

The study of Japanese language speakers

Riikka Länsisalmi

Introduction

Discussing “speakers of Japanese” is a challenging task. Already a quick look at the tables of contents of handbooks and introductions to sociolinguistics shows that “speaker” and “language user” usually do not appear as chapter titles. The term “language” dominates instead. Widely used introductions to Japanese language scantily state that “Japanese is the native language of virtually all Japanese nationals” (Hasegawa 2015: 3), or that “Japanese is currently spoken by approximately 127 million people in Japan” (Iwasaki 2013: 1). Iwasaki (2013: 1) further refers to *kokugo* (national language), “especially as the name of a school subject”, versus *nihongo* (Japanese language), a term used when Japanese “is contrasted with other languages”. Others elaborate that *nihongo* is commonly understood to be “what the Japanese people speak” so that it can be considered equivalent to *kokugo*. In the modern period, Japanese is associated with the standard or common language, “spoken (or speakable) by everyone everywhere in Japan” (Shibamoto and Smith 2016: 27).¹

In order to sketch an overview of “Japanese and its speakers”, one first needs to dismantle the concept of “speaker”, and then elaborate on the notion that Japanese is “speakable by everyone everywhere” in Japan. This leads straight to discussions of “non-native” users of Japanese, i.e., second language Japanese learners in Japan (henceforth, J2) and outside Japan (henceforth, JFL).² The number of Japanese language learners in Japan was approximately 190,000 in 2015 (Bunkachō 2016: 57–58), while some 3,6 million learners studied the language outside Japan (Japan Foundation 2016a).³

Speakers of Japanese: A terminological account

A common-sensical understanding of “native speakers” (henceforth, NS) refers to people speaking their “mother tongue” or “first acquired language”. The concept of “native” is thereby contrasted with “non-native”. This definition relates to lifetime. Learning a language in early childhood is what makes a speaker “native”. Other definitions relate to competence. A NS has a “perfect” command of the language, making NS linguistic authorities in their native tongue.⁴ Limiting our discussions to such idealized “Japanese NS” would be misleading. To start, Japanese-first language speakers (henceforth, J1) speak Japanese in various ways. Then there are J1 speakers outside Japan, and those who have learned Japanese side-by-side with another language, in various circumstances. Japanese is also learned as a second language (J2) and a foreign language (JFL). Japanese was also

enforced as a “national language” (*kokugo*) in colonial Taiwan and Korea, where many of the older generation still speak Japanese (Jian and Sanada 2011; Long and Imamura 2013; Loveday 1996; Miyajima 1999; Mühlhäusler and Trew 2000; Sanada 2009; Yim 2001). Forced Japanese language learning also took place within what is currently Japanese territory, namely in Hokkaido and in the Ryukyu Islands (Anderson and Heinrich 2014; Heinrich 2015a; Maher 2014).

Let us consider some of the Japanese terminology used for “language” and for “speaker”. Dictionary and encyclopedia definitions of *nihongo* (Japanese language) customarily define it as *kokugo* (national language) or *kōyōgo* (official language). Japanese is said to be the language used across the Japanese Archipelago, mainly by Japanese. The common definition of a “speaker of Japanese” is a person who is monolingual, a native speaker and a Japanese national. Outside linguistics, the term *nihongo washa* (Japanese language speaker) is not commonly used. It usually appears in articles on J1 speakers learning foreign languages. *Nihongo bogo washa* (Japanese mother tongue speaker) tends to be contrasted with *nihongo hi-bogo washa* (non-native speaker). Also the loanwords *neitibu* (native) and *nonneitibu* (non-native) are used. On the other hand, concepts such as *kokugo washa* (national language speaker) and *kōyōgo washa* (official language speaker) do not exist.⁵ *Kokugo* is an essentialist term that departs from an ideological assumption that speakers of *kokugo* are Japanese nationals and native speakers, while *kyōtsūgo* (common language) is a functional variety of Japanese. The latter is too specific to warrant a term designating its speakers. There is also the term *nihongo jun-bogo washa* (semi-native speakers of Japanese), which implies that “speakerhood” is based on deficiencies, rather than on differences. In other words, if one is not a “genuine” NS, one will be labeled as someone requiring an extra prefix that indicates that the language is “incomplete” (*jun-*, semi-/quasi-) or “non-native” (*hi-*, non-). Such speakers are on a quest to reach the unattainable target of “native speakerhood”. This shows also in the fact that advanced learners of Japanese (*jōkyū nihongo gakushūsha*) are contrasted with NS, and that there are further categories beyond “advanced” such as super-advanced level speaker (*nihongo chōkyū washa*). There is however no doubt that even “super-advanced” is not “native”.

Research on J1 speakers in Japan

What could be termed “regular” J1 speakers were the main object of research in Japanese sociolinguistics up until the 1990s. A number of overviews have summarized these works.⁶

Sociolinguists would not exist if it were not for the speakers. When adopting a speaker-centered perspective (Coulmas 2013), then variability in Japanese is evidenced in speakers’ micro-choices regarding, for example, standard and regional dialects, gender-specific/-preferred forms, age-

specific forms, occupational jargon, etc. Macro-choices pertain to higher-level units, such as linguistic choices across and functional restrictions on languages (code-switching, bilingualism), and phenomena related to language spread, shift, maintenance and planning. Identity, previously often conceived of in terms of ethnic, social and national identities, is examined as a dynamic and negotiable concept in interaction. Speakers are seen as “active creative agents, able to choose their verbal means”, and it consequently becomes the task of sociolinguistics to “explain why they speak the way they do” (Coulmas 2013: 14).

