1998), the notion does not properly describe Shoji’s linguistic environment at lunchtime.
In the discussion of language ideology, being aware of this power gap is important. When I asked the boys at the table one day what characterized middle school students’ language, Manuel instantly answered with just one word, “English.” For many immigrant students in the U.S., speaking English is an important requirement to be part of the “American community” even though such an atmosphere is a historical consequence of the early half of the 20th century anti-immigrant sentiments (Auerbach, 1993; Pavlenko, 2004). Whereas there was an ideology that forced the immigrant students to use English through political dominance, there was also an egalitarian ideology among the middle school boys that loosely constructed the lunch table community. This can be depicted in the school’s efforts of integration and anti-bullying campaigns as seen in the posters in the hall.
Chapter 7: Discussion of study

The previous three chapters discussed the English language ecology of six Japanese middle school students studying in the United States, focusing on how the young L2 learners from Japan were socialized to use English. The three chapters of analysis largely correspond with Côté and Levine’s (2002) integrative model of identity wherein the separation of ego, personal, and social aspects explain the multiplicity and interdependency of learners’ identities. Following these social psychologists’ model, this study took a holistic approach to the young transnational learners’ L2 socialization and described how the Japanese families constructed the students’ L2 environments, what beliefs and values they had throughout their stays in America, and how one of the Japanese students used English with his English-speaking peers during lunchtime. In describing the students’ language ecology and their development in English, this study adopted Bronfenbrenner’s (1979, 2005) ecological model of development to understand each student’s microsystem as an environment that they constructed through their personal network and through access to physical objects around them. The microsystem was the most immediate layer of each student’s society whereas the macrosystem affected the values and beliefs the student developed through interactions with various agencies of socialization. Corresponding with Gidden’s (1989) agencies of socialization, this study found four domains in the Japanese students’ microsystems; namely, the home,
school, peer, and media domains. In terms of their identities as English speakers, the contradicting values of language in these domains interacted to construct multiple and contradictory identities in the students.

In this chapter, I will discuss the major findings in the previous chapters while integrating the three different perspectives of the chapters. There are three main findings in this study as follows:

1. English proficiency test in Japan constructed the Japanese students’ and parents’ imagined communities of English speakers.

2. The Japanese students’ communicative competence was not monolithic according to the multiple domains of their linguistic environment.

3. There were seven patterns of language socialization pertaining to the Japanese students’ language development.

In the following sections, this chapter discusses the three findings according to the theoretical framework of this study.

1. *English proficiency test in Japan constructed the Japanese students’ and parents’ imagined communities of English speakers.*

The expatriate students’ sociolinguistic reality was complex as they had contact with people with diverse range of background. However, proficiency tests connect their examinees by spreading ideas about their imagined communities of English speakers. Language learners prepare for a test, and while learning their target language they are exposed to the discourses of L1 speakers of English. The concept of an imagined community of English speakers is derived from Anderson’s (1991) imagined community, where national consciousnesses were developed with the advent of print capitalism that
produced the standardization of language. This study follows Anderson (1991) in conceptualizing imagined communities as “images of society” (Blommaert, 2007) that are constructed and disseminated through discourses which are exchanged through interaction with a variety of people and through institutional discourses as evident in proficiency tests such as Eiken. Proficiency tests make certain assumptions about English speakers by filtering out particular varieties of English, and test-takers are bound together by these assumptions, and form a community with this common understanding of English speakers. An imagined community of English speakers is thus ideological, and institutional authority plays important roles in its construction. The concept of an imagined community is applied to English speakers whereby the legitimacy of English speakers is constructed through discourses around language learners.

In measuring the legitimacy of English speakers, English proficiency tests are a vital source of discourses. These tests are designed based on an abstract, imagined community of English speakers where language is standardized and evaluated by its correctness in light of the standards. In this kind of measurement, language is essentially layered, and proficiency tests provide “scales” (Blommaert, 2007) where the tests’ vertical space exercises power on lower levels of sociolinguistic reality. Blommaert (2007) introduces the concept of the scale in his analysis of polycentric and stratified human social environments. He uses a vertical metaphor for the concept of scaling and a horizontal metaphor to explain the notions of “distribution,” “spread,” “community,” “culture,” etc.—spaces that are too often “dramatically distorted, simplified and twisted” (p. 3). These horizontal “spacetimes” are imagined entities and they are indexical so “a move from one scale-level to another invokes or indexes images of society, through
socially and culturally constructed (semiotized) metaphors and images of time and space” (p. 5, italics in original).

While proficiency tests in general have their imagined communities of English speakers, *Eiken*’s graded test also indexes English learners according to their grades (see Figure 10). As the grade becomes higher, the test’s assumption of English learners gets closer to ‘authentic’ English speakers. As the learners earn higher grades, they gain prestige in particular contexts, especially in academic admissions, and prestige increases as the passing rates decrease. Blommaert’s (2007) following argument suggests how Grade 1 and Pre-1 become cultural and symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1991) because their passing rates are 9% and 15%.

“Upscaled language varieties, in contrast, are varieties of entitlement, and enfranchisement in relation to the State’s sociolinguistic regime. They allow for the kind of exportability that we saw above, ties and roles—carrying validity and value across a wide range of contexts. Interestingly, such elite varieties, occupying high ranks in a vertical hierarchy of scales, often appear to be restricted varieties horizontally, with very limited groups having actually having access to them. The top of the pyramid is actually narrower than its base. (Blommaert, 2007, p. 12)
While sociolinguistic layers often force people to jump up and down the scale when they talk to people in different social statuses, this jumping probably does not occur in interactions between English learners who have achieved different grades. However, Grade 1 has stronger currency than Grade 2, and Grade 2 has stronger currency than Grade 3, where higher grades are unconditionally assigned higher values in academic admissions and other social contexts. When higher grades are available to a limited number of learners, those learners are endowed with more prestige than others, regardless of social necessity. Therefore Blommaert’s vertical and horizontal metaphors (see Figure 10) provide a convincing explanation of language ideology in proficiency tests.
For Japanese expatriate students who learn English in an English-dominant country, preparing for the *Eiken* test is an opportunity to learn about an ideology of English speakers sanctioned in Japan. Linguistic realities for the expatriate students and the “images of society” of English as constructed in English proficiency tests imported to America are not necessarily the same. The discrepancy between the two worlds often causes tension among returnees, as was the case Chisa described, where one of her friends did poorly on an English test at school in Japan. Although returnees’ experiences of contact with multiple language varieties can be assets, students who are in contact with only one filtered language variety may have a chance to develop more finely-tuned skills and might gain an advantage if a proficiency test is educationally designed specifically for the cultural context where the test is used.

Furthermore, this study also found that parents’ language ideologies were largely limited to ‘artifactual’ ideology, or ideas about English as a system, which was reflected in the proficiency test, whereas their children’s language ideologies were more extensive, and indexed particular speakers according to the use of particular features of English. The parents made investments in their children’s linguistic environment based on their beliefs that English would be beneficial, although they were also aware of their children’s struggles. In contrast, the students learned to use English in their daily lives. The English learned in daily life, including learning at school, did not necessarily correspond with the kind of English on the proficiency test in Japan.

2. *The Japanese students’ communicative competence was not monolithic but varied according to the domains of their linguistic environment.*
While a proficiency test measures learners’ proficiency in the target language, it does not mean that the learners can use the language as measured in all situations equally. In the Japanese expatriate middle school students’ L2 ecology, each domain of their microsystems had typical characteristics for language use. Both school and home were primarily literacy-driven domains, since textbooks played an important role in mediating the students’ English learning. The peer domain, in contrast, was mostly a conversational space, where formality of language was usually avoided. The media domain was a mixture of orality and literacy, as the students had access to a host of reading materials online, while YouTube and TV provided them audiovisual contents. Yet the media domain did not give the students opportunities for conversational interactions with others. Since the contemporary notion of communicative competence implies competence across a variety of contexts, it is not appropriate to assume that the L2 learners developed communicative competence holistically at one site. Lunchtime conversation among the boys required certain pragmatic knowledge; that is, in the context of their table, the students preferred to be bold and/or rude to be part of the group. Expressions such as excuse me or I beg your pardon, for example, were never used, nor was please for imperatives. Not using particular linguistic knowledge in a particular group is also pragmatic competence, and in this regard, the competence developed through interactions with their peers was different from the competence developed in other domains. Learning across different domains was also evident when Chisa’s Japanese bilingual aid metapragmatically taught the students through their L1 how to speak to local teachers in English, and when the students used what they had learned in classes in their daily lives. Although the students had different degrees of knowledge about how to appropriately use
English depending on the contexts, this was not a problem in the media domain where the students’ English was restricted to receptive skills. Depending on the domain, the required competence for the students differed. Ability in reading developed through proficiency tests did not necessarily indicate equivalent ability levels in other aspects of competence, which were likely to develop through direct social interaction.