How has Japanese sociolinguistics dealt with this? Heinrich and Masiko (2015) indicate that defining the range of sociolinguistics in Japan is not easy. Social stratification, a core phenomenon examined in Anglo-American “first wave” sociolinguistics (Eckert 2012), is approached in Japan in an emic way through the concept of *zokusei to kotoba* or *kotoba no zokusei* (social variables and language). Japanese studies relate language predominantly to age differences (*nenreisa*) or to sex differences (*seisa*), later reframed as gender and language (*jendā to kotoba*), to specific varieties used at some stage of life such as school slang and youth language, as well as to group language (*shūdango*) (Sanada et al. 2010; Long, Nakai and Miyaji 2001). An overview on applied Japanese sociolinguistics by Long, Nakai and Miyaji (2001) includes also language contact (*gengo sesshoku*) in and outside Japan and discussions on immigrants and language (*imin to kotoba*) under the heading of *zokusei* (literally “attribute”). Numerous studies have dealt with language variation in Japan accounting to social variables such as age, sex/gender and formality in the standard language spoken in Tokyo (e.g., Lauwereyns 2002; Takano 1998; Tomosada and Jinnouchi 2004; Matsuda 1993). Studies such as Hibiya (1995) on “uptown” Yamanote and “downtown” Shitamachi Tokyo Japanese, and variationist sociolinguistics in general, could draw on insights gained in the dialectological studies that predated the first sociolinguistic studies in Japan.⁷

“Second wave” approaches, relying on large-scale empirical surveys to grasp the local dynamics of variation and change have dominated research on regional speech. Patterns and diversity of honorific expressions, particularly “honorifics-as-politeness” (Okamoto and Shibamoto-Smith 2016: 292) is another prominent field of second wave sociolinguistics in Japan (e.g., Ogino, Misono and Fukushima 1985; Ogino 1986). Politeness and honorifics have also been examined from multiple alternative perspectives: e.g., structure and displays of “linguistic femininity”, conceptualizations of linguistically polite behavior, consciousness in regional and generational variation, discourse politeness theory, and assessment and evaluation of politeness, including in cross-cultural contexts (Dunn 2013; Fukushima 2004; Ide et al. 1986; Okamoto 2013; Usami 2002, 2008, 2015; Yoshioka 2004). The concepts of “power” and “compliance” have been discussed in

asymmetrical institutional settings, such as doctor-patient communication and eldercare facilities (Backhaus and Suzuki 2010; Ohtaki 2013). Social constructionist theories have inspired more recent “third wave” investigations of “Japanese politeness” and its varying manifestations. In this research strand, speakers are seen as active agents in actual interaction (Adachi 2016; Cook 2013; Geyer 2013).

Interactional resources used in discourse have also been popular topics, e.g., postpositions and cleft-constructions, laughter, interactional particles, and discourse markers used in processes of self-contextualization or the management of information structure (Hayashi 2004; Ikeda 2003; Maynard 1989; Mori 2008; Morita 2008; Onodera 2004; Tanaka 2001, 2005). Heinrich and Masiko (2015) underline the important role of interdisciplinary work in Japanese sociolinguistics. Scholars trained in neighboring disciplines such as sociology, anthropology, political science and historical studies, have crucially expanded the field. In English contributions from outside of Japan, speech styles by female NS have attracted much attention (Heinrich 2015b). This has resulted in socio-culturally inspired criticism on “universal models” of politeness (e.g., Ide 1989; Ide et al. 1986; Takahara 1991; Takano 2000; Tsuji 2002) and on the second wave-type focus on “the lexicon and morphology of gendered expression” (Okamoto and Shibamoto-Smith 2016: 292). While studies published in the 1980s rarely went beyond claims of cultural exceptionalism, recent inquiries have shifted attention towards speakers and their stylistic practices. Transgression of normative notions, particularly as displayed by young female speakers (Gagné 2008; Kataoka 1997; Miller 2004, 2011; Tranter 2008) and discourse of older women (Matsumoto 2009, 2011) have been addressed. While the “gap” how female speakers are expected to speak and how they actually speak has been widely explored, Japanese “men’s speech” has much received less attention. It has typically been considered unmarked language and as such uninteresting for sociolinguistic research. In folk linguistics, in particular, “female language” has been viewed with respect to a presupposed “male norm” and female speakers resorting to “masculine expressions” have been criticized (Satake 2005).⁸ “Manly” speech register by students, “salarymen speech” and “senior speakers” are among the topics covered by SturtzSreetharan (2004, 2006a, 2006b) in her important contributions to close this research gap.

In-between speakers and in-between Japanese

Less typical in Japanese sociolinguistics is the study of “in-between” speakers. The distinction between speakers and in-between speakers is usually drawn on ethnic or on linguistic grounds, but the difference between the two is far from clear. A recent solution is to place language users on a continuum (Takagi 2016). In 2014, the journal *Nihongogaku* (Studies in Japanese Language)

devoted a special issue to *aida no nihongo* (in-between Japanese). It refrained from applying binary categories such as “young versus old”, or “female versus male”, placing the focus instead on the fluidity of language use and on varieties that often escape attention.

Notable contributions to *aida no nihongo* studies are works by Abe (2010, 2014), Maree (2014), Okamoto (2016), and Okamoto and Shibamoto-Smith (2004) on gay, *onee* and “new-half” sexual minority varieties, which do not fit traditional categories of women’s language (*joseigo*) or men’s language (*danseigo*).⁹ The loanword *gei* (gay) is used to refer to male homosexuals, “new-half” to “male-to-female transsexuals” and “*onee* language” to “feminine speech associated with (effeminate) gay men” (Okamoto 2016: 15). Okamoto’s (2016: 5) observation that “the relationship between linguistic forms and gender is variable, not fixed” is echoed in a number of studies. Contributions by Inoue (2002), Endō (2006), Nakamura (1995, 2001, 2007) and Okamoto and Shibamoto-Smith (2016) demonstrate the construction of gendered speech. Okamoto’s (2016) focus on metapragmatic comments on the use of gendered language, and the interpretation of such forms used in local discourse contexts, further expands sociocultural analyses on the discursive construction of identity. Abe (2014) also points out that exaggerated stereotypical gendered features function as hybrid language acts, simultaneously criticizing the underlying heterosexual–queer dichotomy.

Terms such as *onee* and *onabe* (masculine female homosexual) index possible identity features, but they can also be employed in relation to specific professional roles. Besides investigating how language users deal with dominant perceptions of language, other vantage points consider “gendered” professions from a discourse-analytic angle. In the so-called water trade (*mizu shōbai*), i.e., Japan’s nightlife entertainment business, skillfully balancing the public and the private, the familiar and the formal, and the relevant speech styles that accompany these acts are part of the professional toolkit (Nakata 2016). *Onabe*, for example, typically work in service profession in bars frequented by female homosexuals attracted to masculine counterparts, in contrast to *rezubian* (lesbians), who identify themselves as female (Abe 2004, 2010).¹⁰

Another group of the “in-between” category are Japanese repatriate or returnee children (*kikoku shijo*). In schools, the number of returnee pupils has been hovering around 10,000 to 11,000 children (MEXT 2015a). Carroll (2011: 189) observes that these pupils have brought with them “influences from other languages and attitudes from their experiences living in other countries that affect their own language use and may have a wider impact in the longer term.” Often lacking (full) exposure to Japan’s national school curricula, their command of honorific registers or Japanese

script are frequently less solid than that of their Japan-based peers. This notwithstanding, only circa 1,500 of the returnee pupils are seen to require additional “Japanese language guidance” at school (MEXT 2015b).¹¹ In the literature on returnee children, language education has customarily been discussed in the context of national language education. Studies focusing on (War) Returnees from China (*chūgoku kikokusha*) and on foreign spouses (*gaikokujin haigūsha*), on the other hand, have been related to regional J2 education.

“New speakers” of Japanese

The longstanding “belief in the myth of a classless and mono-ethnic Japanese society” (Heinrich and Masiko 2015: 256) together with the loss of Japanese colonies are the main reason why language diversity did not receive much attention in Japanese sociolinguistics before the mid-1990s (Carroll 2010; Noguchi and Fotos 2001). Speakers, who represent “Otherness” vis-à-vis the “prototypical” J1 speakers in Japan were addressed outside the realm of “mainstream sociolinguistics” (Heinrich and Masiko 2015). Although Ainu, Ryukyuan, Koreans and Chinese have often been referred to as established “minorities” in Japan, the terminology is not entirely clear. Iwama (2007) distinguishes several ways in which the term *mainoriti* (minority) is used in social sciences, newspapers and in popular use to denote either the socially disadvantaged (*shakai jakusha*), ethnic, linguistic and religious minorities (*shōsūsha*), or simply odd people (*kawatta hitobito*) who do not blend in with the “majority”. Outside Japanese academia, *mainoriti* tends to be used in reference to the “discriminated and disadvantaged”, that is, it refers to issues of disability, age, sexual orientation, race and religion (Takagi 2016). English-language scholarship on Japan, by contrast, applied the term “minority” from the mid-1990s onwards to refer to Ainu, Ryukyuan, Koreans, Chinese or *nikkeijin*. Also the Burakumin have been discussed under the umbrella term of “minority”, despite the fact that they do not differ ethnically or linguistically from “majority Japanese”.¹² Lumping together such diverse groups has its problems. Hankins (2014: 227) has a point in writing that “[g]roups, the recognition of which has been intended to show diversity in Japan, are, ironically, being homogenized as ‘minorities’.”

It is now mainstream in Japanese sociolinguistics to turn towards marginalized groups “in a move to dethrone the specter of homogeneity” (Hankins 2014: 222). It must be noted in this context that the number of resident foreigners in Japan represents only 1,8% of the population, a small number compared to other developed economies (Green 2017; Hōmushō 2016). Shibuya (2010) reviews studies related to Japanese in immigration contexts and classifies the types of Japanese in two categories: Japanese used by (1) permanent residents such as *zainichi* Koreans and Chinese, spouses and foreign family members of Japanese nationals, Returnees from China, etc., and (2) others

residing in Japan for longer or shorter periods such as most *nikkeijin*, other foreign laborers, and Japanese language learners. People of Ainu and Ryukyuan heritage are now all J1 speakers, and the number of bilingual speakers among these populations is declining. Yamamoto (2001: 28–29) distinguished between four types of bilinguals in Japan: (1) “mainstream Japanese studying a foreign/second language”, (2) *kikoku shijo* returnees, (3) “offspring of parents who have different native languages”, and (4) “ethnic minorities (born) and residing in Japan”. Individuals falling into the first two groups are usually highly educated “elite bilinguals”, who choose to acquire another language. Individuals of the third group may be evaluated similarly, if the combination of languages includes Japanese or English. Non-Japanese speakers in the last three groups would be categorized as “folk or circumstantial bilinguals”, learning the dominant language (Japanese) in order to adapt to mainstream society. In particular studies on “folk or circumstantial bilinguals” of the second and third category are scarce in Japanese sociolinguistics.

Since Japan saw itself as a monolingual and homogenous nation until the 1990s, and with Japanese sociolinguistics reproducing this belief, it is not surprising to find that issues on former colonial subjects residing in Japan were not addressed. Doing otherwise would have been counter-ideological. In the 1990s, the remnants of the Japanese language (*zanson nihongo*) in the former colonies, together with Nikkeijin language problems and other migrant language issues became more prominent (Nakamizu 2001). Initially the main attention was directed to identifying “non-native” features in their Japanese. More recently, scholars from neighboring fields of study have expanded their research to also include related macro-level phenomena (Heinrich and Masiko 2015: 260). Sanada and Shōji (2005) or Tagengoka Genshō Kenkyūkai (2013) are useful introductions to this type of research.

In the case of Chinese and Korean residents, “oldcomers” and “newcomers” are customarily distinguished. The distinction is based on the period of time they came to Japan.¹³ Forced to hide their mother tongue, oldcomer Koreans acquired Japanese without much notice. Language shift among them proceeded rapidly, so that the second, third, fourth and fifth generations are J1 speakers. The usual pattern is that the second generation is passively bilinguals and from the third generation onwards, descendants are often monolingual J1 speakers (Kim 2005). Newcomer students, trainees, spouses and others, by contrast, have found better conditions to maintain their bilingualism (Long et al. 2002; Sanada, Ogoshi and Yim 2005). About 14% of Korean children are educated in ethnic Korean schools, most of them operated by Chongryun (pro-North Korea General Federation of Korean Residents in Japan). Though J1 speakers in early childhood, the children frequenting these schools learn Korean within a couple of years (Cary 2001).¹⁴ In general, the

situation of residents of Korean background and their language life are better documented than those of the Chinese, *nikkeijin*, and other foreign communities (Huzii 2005; Ryang 2000; Sanada, Ogoshi and Yim 2005).