Similar to communicative competence, a language embraces multiple elements. To investigate L2 development and L2 learners’ identities, Chapter 5 suggested that it was important to separate linguistic ideologies as worldviews learned through habitual practice, and the derivative ‘artifactual’ view of language ideologies as discursively constructed metapragmatic systems. The Japanese students developed their L2 identities based on linguistic features such as specific accents and grammar when they interacted with other speakers of English, but they also developed their L2 identities based on tests, which gave the students particular values according to the results and how the students saw the benefits of the tests. While the habitual uses of English in interaction with others in their daily lives gave them senses of what were appropriate, the talks over the language (e.g., necessity in school admission and employment; the values of tests in the future, etc.) also constructed the students’ identities as bilingual speakers in Japan.

As Heller (2007) points out, the studies on bilingualism have long conceptualized two languages merely as separate codes, and social psychological approaches to L2 studies also tend to focus on ‘artifactual’ language ideologies, without taking the complex internal systems of languages (cf. The “Five Graces Group”, 2009) into consideration. Whether it is English or Japanese, a language is intrinsically diverse in internal organization and representation as well as its uses such as multimodality and idiolects,
where L2 learners show complex and contradictory reactions toward the complex linguistic systems. Thus it is superficial to conduct a study that only looks at learners’ attitudes toward a language, which is a collection of subsystems, without focusing on internal complexities. When the expatriate students followed the rules of model adults, as well as rules specific to their own generation, learners experienced ideological tensions. In classrooms, the rules of model adults (i.e., teachers) outweighed the rules of students, but outside of school, the rules of middle school students outweighed the rules of model adults. At lunchtime, the students were in a mixed system of rules, half conscious of the formality of school while having fun under the rules of their peers. The students’ linguistic behaviors were affected by teachers moving around the cafeteria and a researcher recording their conversations who pushed “adult” rules into the community of middle school students.

3. There were seven patterns of language socialization pertaining to the Japanese students’ language development.

Language socialization is a lifelong process (Garrett & Baquedano-Lopéz, 2002; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). This also applies to the life of Japanese sojourners in the United States. Compared with other studies that assume linguistic authority in adult-child social distance, the relationship between same-age peers was more equal, and thus socialization was more subtle. Nevertheless, this study found a variety of patterns of L2 socialization in Shoji’s interactions with his peers, and in the lives of the other Japanese students’ in America as well as in the lives of their parents.

(1) Being socialized into others’ speech community with different norms
This pattern is most commonly discussed in L2 socialization literature, and all six of the Japanese students in this study were socialized to use English differently in the four domains of their microsystems. L2 socialization was realized through (a) direct interaction in English with non-Japanese peers and teachers; (b) metalinguistic guidance in the imagined community of English speakers received from Japanese and experienced students with international backgrounds; and (c) observation of others using English including mass media. In these three methods of L2 learning, learners’ points of views vary. In direct interaction, a learner is directly involved in interaction. In metalinguistic guidance, the learner and the guide are both situated outside an imagined community of English speakers. And in observation of others, the learner is outside the imagined community of English speakers while the observed is within the community.

Taking these varied viewpoints into consideration, these three ways also correspond with Fairclough’s (1992) conceptualization of a three dimensional framework of discourse, namely, discourse-as-text, discourse-as-discursive-practice, and discourse-as-social-practice (Figure 11). Firstly, corresponding to discourse-as-text—i.e., “the linguistic features and organization of concrete instances of discourse” (Blommaert, 2000, p. 448)—implicit cues of non-understanding and inappropriateness in everyday interaction with other speakers led the students to be socialized into the other’s speech community. While their utterances were linguistically oriented, the learners imitated the other speakers and reused the utterances on other occasions.

Secondly, through discourse-as-discursive-practice—i.e., “discourse as something that is produced, circulated, [and] consumed in society” (ibid, p. 448)—the students were in contact with explicit explanations about how language was to be used in classrooms
and elsewhere. Whether it is direct quotation of someone else or implicit intertextual representation, discourse about language and speech communities is circulated to construct an imagined community for learners. Finally, discourse-as-social-practice where discourse is a feature within “ideological effects and hegemonic processes” (ibid, p. 449) explains that the students learn how to use language when they observed other speakers in a variety of situations whether at school or on TV. The boys in this study learned to avoid cussing in front of teachers by observing other students punished for cussing and Ryu was also aware of the social meaning of cussing from R/PG-rated movies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoints</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse-as-text</td>
<td>- Ryu’s learning from tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Peer conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse-as-discursive-practice</td>
<td>- ESL instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Textbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bilingual aide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Earlier arrivals’ guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse-as-social-practice</td>
<td>- Observation of students who cussed and punished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- R/PG-rated movies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10 Three ways of learning “other’s” language in imagined speech communities
While the three-dimensional framework of discourse in L2 socialization explains learners’ viewpoints in second language learning and the roles of discourses in L2 socialization, the following patterns (2)-(5) are also relevant to the framework.

(2) Confirmation of being in the same speech community with others

Talk between people is a constant and implicit attempt to confirm that they are in the same speech community. When people speak to one another, they may assume that both the speaker and the listener are in the same speech community, but in reality two speakers can never be in perfectly identical speech communities, and when there is miscommunication, each side negotiates the conversation to construct their space in which both are able to achieve a common understanding. The act of cussing, for example, indexed a variety of contradictory values depending on the contexts, and each individual had contradicting values about particular words. Shoji’s pointing out Manuel’s absence of cussing (i.e., discourse-as-discursive-practice) in the audio-recorded conversations was an example of negotiations of the social norms that allowed or inhibited the act. This negotiation aimed to close the gap between the two students’ imagined communities of English speakers, and it took a while for Manuel to adopt Shoji’s social values with regard to cussing. The conversation among the students went smoothly unless there were discrepancies in their assumptions of language use (i.e., discourse-as-text), and thus exchanging utterances served as mutual confirmation that they were in the same speech community. In subtle manifestation such as these, language socialization at the level of ideology can be seen to be a continual negotiation between speakers.

(3) Socializing others according to their own norms
Once an outsider, a researcher, came into the context of lunchtime peer conversation, the presence of an adult created a new and different context for each participant. Shoji tried to pull Manuel into his framework where the adult researcher was an equal to his peers and did not have a disciplining role over language use. Based on his understanding that cussing would not cause a problem, Shoji subtly insisted on the acceptability of cussing in the audio-recorded situation (i.e., discourse-as-discursive-practice). After learning English for three years, Shoji identified himself as having some authority over language use in that specific context.

(4) Socializing newcomers in others’ norms

The “socializing” role, as opposed to the “socialized” role, is not a position that is only assumed by advanced learners. Beginners also try to socialize others into their imagined speech community with what they believe to be correct. Even beginner EFL students challenge others’ knowledge by citing their teacher from a previous class. However, it will depend on a variety of factors whether or not other learners will trust the beginner’s claim and change their behaviors as directed.

The Japanese students in the American schools metalinguistically taught other newcomers about English (i.e., discourse-as-discursive-practice) and worked as a bridge between the newcomers and the imagined community of English speakers at school. While this is similar to the previous pattern, it also differs in that the Japanese students identified themselves being at the periphery of a speech community, whereas the previous pattern presupposes their ownership of the language. How the students explained their attitudes toward English in the interviews was an example of their socializing the researcher into what they knew about the community of English speakers.
to which they partly belonged. Those who took care of other international students also socialized them from a peripheral position, acting as a bridge between newcomers and the L2 community. The ability to use Japanese to learn English differentiates L2 socialization for the young expatriate students from L1 socialization for infants.