Oldcomer Chinese tend to maintain bilingualism up until the second generation, but among the third generation bilingual proficiency becomes weaker (Long et al. 2002: 147). Chinese newcomers have been arriving in Japan since the resumption of diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China in 1972, particularly after the beginning of China's "reform and open door" policy in 1978 (Tajima 2003: 68). One particular group among them are the above-mentioned war orphans (*chūgoku kikokusha*), who lost their parents or remained in China during the Japanese retreat at the end of WWII when they were small children. Some of them have been "repatriated" together with their family members with support of the Japanese government, others came to Japan on their own initiative, and at their own expense. They lack long-established organizations that represent their interest and frequently experience settlement problems due to the complex nature of their ethnic identity (Tomozawa 2001: 137). Much effort has been made to teach them (basic) Japanese. Most research on them has been related to J2 education. Tomozawa, who aptly refers to them as "Japan's hidden bilinguals", states that younger "returnees" and their offspring generally acquire Japanese without difficulty in compulsory education. Maintaining Japanese-Chinese bilingualism is difficult, though. Just like Koreans and *nikkeijin*, bilingual Chinese residents adapt their linguistic resources to their environment and use code-switching in different domains, depending on whom they speak to and about what (Tagengoka Genshō Kenkyūkai 2013; Kawakami 2012).

Reforms of immigration laws from the 1990s onwards have opened the door to South American *nikkeijin* immigrants of Japanese ancestry and their spouses, down to the third generation (Hirataka, Koishi and Kato 2001: 165). The biggest communities originate from Brazil (184,000) and Peru (48,000) (Hōmushō 2016). The largest number of *Nikkeijin* residents can be found in Aichi Prefecture and Shizuoka Prefecture, where Japan's car industry is mainly located. The Japanese used by *nikkeijin* has attracted interest since the late 1990s (Nakamizu 2005; Shibuya 2010: 13). While older Brazilian *nikkeijin* rely on Portuguese and use the language at home and restricted other domains (e.g., shops run and church frequented by fellow-Brazilians), young children grow up as J1 speakers.

There are few comparative studies of foreign populations in sociolinguistics. Sociologists have been more active. For example, a study by Chiavacchi (2013: 224) identifies the factors that have led to Korean assimilation and to the development of the *nikkeijin* into a "socially detached underclass".

Third and fourth generation Koreans are J1 speakers, who often do not speak Korean fluently. Furthermore, mixed Korean-Japanese marriages are now conventional. On the other hand, *nikkeijin* children remain not well integrated in the national school system and, as a consequence thereof, “face very limited opportunities in the Japanese labour market” (Chiavacchi 2013: 224).

Japanese as lingua franca in contemporary Japan remains understudied, too. Most sociolinguistic inquiries on the topic concentrate on the former colonies, most notably on Taiwan (e.g., Jian and Sanada 2011). Saitō (2015) examined Japanese as lingua franca in the domains of “restaurant and drinking establishments”, church and in the linguistic landscape in two localities in Gunma Prefecture and Mie Prefecture. Both prefectures have high concentrations of foreign residents. Maher (2004) sketches the history of pidgins and creoles in Japan, including modern varieties such as Japanese-Ryukyu pidgins and Gastarbeiter (*dekasegi*) pidgins among migrant laborers, in existence since the 1980s.¹⁵ Maher (2004: 183–184) supplements these with military base pidgins (“Hamamatsu pidgin” in Shizuoka Prefecture in the 1950s) and “Ogasawara pidgin”, concluding that “[p]idgin research in Japan has been long neglected and does not now feature in contemporary linguistic research.” This lack of research is of course regrettable and the topic should be addressed in future sociolinguistic studies.

Besides historical and colonial settings, the study of pidgins falls into the realm of “late modern” sociolinguistic trends in Japan. A novel broad definition of new speakers (*nouveaux locuteurs*) in the era of globalization would, if applied to Japanese contexts, extend from J1-speaking learners of Ainu and Ryukyuan languages to international students, transnational workers, migrants and refugees, and others crossing national or virtual boundaries, adopting and using Japanese and other languages as a result (Guilleux 2015).¹⁶ Short-term foreign residents (students, trainees, laborers, businesspeople, etc.) as well as illegal residents further add to the current situation of nationalities, ethnicities, residence-permit types, language repertoires and proficiencies in Japan.¹⁷ To cater to these diverse populations and to the increasing number of incoming tourists, multilingual information in East Asian languages, English, Portuguese, etc., is now relatively widely available in Japan. These materials and their production have been examined (Shōji, Backhaus and Coulmas 2009; Gottlieb 2011). These developments have prompted Carroll to point to

the need to strike a balance between ensuring that foreign residents obtain essential information in appropriate languages on one hand, and, on the other, the provision of opportunities for newcomers to learn Japanese language and culture on a long-term basis in order to live together with Japanese people. (Carroll 2010: 390)

J2 speakers in Japan

Providing opportunities for newcomers to learn Japanese has turned into a crucial theme in Japan's super-aged society with too few children. Recent years have seen a surge of interest in and initiatives for J2 education on a local level. At the same time, the national government has been slow to address the needs of immigrants (Green 2014). J2 speakers typically have specific motivations for learning Japanese, e.g., being able to work, study and live in Japan as functional citizens. In this context reference is often made to "children crossing borders" (Kawakami 2012), but in reality children have no choice but to follow their parents, who cross borders and move to Japan for one reason or another (Ozeki 2013).

Seibert Vaipae (2001: 186) distinguishes what she terms "language minority students" into three groups depending on who their parents are: (1) "foreign academics and professionals, (2) working class immigrants, and (3) Chinese 'war orphans' and their families". Note that Japanese children returning from abroad (*kikoku shijo*) do not fall into this category, because they usually have two Japanese-speaking parents and use Japanese as home language. She points out that the quality of the educational programs and measures targeting this heterogeneous population have not been evaluated for their effectiveness. Educational institutions and government authorities minimize their efforts in dealing with these students, "mainstreaming" them in the absence of a migrant policy. As an effect newcomer *nikkeijin* children may end up in the very same classes with "elite bilinguals" such as *kikoku shijo*, despite the fact that they have very different linguistic skills (Carroll 2011: 189).

Kawakami (2012: 81) prefers to consider children crossing borders as a concept that represents characteristics of (1) geographical and (2) linguistic mobility, as well as (3) mobility in terms of the type of language education they are immersed in (*kokugo*, JFL, J2, heritage language). Kawakami (2012: 81) focuses on "the relationship between children's language education, identity formation, and citizenship and the kind of society and system of language education needed by children living in a context of increasing mobility." In his view, "plurilinguality" should be "fostered as an reorganized resource" which has meaning for each individual child and is employed in their daily lives (Kawakami 2012: 96). However, it is questionable to what extent this is a sociolinguistic reality in contemporary Japan beyond the small group of students with "elite bilingualism" (Yamamoto 2011).

J2 children and pupils is another concept that has drawn much attention recently. Over 70,000 foreign children are currently enrolled in Japanese public schools, almost 60% in primary school, some 30% in junior high school, and the rest in senior high school. These numbers have remained relatively stable during the past decade (MEXT 2015b). The number of foreign children requiring additional Japanese language guidance (*nihongo shidō*) has increased from less than 30% a decade ago to nearly 40% today. In addition, the number of children with Japanese nationality in need of “guidance” is on the rise, reaching nearly 8,000 pupils according to official statistics. Such children have either one non-Japanese parent or have their “roots abroad” (MEXT 2015a). In 2016, over 34,000 children were reported to be in need of “Japanese language guidance” in primary and middle school (MEXT 2016a). Pupils attending Japanese schools have more than sixty different language backgrounds (Kawakami 2012: 96). Most of these foreign children are speakers of Asian languages (Chinese, Filipino/Tagalog, Vietnamese, Korean, etc.), or speakers of *nikkeijin* languages such as Brazilian Portuguese and Spanish. These children are concentrated in specific schools in the car-manufacturing region of Aichi Prefecture, as well as in Kanagawa Prefecture and Tokyo Prefecture. Nearly 80% of public primary and middle schools in Japan have no such pupils (MEXT 2015b, 2016a).

The organization of J2 education at schools frequented by children of migrant families has not escaped criticism (e.g., Ōtsu 2005), and efforts are currently made to support residents with non-dominant language proficiencies in order to turn them into *seikatsusha* (citizens and consumers) (Kakazu 2011: 69; Kumagai and Satō 2011). Japanese language guidance for foreign children in compulsory education is organized in various ways. It is either included in the curriculum or provided as an extra-curricular activity (Miyazaki and Kimura 2014).¹⁸ Various measures targeting Japanese language learning by pupils (and their parents) have been taken, including the deployment of new instructors, the granting of financial assistance, offering training for administrative and teaching personnel at schools, compilation and distribution of instructional booklets on schooling in Japan in multiple languages, and the creation of special curricula, materials and learning targets (MEXT 2015b).¹⁹ Academic analyses of learning materials and recommendations for pedagogical practices exist, but the effects of educational efforts are still to be fully explored. The concept itself, *gaikokujin jidō seito* (“foreign children and pupils”) is oblivious of the diverse backgrounds of these children (Ozeki 2013). It also excludes those going to schools for foreign nationals or those refusing to go to school.²⁰ The danger of becoming *daburu rimiteddo* (double limited), that is, starting school in Japanese while the mother tongue is still underdeveloped, is another point of concern. In addition, the criteria determining who is “in need of Japanese language guidance” have been criticized for being too vague. Ozeki (2013: 3) claims that the numbers published by the Ministry of

Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) do not reflect the real scope of language problems that J2 speakers are experiencing in educational settings.

The majority of research activities in this field consists of surveys and case studies targeting localities where the majority of *nikkeijin* or other foreign national children go to school, but also of proposals for J2 assessment, curriculum development, teacher education, and reflections on multicultural education and “co-living” (*kyōsei*). Also the technical aspects of a bibliographical heritage language education database have been addressed under the umbrella of large research projects (Nakajima, Tanaka and Morishita 2011). This notwithstanding, comprehensive overviews are hard to come by. Part of the problem is that academic publications in Japan do not rigorously separate reports on J2 and JFL education. Established in 2003, a research network entitled “The Mother Tongue, Heritage Language, and Bilingual Education (MHB) Research Association” is divided into interest groups covering “Overseas Heritage Japanese Language”, “International School”, “Assessment”, and “Bilingual Writing” (MHB 2016).

Besides “JSL children”, other J2/JFL speaker groups are well represented in Japan. The number of students in language education facilities for foreigners totaled almost 175,000 in 2014, and nearly 190,000 one year later (Bunkachō 2014, 2016). More than 50,000 such students are enrolled in institutions of tertiary education. Roughly 120,000 are learning Japanese in educational institutions. More than 80% of these learners are from Asian countries. Students from the Republic of China (36%) provide for the largest group, followed by Vietnamese (15%). Nepalese, South Korean, Taiwanese and Filipino students represent each about 5%. Roughly 2% of these students have Japanese nationality. The majority of the students (over 60%) are exchange students. Other categories include technical trainees, businesspeople, short-term visitors, spouses of Japanese citizens, *nikkeijin*, “returnees from China”, refugees, and others. More than half of the students stay in Japan for a period of one to three years. Most students reside in the Tokyo metropolitan area and the surrounding prefectures. Other large concentrations can be found in the Kansai area, in Fukuoka Prefecture and in Aichi Prefecture.

Ongoing JSL research is reported by the Research Division on Japanese as a Second Language at the National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics.²¹ There are also a number of specialist periodicals such as *Nihongo kyōiku* (Journal of Japanese Language Teaching) or *Nihongo/nihongo kyōiku kenkyū* (Studies in Japanese Language and Japanese Language Teaching). The latter journal carries articles on Korean-, Chinese-, Hindi-, Vietnamese-, Malay-, and Thai-speaking learners, including contrastive analyses. It concentrates mainly on (contrastive) pragmatics

and analysis of selected syntactic or discourse elements and structures. The more established *Nihongo kyōiku* regularly publishes articles and special issues relevant to sociolinguistics (e.g., language minority children, “Easy Japanese”, universal communication design, language empowerment, *nikkeijin* laborers, or multilingualization). On the occasion of its 150th edition, Usami (2012) provided for an overview of 610 articles with “sociological perspectives” that were published in the journal. While the earliest issues concentrated on JFL education and its conditions abroad, attention placed on learners in Japan has increased since the late 1980s. Key concepts that reflect sociolinguistic research topics include context and language use (*bamen to gengo un'yō*), culture (*bunka*), and social conditions and learning (*shakai jōsei to gakushū*).