(5) Resisting socialization

When a group of speakers often uses particular features of language, an L2 learner does not necessarily use the same features, and the reasons may be linguistic or ideological. On the one hand, a learner would not use a particular feature of another speaker’s language if he or she did not notice it. On the other hand, particular features may be ideologically problematic for the learner, and he or she may resist to using them. While this study could only surmise the reasons for Shoji’s not using would as a lack of linguistic knowledge, Daisuke’s avoidance of the word bitch in his assignment and Shoji’s not using personal names in peer conversation seem to be the cases of ideological resistance (i.e., mismatches in discourses-as-social-practice). Whether resistance is attributed to ideological or linguistic reasons (cf. Lightbown & Spada, 1994; Odlin, 1989; White, Spada, Lightbown, & Ranta, 1991), such resistance should be included in the L2 socialization process if a study intends to provide a complete picture. Particularly, if L2 socialization is considered in the context of classroom teaching, determining students’ reasons for resistance will be helpful for teachers so that the teachers can intervene effectively and appropriately with their students’ learning.

(6) Lack of socialization due to rejection from the society

In contrast to resistance to being socialized into the other speaker’s world, the other speaker can also reject particular individuals and prevent them from becoming part
of their social network (Duff, 2007). Although this study found episodes of Japanese students’ distancing themselves from particular groups of people, it did not reveal any episode where students were rejected—except for disappearing social connections with peers. This may imply that the students did not receive (or remember) any hostile reactions from others; however, being rejected and self-distancing are not totally separated. Social categories such as girl and boy, teacher and student, middle school students and elementary school students, etc., often divide people into different groups and maintain their linguistic practices (Eckert, 2000; Farr, 2006; Willet, 1995). Just as people’s ego identities play an important role in their self-distancing from particular groups of speakers, rejection also involve mismatches of identities. As the friendly interaction between Chisa and his teacher indicates, the meanings of social categories such as teacher and student depend on individuals as well as contexts. In a sense, being in a social category, not necessarily the ones that are conspicuous with Japanese students, can become a ground for rejecting particular speakers to becoming part of one’s network.

(7) L2 socialization as agentive construction of L2 ecology

Finally, L2 socialization should be regarded as an agentive construction of one’s linguistic ecology in his or her L2. While many studies view “society” for language socialization as something already existing for learners, individual learners actually construct their L2 ecologies. For the Japanese students in this study, parents had limited control over the selection of the initial environment and the students developed their L2 ecologies according to varying personal and material conditions. In this view, learners actively choose and construct their language ecologies where an individual resides in multiple speech communities on multiple levels with different linguistic practices and
values. The assumption of closed community is problematic in the view of language ecology of contemporary transnational learners of English where the entirety of the learners’ experiences forms their worlds.

The seven patterns of L2 socialization (including non-socialization) were derived from the Japanese expatriate students’ experiences and development in English. In line with the complexity of L2 socialization as suggested by Larsen-Freeman (2002) and Larsen-Freeman and Cameron (2008), the Japanese expatriate students in America provided complex understandings for an L2 socialization approach. The following section further discusses this complexity by focusing on chronological aspect of language ecology.

**Complexity in L2 socialization and language ideology**

As in Bronfenbrenner’s (2005) chronosystem, when a chronological perspective is taken into consideration, the complexity of linguistic ecology makes more sense if it is seen as similar to an organism. Not only were the four domains connected and overlapping with each other, the domains changed shape as the focus of the learners’ lives changed. For instance, sports and after-school activities were seasonal. When the activity-driven peer domain was high, the home and media domains were necessarily low due to time constraints. The school domain’s role diminished during the summer holidays, and all the domains took a temporary break when the students went back to Japan where they had little access to English. However, having few opportunities to use English does not mean that learning Japanese has no contribution to the development of their English as I discussed with regard to loanwords, which calls investigating only “L2” ecology into
question. The linguistic ecology for the Japanese middle school students in this study was thus amorphous.

Despite the amorphousness, individuals act like objects in Newton’s law of gravity. A small stone appears to fall on earth because of the planet’s gigantic gravitational pull. But as the object in question gets larger, it exerts its own gravitational pull on the earth, as is the case with ocean tides that are caused by the gravity of the moon. Textbooks and American schools exerted a large influence on the young second language learners from Japan; however, ideologies across different domains was often in conflict as Daisuke’s evaluations on his correspondence material from Japan conflicted with his local school experiences. In terms of “correctness,” the local children had less authority over their language than the adults who taught at school. Though the children have less authority, they can construct networks with more equal influence with one another if they are able to form a close group. But it takes something more than language to be part of a group of local peers. Furthermore, as the local students grew older they gained the authority of adults and the power gap between them and the L2 learners become larger. The Japanese students developed their English skills in relation to their local peers, who were also going through the same process of developing their authority over language, and L2 socialization must pay attention to the changing power balances among the students.

As Blommaert’s (2007) vertical metaphor of a scale suggests, authority in language is hierarchical. And, in the horizontal axis, there are indexical, imagined communities of English speakers where speakers of the language and language varieties jump up and down the scale increasing or decreasing their power in relation to other
speakers. As for the Japanese expatriate students in this study, their imagined communities of English speakers were created throughout their history of learning and using English in complex interactions with a variety of speakers and linguistic materials. In Shoji’s self-repair in peer interactions we can see the emergence of Shoji’s imagined community of English speakers where the imagined community’s authority was internalized throughout his learning history on a variety of occasions. In that the authority is internalized, Shoji’s modified utterances were “double-voiced” (Bakhtin, 1963/1994) and, in his mind, he jumped up the vertical scale to the same level as an imagined community of English speakers.

Imagined communities are ideological and give order to learners’ complex spacetime of L2 socialization. This ideological construction of order is equivalent to the concept of the “attractor” in Larsen-Freeman and Cameron’s (2008) application of complex adaptive systems theory to applied linguistics. Because “an attractor is a region of a system’s state space into which the system tends to move” (p. 50), second language learners, as well as first language learners, are “attracted” to the ideologically constructed imagined space that they can explain the dimensions of. The space changes its shape by modification and mutual confirmation through negotiations in interaction because the space is not only constructed individually, but also is shared socially. The degree of modification is probably smaller for more experienced learners with more (imagined) authority than beginners, as Shoji showed only subtle changes in his peer interactions.
Chapter 8: Conclusion

Based on an ecological systemic perspective, this study has looked at the lives of Japanese expatriate middle school students in the United States. Though there were differences among the six students, they led more or less similar lives during their stays. Their selections of opportunities for linguistic contact were largely related to their expectations for the future. At the same time, all the families did not have equal access to linguistic resources because available information worked as an important guide for the selection of and access to linguistic resources. The parents chose the educational settings for their children according to their beliefs and values, and the Japanese children were socialized to use L2 English while they lived in the L2 environment. However, they were also socialized through more experienced students’ guides mediated by L1 Japanese. In addition to two languages, two ideological systems of English in the U.S. and in Japan guided different paths through L2 socialization. While L1 played an important role in constructing “artifactual” views of English for the future, L2 played a role in developing worldviews through habitual practices via interactions with other English speakers.

This study employed two lenses (i.e., ideology and identity) to see how the students were socialized to use English and how their contact with English helped to construct their microsystems. The different lenses helped me see L2 socialization on different layers, much in the way that different lenses give astronomers different views of
the universe and show biologists different pictures of life. Figure 9 represents the
Japanese expatriate students’ L2 ecology where dotted circles show the boundaries of
domains of the students’ microsystems. Methodologically, this study was necessarily
limited to the microsystem and macrosystem, and it does not encompass the whole
society, which also contains the meso- and exosystems. While discussing the students’ L2
ecology in their microsystems, chapter 4 described the grounds of L2 socialization for the
Japanese middle school students studying abroad. Chapter 5 explored the students’
language ideologies, showing the students’ views of themselves as learners of English,
which at times drove the students to language learning and use while at times they held
them back. Chapter 6 examined Shoji’s interactions with others to provide a look at the
space where individual engagements with the group constructed a social network.
As discussed in chapter 4, the six Japanese middle school students had different L2 ecologies in their microsystems. The Japanese students’ individual networks of English speakers varied depending on initial parental investment, school demography, personal preferences and luck. Their physical environments were also individually diverse and affected by the students’ preferences and by other social demands. Despite the individual differences, this study still found that there were four broad domains in the students’ microsystems where different agencies of socialization played their roles. While the students had different degrees of access to English in the home, school, peer, and
media domains, the quality of English also varied as each student was surrounded by different people and materials.