JFL speakers

Increasing the number of JFL speakers has been an objective of the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs for many decades now (Gaimushō 2013). Currently, the objective is to have five million JFL learners by 2020. While Japanese still attracts quite a large number of language learners outside of Japan, surveys demonstrate that Japanese is losing ground to Mandarin Chinese.²²

Compared to J2 education, JFL education abroad has a long history of systematic governmental policies. Learners having mastered and those endeavoring to master Japanese are nowadays often referred to as *nihongo jinzai* (Japanese language human resources). They tend to be seen uniquely as concrete assets for Japan, e.g., *shisan* (property, asset), *jintekina asetto* (human asset) or *ōkina rieki* (great profit) (Länsisalmi 2016: 222). The Japan Foundation – an independent administrative institution financed by the Japanese government, investment revenues and private donations – has been carrying out surveys on Japanese-language education abroad since 1974 (Japan Foundation 2016b). The latest survey reveals that Japanese is studied in 137 countries worldwide, but that the number of overseas learners has decreased by roughly 300,000 after a long period of steady growth. In addition to the current learners, former JFL learners outside educational institutions constitute an important group around the globe, but the size of active Japanese users is hard to guess. Gottlieb (2005: 6) puts the number of current and former learners at an estimated ten million.

Language learning motivations listed in surveys prominently include “interest in Japanese language” (62%), followed by “communication in Japanese” (56%), “interest in *manga*, *anime*, J-Pop, etc.” (54%), and “interest in history, literature, etc.” (50%) (Japan Foundation 2012: 4). Knowledge about Japan and its language has been a more important factor than utility-based motivations. “Future employment” (42%) ranks fifth in the survey and “study in Japan” (34%) is in seventh place. The majority of learners, nearly 80%, reside in regions close to Japan in East and

Southeast Asia (People's Republic of China, Indonesia, South Korea) where knowledge of Japanese has an instrumental value in the job market. Roughly 10% of the learners live in Australia, less than 5% in the US, and only 3% in Europe. The smallest numbers of learners are found in Africa (Japan Foundation 2016a).

Inoue (2007: 98) distinguishes three factors determining the market value of languages, (1) population size (global scale), (2) economic power of the speech community (global and regional scale), and (3) information quantity and cultural elaboration (global, regional and personal scale), and includes Japanese in all these categories. While the Japan Foundation produces JFL reports on a regular basis, these do not capture the full picture of Japanese language studies outside Japan. Currently available mobile and digital technologies offer unprecedented possibilities and resources to anyone interested in learning Japanese independently. This phenomenon can be evidenced in formal classroom education where JLF teachers nowadays deal with students of increasingly varying proficiencies.²³

In linguistic research, in particular Japanese inter-language produced by NNS learners has been studied. The areas and research interests in JLF and J2 education intersect with many fields of sociolinguistics. However, it is often primarily the specific ways in which NNS use Japanese that capture the interest of scholars. Sasaki (2005) and Mori and Mori (2011) offer extended reviews on J2/JFL research for the period of time from 2000 to 2010, covering both “second language acquisition” and pedagogical practices. In another overview, Nuibe (2007) lists the following main areas of research: teaching Japanese to young children, Japanese for academic purposes, teacher training, teaching methods, second language acquisition, and pedagogical grammar. In this overview, sociolinguistics ranks last, covering only about 10% of the reviewed articles and reports. Besides information and publications on JFL by the Japan Foundation, information on the latest trends in Japanese language education is easily available. There are a number of academic associations and research centers that publish journals, newsletters or proceedings. Examples include the Japan Association for Language Teaching (JALT) in Japan, and The Association of Japanese Language Teachers in Europe (AJE) or The American Association of Teachers of Japanese (AATJ) overseas.

In the past decade, identity and language learning has received more attention. It is studied how learners establish “their ability to make their own choices as to how they [want] to present themselves in different social contexts” (Mori and Mori 2011: 459–460). JLF speakers, often a long distance away from Japan, do not necessarily ascribe to idealized linguistic NS models.²⁴ Critical

approaches now address the obvious power imbalances that are inherent in NS versus NNS categorizations (Cook 1999, in Tanaka 2013). Other related areas of interest include “easy” or “plain” Japanese (*yasashii nihongo* and *wakariyasui nihongo*, respectively), connecting directly to discussions on “barrier-free information” and “co-living Japanese” (*kyōsei nihongo*), a language variety created in actual communication situations involving NNS and NS (Yoshinaga 2015; Gottlieb 2012; Matsuo et al. 2013). Besides J2 and JFL education, these topics are often researched in the fields of critical sociolinguistics or welfare-linguistics (Murata 2015).

“Virtual speakers” in fiction, translation, and real life

There is one more type of speaker – speakers who are “purposefully ‘incoherent’” when speaking (Heinrich 2017). There is no label for such speakers yet, but the kind of language they produce is discussed in Japan as *yakuwarigo* (role language), or as *vācharu nihongo* (virtual Japanese). This kind of language use, associated with features of imaginary speakers, has grown in a popular field of cross-disciplinary study. Consumers of Japanese novels, *manga* comics, soap operas, *anime*, TV drama, games, translated literature, etc., regularly come across such language use. Kinsui (2007) notes that speaker-characteristics in role language include age, gender, social status or occupation, regional origin, nationality, race or historical period. There is no end to this list. It includes also, for example, imagined alien or robot speech.²⁵ Teshigawara and Kinsui (2011) state that crafted role language is typically rooted in non-fictional language use, and that Japanese NS audience is well aware of the fictional character of such speakers, and such speech. However, only sporadic information is available on the actual abilities to infer the type of role portrayed by virtual speech styles (for both NS and NNS). One of the rare exceptions is Shukuri’s (2012) work which focuses on first person pronouns in “virtual Japanese”.²⁶

The most typical virtual features are associated with particular speaker first person pronouns, variants of the copula, and sentence-final interactional particles. Also many other features such as honorifics, Sino-Japanese words (*kango*), loanwords (*gairaigo*), interjections, laughter, pidgin-like expressions, accent, intonation, voice quality, and particular pragmatic and discourse features are listed in the research literature. This type of research culminates in a role language dictionary, which explains on more than 200 pages lexical items, morphosyntactic features and other expressions that are often linked to fictional characters (Kinsui 2014). Contrastive studies comparing Japanese and (translations into) Korean, Chinese, English, Spanish and Finnish, and reflections on role language in Japanese language education are other additions to the field (Kinsui 2011; Teshigawara and Kinsui 2011). A sub-field of role-language studies also looks at expressions

of non-human characters such as animals or hybrid human-animals (Akizuki 2012; Kawasaki 2015).