The Japanese middle school students learned English in America because of their parents’ involvement in the Japanese manufacturing industry that valued global business opportunities. While the parents took their children together abroad, they also considered that their children were learning English not only to use while they stayed in America but also to use while living in Japan, where English is usually seen as an educational requirement. The parents’ investments in their children’s linguistic environments were realized through access to information that enabled the parents to picture their children’s future in the host country as well as their future back in Japan. Although the students could not change the linguistic framework of their schools by themselves, to some extent their parents could select the environment prior to their arrival even if the information available was limited. Nonetheless, the parents’ access to information was also dependent on their personal network and within the limitations of their companies. Not all the parents were able to set up the linguistic environments that satisfied them.

The nature of parental ‘investment’ in the environment in this study was different from Norton’s (1995) original concept of investment in contrast to motivation; however, parental investment did constitute an important part of L2 development for the young Japanese expatriate students. The parents’ view of their children’s future was not derived from their own experiences in the past, and thus their parental authority was absent with regard to the students’ L2 socialization, especially after the students had stayed in the host country for several years. The students had to learn by themselves what to say and what not to say when using English outside the home. Their determination to learn
English by themselves—i.e., not from their parents—was clear in their value judgments and rejection of their parents, such as Ryu’s criticism of his mother for letting his little brother watch *South Park*, and Daisuke’s ignoring his father’s suggestion that he could use the word *bitch* in his homework.

Among the four domains in the students’ microsystem, the largest domain was no doubt the school, where the Japanese students were engaged in various activities in the modern American education system, and had contact with other English speakers. While the students were in the social structure of teachers vs. students and of age-based peer groups, they also perceived more nuanced structures amongst the peers. Shoji described the peer structure with the word *level*; Ryu separated himself from *good* kids; and the other Japanese students at Dartmouth kept distance from “Ame-jin” or white Americans while they maintained closer relationships with students with Asian backgrounds. In other words, the Japanese students’ ego identity made them keep their distance from particular people. Daisuke’s dislike of noisy students drove him to talk no more than necessary to the group next to his own. Initially, Noriko’s gender identity inhibited her from seeking help from more experienced students. Ryu’s negative self-image kept him away from his teachers. Shoji kept his distance from higher *level* students with “auras.”

Despite these distances from some students, the Japanese students constructed, maintained, and reconstructed their social networks during their stay.

The social network in the peer domain overlapped with the school domain. Some students maintained their friendships at school from the earlier in their stays, and extended their sphere of interaction beyond schools. Although Minoura (2003) views such peer relationships as an essential factor for Japanese expatriate children’s
development in L2 meaning systems, ‘hanging around with buddies’ as Ryu did was not very common among the sojourners in this study. Although this study did not aim to investigate the relationship between age and L2 development, Minoura’s position that early arrivals have denser peer relationships with the locals explains Ryu’s comfort in English and strong bonding with his local peers. However, it is also important to take into consideration his negative experiences with his Japanese peers prior to his arrival in America, and his mother’s influence over his linguistic environment, which distanced him from the other Japanese students. Allegiance to the L1 and Japanese community was much smaller for Ryu and his mother prior to their arrival, and this ideological element also needs to be considered when understanding Ryu’s L2 development in his relatively denser L2 peer network.

The Japanese students’ L2 ecology in the home domain was driven by their future prospects. This domain was an artificial-Japanese world where the students experienced the Japanese education system while in America. In this context, the opportunities to use English for communication were limited for the students, since the students mostly used Japanese to communicate with each other in the home domain. English occasionally appeared in the form of textbooks and media entertainment when no American or other non-Japanese people were present in the home; however, the production of English was mostly limited to brief exchanges of words and expressions in conversations with Japanese friends and siblings.

The home domain overlapped with the school domain in that both contained a literacy-driven L2 ecology. While the students were in American schools, the Japanese families also used limited subsidies—if available—from their companies to pay for
Saturday school and tutors. In the earlier part of their stays, tutors helped the Japanese children adapt to American society. But as their returns drew nearer, the parents grew concerned with the students’ lives back in Japan and preparations for English proficiency tests became one of the main English-related activities in the home domain. The parents’ belief that English would be important when the students were back in Japan convinced the children to study for the tests, and the children learned English beyond what they had learned in America by preparing for the tests, which are based on an abstract, imagined community of English speakers.

Activities in the home, school, and peer domains were often mediated by access to a variety of types of mass media, such as the Internet, TV, and DVDs. The students preferred diverse media whereas school projects often demanded the students use the Internet at home. When the students did not have school projects, the media activities were dictated by the students’ preferences, and thus, the activities were both in English and Japanese depending on availability. Internet-based activities with Facebook and email helped the Japanese students to maintain their bonds with others whether they were Japanese, or local and international peers. Unlike the Chinese expatriate teenagers in Lam’s (2000, 2004) study, who constructed online global bonds with Chinese speakers in other parts of the world, the middle school students in this study used the Internet primarily to maintain local bonds rather than participating in global online ‘talk.’ Text messaging through cell phones was the most convenient tool for local bonding, provided that the parents let their children use cell phones.

Just as there were two codes in the analysis of language (i.e., Japanese vs. English) in the Japanese students’ L2 socialization, other aspects also had multiple levels
of analysis. This study has covered linguistic elements (e.g., phonetic, morpho-syntactic, pragmatic), identity (i.e., ego, personal, social), ideology (i.e., language ideology pertaining to particular features vs. ‘artifactual’ views of language), social domains (i.e., home, school, peer, media) and time (i.e., past, present, future). These aspects with multiple levels contain even more complex elements within them, and the view of these complexities in L2 development leads to the idea that L2 teaching is more of an intervention in the dynamic organism of language ecology, just as L2 learning is part of human development. The ecological perspective of L2 socialization is a holistic view of L2 learners in all contexts that involve language.

*Implication of the study*

Through the exploration of L2 development among Japanese expatriate students abroad, this study has provided a look at how L2 learning is situated in a complex ecology that contains a variety of language ideologies and individual identities. This view can and should also be applied to EFL contexts. As Duff (1995) demonstrates in her study of an EFL classroom in Hungary, classroom learning is sociohistorically conditioned, and laden with ideologies of language and learning. The contrast between Japanese students studying English in Japan and the Japanese expatriate students will help develop our understanding of English language ideologies and learning in Japan. As Taron and Swain (1995) point out in their study of adolescent students in an immersion program, sociolinguistic identities are an important factor for adolescent language learners, and this study suggested the importance of considering specific linguistic features—in addition to a particular second language as a whole—that drive learners to learn another language in ideologically complex societies.
While this study focused on Japanese adolescent students, its emphasis on language ecology and language ideology has several implications for second language instruction. First of all, understanding the linguistic environments of the students as well as their values and beliefs, will help teachers provide effective instruction because teachers can employ linguistic resources outside of their own classrooms. Understanding the students’ out-of-class linguistic environments will help the teachers provide effective scaffoldings to their students, and the teachers can intervene in the students’ environment by providing appropriate linguistic resources. Second of all, it is important to consider the values of language developed in the classroom and those outside the classroom separately. Even though some students learn their target language dramatically in a teacher’s class, it does not necessarily mean the class is purposefully designed to be successful, as it could simply be that the teacher is lucky to be teaching the students whose linguistic ecology happens to be similar to his or her instructional goals. On the other hand, when the students lack motivation, this may not necessarily be the teachers’ fault, though the teachers are generally expected to get the students to learn regardless of their environment outside of school. This study points to the significance of determining the reasons for ideological cacophony through investigating students’ complex language ecology, including the classroom and multifaceted values imposed by the school. While a child may learn xenophobic, ethnocentric attitudes from their parents, for example, and this can hinder their learning of another language, an ecological view suggests that there are interdependent influences— inherent with conflicts between different authorities—on children’s language development whose “problems” can be solved through holistic
approaches that involve children, parents, teachers, and other agencies who are indirectly committed to the children’s development.

**Limitations of the study**

As a Japanese researcher who came into contact with the Japanese middle school students, I faced several limitations when conducting this study. First of all, as explained in chapter 3, I could not follow the students everywhere and directly observe them during their entire stay. This forced me rely on the students’ subjective descriptions of their own linguistic ecology, which might not necessarily match what I would have observed if I had able to view their use of language directly. Also, even though I followed Shoji at school, because I was an adult and attached to Shoji, I did not have access to all the students in his school; for example the popular, inaccessible students whom Shoji described as *high level*. If I had started by investigating the social structure and practices of a school (cf. Eckert, 2000), I might have had access to all the peers around specific participants. In this respect, the methodology this study adopted was not suitable for the description of a school as a space of sociocultural practices. Furthermore, this study has described L2 microsystems from the eyes of Japanese expatriate students, and it was doubly subjective in that I took in the subjective viewpoints of each students as well as my own viewpoint as a researcher, a former teacher in Japan and at a Saturday school, a graduate student, and an adult male. My proximity to the participants allowed me to share some of my views with the participants but, at the same time, it may not have enabled me to see particular ideological views which would have been obvious to others.

Second of all, observer’s paradox (Labov, 1971; Davis, 2001) is unavoidable in ethnographic studies since the researcher is in close contact with the target group and
affected by how they live with their cultural practices. In classical studies of language socialization, however, sociocultural practices of the target groups are generally assumed to be stable as it would be easy for insiders to notice changes brought about by researchers’ interventions. In other words, the researchers in those studies start to participate at the periphery of a relatively stable community of practice and as time passes, they develop to be fuller members by sharing the worldviews in the community. While the researchers are at the periphery, their influence would initially be minimal in the face of the greater authority of the value holders of the community. This study was partly successful in this respect. Although my influence was evident as seen in my failed attempt to sit with the middle school students at the lunch table and their covering the microphones at the beginning of observation, my presence at the periphery was at least naturalized as the students became used to being observed.

In contrast, this study also focused on middle school expatriate students’ L2 learning practices during their stay in America, which required the researcher’s sensitivity with the students’ transformation in unstable environments. My background as a researcher in higher education and a Japanese graduate student learning in America would have had a great influence in the lives of the middle school students and their parents if the participants had been studied since the beginning of their stay in America. Their consciousness of being under study would probably have made them, especially the parents, think more about English and their children’s learning than they otherwise did not. A simple question such as “What opportunities do you have to learn English?” could have sensitized—and actually did sensitize Daisuke’s mother—the interviewees who were under the influence of an ideology that views English as a prestige language and
would have driven them to seek out for more opportunities to make themselves look better in the following interviews.

Lastly, this study did not put an emphasis on the Japanese language because I was interested in the students’ use of English. However, the boundaries between Japanese and English are often unclear and it is not hard to imagine that the middle school students used some of their prior knowledge of English loanwords to communicate with others in English (cf. Daulton, 1998). Thus the available information from the interviews was necessarily limited because of their limited cognitive awareness of their language use, which is caused by their language ideologies (Silverstein, 1979). For instance, when Yasushi showed me a music clip of a Japanese pop group, he did not regard the English loanwords in the Japanese songs as English. Because of this vagueness of linguistic boundary, this study’s approach to the middle school students’ linguistic environment probably dismissed areas where the students considered as the Japanese language rather than English.

Directions for future study

In contrast to the tradition of reductionism in the field of SLA, this study has pursued ethnographic holism. As Larsen-Freeman (1997) introduced chaos/complexity theory which developed into complex adaptive systems in approaching L2 learning (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008; The “Five Graces Group”, 2009), the complexity was clear in this study with adaptiveness of language ideology and identity as investigating lenses, but the study was also limited in its scope and contexts. One future direction of this study is to pursue the complexity of L2 socialization in other contexts, especially in EFL sites in Japan where textbooks and other language learning materials
maintain the dominant language ideologies of the United States. Whereas ‘artifactual’ views of language have become the backbone of language education policies in Japan, learners have their own views and values toward languages as a whole and begin to form their own ideologies toward particular features of the language. To investigate how such views are produced, conveyed, supported and negated in the learners’ complex system of language ecology, it would be important to understand how those views affect their language learning in dynamic interactions with others in particular social contexts. Understanding learners’ transformation in contact with particular language ideologies will enable teachers and instructors to provide effective intervention in language learning as well as to manage their ethical concerns during their intervention.
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### Appendix A: Transcription notation (adopted from Gumperz & Berenz, 1993)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>//</td>
<td>Final fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>Slight final fall indicating temporary closure (e.g., more can be said on the topic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Final rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>Slight rise as listing intonation (e.g., more is expected)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Truncation (e.g., what ti- what time is it/)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_</td>
<td>Level ending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..</td>
<td>Pauses of less than .5 second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>Pauses greater than .5 second (unless precisely timed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2&gt;</td>
<td>Precise units of time (= 2 second pause)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>To indicate overlap and latching of speakers’ utterances: spacing and single = before and after the appropriate portions of the text to indicate overlap; turn-initial double = to indicate latching of the utterance to the preceding one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>::</td>
<td>Lengthened segments (e.g., wha::t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~</td>
<td>Fluctuating intonation over one word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Accent; normal prominence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Extra prominence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{[ ]}</td>
<td>Nonlexical phenomena, both vocal and nonvocal, that overlay the lexical stretch (e.g., {[lo] text/})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Nonlexical phenomena, both vocal and nonvocal, that interrupt the lexical stretch (e.g., text [laugh] text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Unintelligible speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di(d)</td>
<td>A good guess at an unclear segment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(did)</td>
<td>A good guess at an unclear word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xxx)</td>
<td>Unclear word for which a good guess can be made as to how many syllables were uttered, with each x equal to one syllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># #</td>
<td>Use cross-hatches when extratextual information needs to be included within the text (e.g., R: did you ask M #surname# to come?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Interview questions for Japanese middle school students

A. Background information

- When did you come to the US? （いつアメリカに来ましたか）

- Why did you come to the US? （どうしてアメリカに来たのか教えてください）

- When do you and your family plan to go back to Japan? （いつ家族と一緒に日本に帰る予定ですか）

- How often do you go back to Japan and how long do you stay there? （どのくらいよく日本に帰りますか。どのくらい日本にいますか）

- Why do you live in this area? （この辺りに住んでいる理由を教えてください）

B. About school life in the United States

- How do you like your school? （学校はどうですか、好きですか）

- Please describe your typical days when you have school. （学校がある日の普通の一日がどのようなものか教えてください）

- With whom do you have conversation outside home in your typical days? In what situation? In what language? （普通の日に、家の外で誰と話をしますか。どのような状況ですか。何語で話しますか）

- How important is lunchtime conversation for you as a conversational opportunity? （ランチの時の会話は、あなたが会話をする機会の中でどれくらい大切ですか）

- How did you meet the students who you talk with at lunchtime? （昼食時に話をする人たちとはどのようにして出会いましたか）
- What is your school like?
(○○君、さんの学校はどのような学校ですか)

C. About English learning
- How have you learned English?
(○○君、さんはどうやって英語を学びましたか)

- What do you do to learn English now?
(今何をして英語を学んでいますか)

- When do you think you are learning English?
(○○君、さんが英語を学んでいると思うときはどんなときですか)

- How important is English in your life?
(英語は○○君、さんの生活の中でどれくらい大切ですか)

- How important will English be in your future?
(英語は○○君、さんの将来でどれくらい大切ですか)

- How and how often do you use the Internet
(インターネットをどのように、どれくらい使っていますか)
Appendix C: Weekly interview questions for Japanese middle school students

- Please describe what the last week was like in learning English.
  （英語を学ぶことについて、先週がどのような週だったか話してください）