Translation, contrastive studies or Japanese language education are other areas, where “hidden” stereotypes incorporated in role language have been studied. Ōta (2009, 2017), for example, investigates how athletics superstar Usain Bolt’s “stardom” is reflected in the Japanese translations of his comments (e.g., tough masculine first person pronoun *ore* in edgy katakana) and how Japanese TV subtitles of interviews with foreign athletes reflect their expected roles in “Olympic Stories”. Although “role language” is a novel term, similar studies were carried out before the popularization of this field. Examples include dialect use by Japanese romantic heroines in the construction of “authentic femininity” (Shibamoto-Smith 2009), or the manipulation of honorifics in the construction of social identities in Japanese TV drama (Barke 2010). Translated Western heroines continue to speak *onna kotoba* (women’s language), reflecting a Japanese-inspired normative femininity, while Western youngsters resort to frank masculine *otoko kotoba* (male language), and black people are portrayed to speak “dialect”, reproducing thereby stereotypes and discriminatory images via translation (Nakamura 2013; Hiramoto 2009).

Japanese language users on the Internet and in social media constitute another area of research. How bloggers write, talk and present themselves to their audiences, how dialectal features and verbal styles are used in messaging, chatting and tweeting are areas that remain little developed at the moment.²⁷ Rather than approaching such phenomena as “varieties” or “registers” partaking in a “structural system”, Heinrich (2017: 221) offers an analysis how such “new presentations of self” by a new generation are now linked to “showing how things are done with words, by doing unexpected things with words, in order to change how things are done with words.” Analyzing these phenomena with the customary “first and second wave” sociolinguist’s toolkit will prove unsuccessful.

Japanese and its speakers in the future

For the most part, Japan is today an urban society. In such contexts new types of speakers and learners, various degrees of language ownership, poly- and translanguaging and crossing are widely observed. In such settings, the conceptual framework of “speech communities” is taking a backseat to “individual speakers”. Diverse groups of speakers are further diversifying, and as an effect sociolinguistic research has to zoom in on individual “linguistic repertoires” (Blommaert and Backus 2013). Such kind of research is not yet prominent in Japanese sociolinguistics. However, in Japan, too, the notion of “speaker” needs to be expanded in order to do justice to fluidity of urban,

globalized and digital life (cf. Nakane, Otsuji and Armour 2015; Pennycook and Otsuji 2010, 2014, 2015). Any overview of “speaker” needs to consider global communication and mobility, outcomes of personal and socio-political (power-related) histories traced over time, attempts at maintaining and revitalizing languages, efforts of adding or strengthening new languages to the existing repertoire, and how all of this intersects in some way or another with everyday language practices. Sociolinguistics needs to investigate who speaks what kind of Japanese, what it means to them to speak this way, and what they do with language in various local socio-cultural environments around the globe.

References

- Abe, Hideko (2004) Lesbian Bar Talk in Shinjuku, Tokyo. In: *Japanese Language, Gender, and Ideology. Cultural Models and Real People*. Shigeko Okamoto and Janet S. Shibamoto Smith (eds.), 421–55. New York: Oxford University Press.
- (2010) *Queer Japanese. Gender and Sexual Identities through Linguistic Practices*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Abe, Hideko Nōnesu (2014) Gei, onee, nyūhāfu no kotoba – danseigo to joseigo no aida [The Language of Gay, *onee*, New Half Speakers. Between Male and Female Language]. *Nihongogaku* 33(1): 44–59.
- Abe, Yasusi (2014) Gengo gakushū no yunibāsarū dezain [Universal Design for Language Learning]. *Nihongogaku* 9(33): 56–67.
- Adachi, Chie (2016) Sugoi! Indexicality and Stancetaking in Japanese Compliments. *Language in Society* 45(2): 193–216.
- Akizuki, Kōtarō (2012) Dōbutsu kyarakutā no gengogaku [The Language of Hybrid Human-animal Creatures]. *Research Reports of Shokei Gakuin College* 64: 43–57.
- Anderson, Mark and Patrick Heinrich (eds) (2014) *Language Crisis in the Ryukyus*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Arita, Eriko (2003) Japanese Discrimination against Korean and other Ethnic Schools. *The Asia-Pacific Journal Japan Focus* 1(4): 1–2. Online available at: <http://apjjf.org/-Eriko-ARITA/2137/article.pdf> (accessed 5 June 2018).

- Backhaus, Peter and Rie Suzuki (2010) Time to Get Up. Compliance Gaining in Japanese Institutional Eldercare. *Shakai gengo kagaku* 13(1): 48–57.
- Barke, Andrew (2010) Manipulating Honorifics in the Construction of Social Identities in Japanese Television Drama. Honorifics in Japanese Television Drama. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 14(4): 456–76.
- Blommaert, Jan and Ad Backus (2013) Superdiverse Repertoires and the Individual. In: *Multilingualism and Multimodality*. Ingrid de Saint-Georges and Jean-Jacques Weber (eds), 11–32. Rotterdam: Sense.
- The British Council (2013) *Languages for the Future. Which Languages the UK Needs Most and Why*. Online available at: <https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/languages-for-the-future-report.pdf> (accessed 16 June 2018).
- Bunkachō (2014) *Kokunai nihongo kyōiku gaiyō* [Overview of Japanese Language Education in Japan]. Online available at: http://www.bunka.go.jp/tokei_hakusho_shuppan/tokeichosa/nihongokyoiku_jittai/h26/pdf/h26_zenbun.pdf (accessed 24 May 2017).
- (2016) *Policy of Cultural Affairs in Japan. Fiscal 2016*. Online available at: http://www.bunka.go.jp/english/report/annual/pdf/2016_policy.pdf (accessed 7 June 2018).
- Carroll, Tessa (2010) Local Government Websites in Japan. International, Multicultural, Multilingual? *Japanese Studies* 30(3): 373–92.
- (2011) Japanese as an International Language. In: *Language Life in Japan. Transformations and Prospects*. Patrick Heinrich and Christian Galan (eds), 186–201. London: Routledge.
- Cary, Ann B. (2001) Affiliation, not Assimilation. Resident Koreans and Ethnic Education. In: *Studies in Japanese Bilingualism*. Mary Goebel Noguchi and Sandra Fotos (eds), 98–132. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Chiavacchi, David (2013) Integration and Exclusion of Minorities in Japan. A Comparison of Korean Residents and Nikkeijin. In: *Life Course and Life Style in Comparison*. Akira Tokuyasu, Makoto Kobayashi and Mototaka Mori (eds), 207–30. Tokyo: Hōsei University.
- Cook, Haruko Minegishi (2013) A Scientist or Salesman? Identity Construction through Referent Honorifics on a Japanese Shopping Channel Program. *Multilingua* 32(2): 177–202.
- Coulmas, Florian (2013) *Sociolinguistics. The Study of Speakers' Choices* (second edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dunn, Cynthia Dickel (2013) Speaking Politely, Kindly, and Beautifully. Ideologies of Politeness in Japanese Business Etiquette Training. *Multilingua* 32(2): 225–45.
- Eckert, Penelope (2012) Three Waves of Variation Study. The Emergence of Meaning in the Study of Sociolinguistic Variation. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41: 87–100.