- How were the classes?
  （授業はどうでしたか）

- How were the interactions with your friends?
  （友達との付き合いはどうでしたか）

- How often did you interact with people in English?
  （他の人とどれくらいよく英語で話しましょうか）

- Who were those that you interacted with?
  （話をした人たちは誰ですか）

- When did you interact with them?
  （いつ話をしましたか）

- What was the quality of the interaction?
  （話の仕方はどのようなものでしたか）

- How about other learning situations, such as reading, writing, watching TV etc.?
  （読書やものを書いたり、テレビを見るようなところで、学ぶようなことはありましたか）
Appendix D: Interview questions for non-Japanese students

- How did you know the Japanese student?
- Were you born in the US? If not, how long have you been in the U.S.?
- What languages do you speak?
- What do you think about non-American students’ English?
- Do you do something special for non-American students?
Appendix E: Interview questions for the parents of Japanese students

- When did your family come to the US?
  (アメリカに家族でいらしたのはいつですか)

- Why did your family come to the US?
  (アメリカにいらしたのはなぜですか)

- When do you plan to go back to Japan?
  (いつ日本にお帰りになる予定ですか)

- How often do you go back to Japan and how long do you stay there?
  (日本にどれくらいの頻度で帰国なさいますか。どれくらい日本にいらっしゃいますか)

- Why do you live in this area?
  (この辺りにお住まいになっていらっしゃる理由をお聞かせください)

- What do you like living in the US?
  (アメリカでの生活でお好きなことは何ですか)

- What do you think about your child’s education?
  (お子さんの教育についてどのようにお考えですか)

- What do you think about your child’s language ability?
  (お子さんの言葉の力についてどのようにお考えですか)

- What do you think about English language in Japanese society?
  (日本の社会での英語についてどのようにお考えですか)
Appendix F: A sample of the Grade 2 *Eiken* test
(1)  
A: The company’s sales haven’t risen much since last year. I think we’d better try a different _______ to advertising our products.
B: I agree. Maybe we should change the advertising agency we’re using.
   1 figure    2 escape    3 desire    4 approach

(2)  
A: What kind of books do you like, David?
B: Well, _______ I read nonfiction, but sometimes I like to read a novel.
   1 kindly    2 similarly    3 considerably    4 generally

(3)  
The meeting between the two leaders was widely reported in the _______. Photographs of them shaking hands were on the front page of most major newspapers.
   1 resource    2 press    3 economy    4 factor

(4)  
After taking care of the lion for two months while it was sick, the zoo decided to _______ it back into the wild.
   1 eliminate    2 qualify    3 solve    4 release

(5)  
The scientists said that the dinosaur bones they had discovered were _______. They said the bones seemed to belong to a previously unknown kind of dinosaur.
   1 costly    2 vacant    3 unique    4 harmful

(6)  
Brenda asked the salesman if he could _______ the price of the car. Eventually, he agreed to reduce it by 5 percent.
   1 stretch    2 bet    3 lower    4 trick

(7)  
Jack is worried about his big wrestling match tomorrow because his _______ is the top wrestler in the state.
   1 opponent    2 companion    3 technician    4 developer

(8)  
When Justin agreed to _______ the database project, he never guessed that it would take over three years to complete.
   1 endanger    2 undertake    3 annoy    4 reflect

(9)  
A: Our new computer has many more _______ than our old one did.
B: Yeah. I don’t know how to use most of them, so I’m going to have to read the instruction manual.
   1 features    2 sensations    3 instincts    4 contacts

(10)  
The government announced that it had _______ a new policy to help the homeless. The policy took several months to prepare, but now it is ready to be introduced.
   1 formulated    2 adored    3 consumed    4 disturbed
A: Do you think I should invite Sam to my party?
B: It's (down for) you. It's your birthday party, not mine.
1 down for 2 up to 3 out on 4 over by

(12) The boss called his employees into his office one at a (mode) time so that he could discuss their recent work with them.
1 mode 2 time 3 stock 4 choice

(13) A: Simon and his brother really look alike, don't they?
B: Well, they look very similar (at a distance). But when you see them closer, their faces are actually quite different.
1 for a change 2 out of shape 3 at a distance 4 by the way

(14) A: Can I talk to you (in private)? It's about the surprise party for Tiffany. I don't want her to hear us.
B: Sure. Let's go over there.
1 in private 2 on duty 3 above all 4 for instance

(15) A: The office has been really quiet since Jordan left for vacation, hasn't it?
B: Yes. I don't want to (throw) ill of him, but it's actually much easier to work when he's not here.
1 throw 2 cause 3 speak 4 defend

(16) When Dan got home, he found that a thief had (broken into) his apartment. The thief had taken his computer and all his DVDs.
1 stood by 2 switched off 3 graduated from 4 broken into

(17) A: Marcia, do you have drama practice before the school play tomorrow night?
B: Yeah, Mom. We're going to run (across) the play one last time to make sure we're ready.
1 across 2 through 3 past 4 onto

(18) Because Cindy is a college student, she doesn't have much money to spend. She doesn't worry, though, because if she needed money, her father (would give) her some.
1 would give 2 had given 3 is giving 4 gives

(19) Brad is training hard for a marathon. (Even if) he doesn't feel like it, he gets up early every day to train.
1 Now that 2 Even if 3 Ever since 4 As though

(20) The rules of the English speech contest say that participants should speak for (many more) than three minutes. Anyone who talks longer will lose points.
1 many more 2 so much 3 no more 4 not much
(21) After Linda got on the airplane, there was a small problem with the engine. As a result, ( ) while the engine was checked. Then, the airplane was finally ready to leave.

1 to  
2 wait for  
3 made  
4 everyone was  
5 30 minutes

(22) A: Gina, I need to talk to Mr. Lee. Do you know when his meeting is going to finish?
B: No. His meetings often take a long time. ( ) he'll be done.

1 is  
2 there  
3 knowing  
4 no  
5 when

(23) When Susan quit the company, the manager asked Jack to ( ) responsibilities while they looked for someone else.

1 over  
2 all  
3 her  
4 take  
5 of

(24) A: Who do you think will win Saturday's bicycle race?
B: Oh, definitely Becky. ( ) she is. She easily won the last three races.

1 faster  
2 is  
3 than  
4 student  
5 no other

(25) Rachel was very upset because her husband forgot about their wedding anniversary. But he ( ) by taking her out to a nice restaurant for dinner.

1 mistake  
2 his  
3 made  
4 for  
5 up
Keeping French “French”

For some time now, English has established itself as the most commonly used language in the world. Whether for business, science, or international politics, people from around the world are increasingly using English to communicate with one another. Indeed, according to the British government, at least one quarter of the world’s population now regularly uses the language. One result has been that more and more English words are entering other languages. Some countries (26) this addition to their vocabulary. This is because people in these countries regard English words as attractive or even fashionable. Others, however, take a less positive view.

One country that has tried hard to protect its language from English influence is France. In fact, France has an organization known as the Académie Française, whose main task is to keep the language (27). One way they try to do this is by promoting French versions of modern English words. For example, they recommend using the word logiciel for “software” and courriel for “e-mail.” France also has laws that limit the use of English in government documents, in advertisements, and in the workplace.

People in France seem to have a (28) attitude toward these efforts. A majority say they support the government’s actions. At the same time, though, many French parents want more English classes in schools. Bilingual schools, where both English and French are used, are also increasingly popular. Meanwhile, another threat to French has appeared. In France, there are many speakers of minority languages, such as Breton, a language spoken in parts of northern France. The French government does not recognize minority languages as official languages. Now, though, speakers of these languages are insisting on their right to use them in schools and other areas of public life. The Académie Française (29) this. They say that allowing the use of other languages would make it even harder to protect the French language.

(26) 1 repeat  2 predict  3 welcome  4 explain
(27) 1 sharp  2 wild  3 quiet  4 pure
(28) 1 secret  2 mixed  3 polite  4 fresh
(29) 1 opposes  2 extends  3 promises  4 completes
Homework Problems

Students often feel they have too much homework to do. Parents, though, usually have a different point of view, believing that homework will help their children do well at school. Recently, however, a growing number of parents in the United States have begun to doubt this idea. They complain that their children, especially those in elementary school, are being given so much homework that they have little time left for playing or relaxing. (30), some experts have also begun to criticize the amount of homework children are expected to do.

In fact, this is not the first time that homework has come under attack in the United States. At the end of the 19th century, many doctors and parents became concerned that children were losing physical strength and becoming nervous because of too much homework. They demanded that schools (31) the amount of homework they gave to encourage children to play and exercise. In 1901, the state of California even passed a law banning homework for all children under the age of 15. Later, however, American attitudes changed again. In the late 1950s, and then again in the 1980s, Americans became worried that (32) standards were falling below those of other countries. Homework began to increase again.

Now, many schools are once again telling teachers to reduce the amount of homework they give. Some are even banning homework over vacations or on weekends. Surveys, though, suggest that homework itself is not the real problem. Students today are busy, not because they have more homework, but because they are doing more extra activities such as sports or volunteering. This makes them feel stressed. Another problem is that some teachers (33) the rules concerning homework that already exist. The answer, according to some experts, is to make sure that these are obeyed by all teachers. Whatever happens, it seems likely that arguments over homework will continue.
From: Richard Henley <t-henley@newstepmail.com>
To: Wendy Turner <w-turner@westberryclothing.com>
Date: June 13, 2010
Subject: Joseph Lamont sweater

Dear Ms. Turner,

I am writing to complain about an item that I bought from your store on June 7. The item was a blue Joseph Lamont sweater. The sweater was on sale at a 40-percent discount, and I paid $54 for it. When I returned home, I discovered that there was a small hole under the arm.

Two days later, I went back to your store to exchange the sweater. I’m sorry to say that the young sales assistant I spoke to was not very helpful. First, she told me that the store had sold out of Joseph Lamont sweaters, so she could not replace mine. Then she said that I could exchange my sweater for a more expensive one of a different brand, but that I would have to pay the difference in price. This was not acceptable to me, so I asked to speak to a manager. The sales assistant told me none were available, but she did provide me with your name and e-mail address.

I understand that your store has a policy of not giving refunds on sale items. Since the sweater was damaged when I bought it, however, I believe you should make an exception to your policy in this case. Please tell me when it would be convenient for me to return to the store to receive my money.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Henley

(34) On June 7, Richard Henley

1. found that the sweater he had bought was damaged.
2. wrote to Ms. Turner about a blue Joseph Lamont sweater.
3. tried to return a Joseph Lamont sweater to Ms. Turner’s store.
4. saw that a sweater he had bought was on sale at a cheaper price.

(35) A sales assistant told Richard Henley that

1. he should return to the store when a manager was available.
2. he could not exchange his sweater for one of the same brand.
3. he might not be able to find a sweater in the same color in the store.
4. he would have to pay more money to get another Joseph Lamont sweater.

(36) Richard Henley tells Ms. Turner that

1. the store should refund the money he spent to get there.
2. the store must change its policy of not repairing damaged items.
3. he would like her to send some money to him for the sweater.
4. he thinks he should get a refund despite the store’s policy.
Shock Value

Although governments try to keep roads in good condition, it is impossible to get rid of all the bumps in them. For this reason, cars and other vehicles are equipped with devices called shock absorbers. When a vehicle goes over a rough part of the road, these devices protect the vehicle and the people in it from the impact. Now, a team of students in the United States has invented a system that uses a new kind of shock absorber to save fuel.

The team, whose members are students at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has come up with the idea of designing shock absorbers that can create electricity. Each time the vehicle hits a bump, the impact causes the shock absorber to move. This movement pushes liquid through a pipe and into a generator, where it turns a wheel. The turning of the wheel produces electricity that can be used for the lights and other electrical systems in the vehicle.

According to the students, each shock absorber in a large truck, for example, could generate an average of 1 kilowatt, more than enough to cover the truck's electrical needs. Vehicles with the new system would no longer need the usual equipment that depends on the engine to create electricity. This would save gasoline. In addition, the vehicle would become lighter, making it easier to move, and this would save even more fuel. Team leader Shakeel Avadhany says that up to 10 percent of the fuel presently being used in vehicles could be saved by his team's new shock absorbers.

The heavier the vehicle, the more electricity the shock absorbers can produce. For this reason, the students think their invention will be most useful in heavy trucks and other large vehicles. They estimate that a large discount-store and supermarket chain such as Wal-Mart, for example, could save as much as $13 million a year if its delivery trucks were all equipped with the new devices. The students have formed a company to sell their product, and already a number of truck manufacturers have expressed an interest in buying it.
(37) What is one thing shock absorbers do?
1. They help to repair rough parts of the road.
2. They protect people from bumps in the road.
3. They save fuel by helping the engine run faster.
4. They stop vehicles from causing damage to roads.

(38) The students' new system is designed to
1. use bumps in the road to generate electricity.
2. remove liquid from the engine to make it lighter.
3. supply fuel to the engine in a way that saves energy.
4. stop rough surfaces from damaging the shock absorbers.

(39) What is one way in which the new system saves gasoline?
1. Vehicles with the system can also use other types of fuel.
2. The vehicle's lights no longer need to use electricity.
3. The engine is no longer used to generate electricity.
4. Trucks with the system can carry more equipment.

(40) Why would the product be useful for large companies like Wal-Mart?
1. They use huge amounts of electricity to light their supermarkets.
2. They can easily afford to install the new shock absorbers.
3. They could use it to reduce the number of their trucks.
4. They use many heavy trucks to deliver their goods.
Whale Falls

A “whale fall” is a term used by scientists to describe the dead body of a whale that has fallen to the ocean floor and become a source of food for other sea creatures. A whale fall was first discovered by accident in 1987 by a team of scientists who were exploring the ocean floor in a submarine. Since then, 19 more whale falls have been found and studied, leading to many important discoveries.

Research has shown that there are three different stages to a whale fall. In the first stage, creatures such as crabs and fish eat the flesh of the whale and leave only the skeleton. In the next stage, worms and other animals eat the surface of the bones. Finally, in the last stage, a wide variety of species—including bacteria and shellfish—eat the oil inside the whale’s bones. Scientists calculate that this stage can last as long as 80 years.

Scientists say we can gain many benefits from studying whale falls. One of these is the potential usefulness of new species that have been found at whale falls. A company in California, for example, is developing a soap using a chemical from one of the worms that live on whale bones. This chemical works very effectively in cold water, allowing energy to be saved. Another benefit is that we can learn about what happens to waste after it sinks to the bottom of the ocean. This may give us new ideas for dealing with organic waste in the future.

The chief benefit, however, is that whale falls allow us to learn more about the ocean. The deep parts of the ocean are very difficult places to live. They are very cold and dark, and there is little food. Surprisingly, though, as many different creatures live there as in tropical rainforests. Scientists believe that whale falls can provide important clues to how these creatures live in such a severe environment. Moreover, the deep ocean is an essential part of our planet’s ecosystem. Learning more about it and the role it plays may, in fact, be essential to our own survival in the future.
(41) What did a team of scientists discover in 1987?
1. A submarine that had sunk after crashing into a whale.
2. A new species of whale that lives deep in the ocean.
3. A whale's body that was being eaten by sea creatures.
4. A part of the ocean where many whales live together.

(42) What part of the whale fall do bacteria feed on?
1. The worms that live inside a whale's body.
2. The oil that is found inside whale bones.
3. The shellfish that live on the surface of the whale.
4. The fish and crabs that have been eaten by whales.

(43) What practical benefit is likely to be gained from studying whale falls?
1. A chemical that can be used to kill worms.
2. A method of keeping warm in cold water.
3. A kind of soap that will help save energy.
4. A way to create energy using whale bones.

(44) One important thing we can learn from whale falls is
1. how whales can live in cold and dark parts of the ocean.
2. how creatures can survive under difficult conditions.
3. how human beings can learn to swim in the deep sea.
4. how scientists can study the environments of other planets.

(45) Which of the following statements is true?
1. Studying whale falls may help us manage some kinds of waste.
2. Whale falls can tell us a great deal about how our planet was formed.
3. Scientists are using a chemical from whale falls to clean up the oceans.
4. Human beings have come to depend on whale falls for survival.
Appendix G: Sample questions of the Grade 1 *Eiken* test
1. To complete each item, choose the best word or phrase from among the four choices. Then, on your answer sheet, find the number of the question and mark your answer.

(1) As part of its new policy, the government announced that it will ( ) all illegal immigrants. Flights will be arranged to take them back to their home countries.
1 repatriate 2 infiltrate 3 rebate 4 invigorate

(2) David wanted to exchange his broken computer for a new one but was told by the store he had ( ) the warranty by trying to fix it himself.
1 mortified 2 verified 3 gratified 4 nullified

(3) A: I can’t believe my son broke his promise not to smoke. I caught him smoking in his room again.
B: I understand why you’re upset, but that kind of ( ) is not unusual for teenagers.
1 acquittal 2 larceny 3 defiance 4 tyranny

(4) Brian always arrived at work early, did his job well, and got along with his colleagues. He was an ( ) employee.
1 elaborate 2 adversarial 3 exemplary 4 emancipated

(5) Although the salaries at TeknoSoft are relatively low, the ( ) are good. They offer flexible working hours, long vacations, and a generous retirement plan.
1 shrugs 2 perks 3 tabs 4 stakes

(6) When the prosecutor started questioning her story, the witness ( ) so badly it was difficult to understand what she was saying.
1 slackened 2 fortified 3 exasperated 4 stammered

(7) A: How should we go to my parents’ summer house in Scotland this year?
B: Let’s go by train. That way, we can avoid the ( ) of going through airport security.
1 derision 2 hassle 3 sanctuary 4 gristle

(8) The launch of the satellite had to be ( ) at the last moment when a technical problem was discovered in one of the rocket’s engines.
1 excavated 2 replenished 3 aborted 4 recanted

(9) The company president knew he would have to cut some staff but ( ) at doing it just before Christmas. He decided to wait until the new year.
1 straddled 2 drooled 3 muffled 4 balked
Serving Justice

Early in 2008, the trial of a man accused of illegally selling drugs was winding to a close in Florida. According to later information, the defendant was about to be found innocent. However, just before the verdict was to be announced, one of the jurors informed the judge that another juror had admitted ignoring the judge’s warnings not to use the Internet to check up on information relevant to the trial. When the judge questioned the jury, he found that no fewer than eight others had done the same thing. He had no option but to declare a mistrial, dismiss the jury, and set a date for a new trial.

This was one example of a “Google mistrial,” a trial declared invalid because jurors accessed the Internet. One might think, as the jurors apparently did, that to browse the Internet in search of extra information would be a good thing. Perhaps in nonlegal contexts, yes, but it goes against centuries of legal practice because it violates the rules that guide what evidence can and cannot be introduced into a trial. All evidence is rigorously examined by lawyers on both sides to ensure it is relevant, reliable, and not likely to prejudice the jury. “You lose all that when the jurors go out on their own,” says Professor Olin Wellborn of the University of Texas.

Google mistrials are likely to become more common, especially with the spread of mobile information technology—anyone can now research almost anything at any time. Douglas L. Keene, former president of the American Society of Trial Consultants and a defender of the current practice concerning evidence, admits that the actions of jurors are not easily controlled. “There are people,” he says, “who feel they can’t serve justice if they don’t find the answers to certain questions.” Nevertheless, he believes it is the responsibility of judges to impress upon jurors that using the Internet violates the rules of evidence, and that it is also the task of judges to ensure those rules are upheld. However, this seems impractical. Can people really be expected not to go online, an action that has become part and parcel of everyday life? For Keene’s suggestion to succeed, all wireless devices would have to be confiscated and the movement of jurors restricted by sequestering them for the duration of a trial—at huge additional expense.

According to current rules, any common knowledge and common sense that jurors possess before a trial is considered an inevitable and integral part of the trial. It is not such a huge leap to suggest that information available on the Internet should now also be recognized as common knowledge. Of course, this may mean that jurors will have access to evidence that would be considered inadmissible under the current system. This would put the onus on lawyers to determine whether any information available online is relevant to the case, and, more importantly, whether there is a need to validate or debunk this information in the courtroom.
Analyzing Altruism

When Charles Darwin formulated his theory of evolution by natural selection, he simultaneously spawned a debate over whether genetically determined altruistic behavior is viable. Sociobiologists define altruism as behavior by one organism that benefits another organism at the expense of the first. In terms of natural selection, this would suggest that altruism is a poor strategy as it decreases an individual's chances of passing on its own genes. The logical conclusion is that any gene predisposing an individual to altruism should eventually disappear. In the real world, however, there are myriad examples of apparently altruistic behavior all around us.

Darwin explained this seeming anomaly through the theory of group selection, which suggests that unselfish actions by individuals increase the probability of survival of the group as a whole. The idea remained popular until the 1960s, when researchers applied mathematical models which demonstrated that group selection is, at best, a weak evolutionary force. These models showed that any selfish individuals in a group would gain enormous survival advantages from others' altruistic behavior while taking no risks of their own. The majority of the scientific community at the time believed that these findings constituted a rejection of group selection by demonstrating that altruistic traits will not be passed on if they offer advantages to the group but fail to confer benefits on the altruist.

In 1964, a new approach to explaining the perpetuation of altruism was offered by William Hamilton when he presented his theory of inclusive fitness. This provided mathematical evidence that natural selection would only favor genes that endow an individual with instincts for altruistic behavior if the "recipients" of that behavior—the individuals that benefit from it—are genetically close to the altruist, or "donor." A much-touted example of this theory is that of the Belding's ground squirrel. When a squirrel group is threatened by a predator, an individual will let out an alarm call, which puts the individual at greater risk of being discovered but helps protect the rest of the group. Research indicates that the level of risk an individual squirrel is willing to take is correlated to that individual's relatedness to the members of the group.

While different sociobiological theories exist to explain the persistence of altruistic behavior, studies in other fields suggest that altruism may, in humans at least, also be beneficial to donors. A project conducted by Allan Luks in the 1980s followed over 3,000 subjects. Luks found that after behaving altruistically, many subjects experienced what he coined "helper's high," a kind of euphoria followed by a period of serenity. These sensations have been shown to positively affect the immune and cardiovascular systems of donors. Still, there could be a flip side. Several studies show that people who performed an altruistic act—like volunteering at a local charity, for example—were then less likely to help out their friends, or more likely to cheat on a test. In the words of Nina Mazar, an assistant professor at the University of Toronto, "If we do something that is better than our norm, we balance it out with something deviant: it's a zero-sum game."
Write an essay on the given TOPIC covering three of the POINTS below. Use the space provided on your answer sheet.

- Structure: Three or more paragraphs, including an introduction and conclusion
- Length: Around 200 words

**TOPIC**

*Should Japan play a bigger role in international affairs?*

**POINTS**

- Cultural exchanges
- Development aid
- Domestic issues
- Nuclear disarmament
- Terrorism
- The environment
Appendix H: A sample question of speaking section of the Grade 2 *Eiken* test
Practical Skills

Today, practical skills such as using computers and speaking foreign languages are regarded as important. As a result, many schools are offering classes for these skills, and learning them gives students more opportunities to find jobs. However, some teachers say that students are losing interest in traditional subjects like math and history. Practical skills are useful, but studying traditional subjects is also important.

Your story should begin with this sentence: One day, Mr. Sato was asked something in English by a customer at his bookstore.
次の日本文に合う英文になるように、( )に適切な語を書きなさい。

(1) カオリはいつフルートを演奏しますか？

( ) ( ) Kaori play the flute?

(2) 水曜日にです。(1)の答え)

( ) ( )

(3) ここからあなたの家までどのくらいの時間がかかりますか。

( ) ( ) does it take from here to your house?

(4) 約10分かかります。（3）の答え）

( ) ( ) about ten minutes.

(5) あなたはどうやって学校に行きますか。

( ) ( ) you go to school.

(6) バスです。（5）の答え）

( ) ( )

次の日本文に合う英文になるように、( )内の語句を並べかえなさい。

(1) キョウコはラケットを何本持っていますか。

( does / rackets / many / Kyoko / have / how )

(2) あなたのお父さんはどんな動物が好きですか。

( does / like / what / your father / animal )

(3) 誰がマサトと話しているのですか。

( talking / who / Masato / is / with )
次の英文に合う日本文を完成させなさい。
(1) Adam can read Japanese.
アダムは日本語を（　）。

(2) I cannot go to the park today.
わたしは今日（　）。