- Endō, Orié (2006) *A Cultural History of Japanese Women's Language*. Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies.
- Frellesvig, Bjarke (2010) *A History of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fukushima, Saeko (2004) Evaluation of Politeness. The Case of Attentiveness. *Multilingua* 23(4): 365–87.
- Gagné, Isaac (2008) Urban Princesses. Performance and “Women’s Language” in Japan’s Gothic/Lolita Subculture. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 18(1): 130–50.
- Galan, Christian (2005) Learning to Read and Write in Japanese (*kokugo* and *nihongo*). A Barrier to Multilingualism? *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 175/176: 249–69.
- Gaimushō (2013) *Kaigai ni okeru nihongo no fukyū sokushin ni kansuru yūshikisha kondankai “saishū hōkokusho”* [Expert Panel on the Promotion of Japanese Language Abroad, “Final Report”]. Online available at: http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/press/release/press24_000013.html (accessed 10 June 2016).
- Geyer, Naomi (2013) Discernment and Variation. The Action-oriented Use of Japanese Addressee Honorifics. *Multilingua* 32(2): 155–76.
- Gottlieb, Nanette (2001) Language and Disability in Japan. *Disability & Society* 16(7): 981–95.
- (2005) *Language and Society in Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (ed.) (2011) *Language in Public Spaces in Japan*. London: Routledge.
- (ed.) (2012) *Language and Citizenship in Japan*. London: Routledge.
- Green, David (2014) Education of Foreign Children in Japan. Local versus National Initiatives. *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 15(3): 387–410.
- (2017) As its Population Ages, Japan Quietly Turns to Immigration. *Migration Information Source* (Migration Policy Institute). Online available at: <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/its-population-ages-japan-quietly-turns-immigration> (accessed 12 March 2018).
- Guilleux, Céline (2015) Nouveaux locuteurs dans l’Europe plurilingue du XXI^e siècle. *Calenda*. Online available at: <https://calenda.org/318429> (accessed 10 June 2016).
- Hankins, Joseph D. (2014) *Working Skin. Making Leather, Making a Multicultural Japan*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Hasegawa, Yoko (2015) *Japanese. A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hayashi, Makoto (2004) Discourse within a Sentence. An Exploration of Postpositions in Japanese as an Interactional Resource. *Language in Society* 33(3): 343–76.

- Heinrich, Patrick (2005) Language Ideology in JFL Textbooks. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 175/176: 213–32.
- (2012) *The Making of Monolingual Japan. Language Ideology and Japanese Modernity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- (2015a) Language Shift. In: *Handbook of the Ryukyuan Languages*. Patrick Heinrich, Shinsō Miyara and Michinori Shimoji (eds.), 613–30. Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- (2015b) The Study of Politeness and Women’s Language in Japan. In: *Globalising Sociolinguistics. Challenging and Expanding Theory*. Dick Smakman and Patrick Heinrich (eds.), 178–93. London: Routledge.
- (2017) New Presentations of Self in Everyday Life. Linguistic Transgressions in England, Germany and Japan. In: *Identity and Dialect Performance*. Reem Bassiouney (ed.), 381–407. London: Routledge.
- Heinrich, Patrick and Christian Galan (eds.) (2011) *Language Life in Japan. Transformations and Prospects*. London: Routledge.
- Heinrich, Patrick and Hidenori Masiko (2015) Japanese Sociolinguistics. A Critical Review and Outlook. In: *Contemporary Japan (Ca’ Foscari Japanese Studies)* 3: 249–66.
- Hibiya, Junko (1995) The Velar Nasal in Tokyo Japanese. A Case of Diffusion from Above. *Language Variation and Change* 7(2): 139–52.
- Hiramoto, Mie (2009) Slaves Speak Pseudo-Tōhoku-ben. The Representation of Minorities in the Japanese Translation of “Gone with the Wind”. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 13(2): 249–63.
- Hirataka, Fumiya, Atsuko Koishi and Yosuke Kato (2001) On the Language Environment of Brazilian Immigrants in Fujisawa City. In: *Studies in Japanese Bilingualism*. Noguchi, Mary G. and Sandra Fotos (eds.), 164–83. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hōmushō (2016) *Zairyū gaikokujin tōkei – kyū tōroku gaikokujin tōkei* [Statistics on Foreign National Residents. Former Statistics on Registered Foreigners]. Online available at: http://www.moj.go.jp/housei/toukei/toukei_ichiran_touroku.html (accessed 10 June 2016).
- Huzii, Konosuke (2005) Kankoku, chōsenjin [South-, North-Koreans]. In: *Nihon no tagengo shakai*. Shinji Sanada and Hiroshi Shōji (eds), 178–82. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- IALC (=International Association of Language Centres) (2016) *News. New Report Compares Current and Future Demand for Nine Foreign Languages*. Online available at: <http://www.ialc.org/news/201604-new-report-compares-current-and-future-demand-for-nine-foreign-languages.asp> (accessed 1 February 2018).
- Ide, Sachiko (1986) Introduction. The Background of Japanese Sociolinguistics. *Journal of Pragmatics* 10(3): 281–6.

- (1989) Formal Forms and Discernment. Two Neglected Aspects of Universals of Linguistic Politeness. *Multilingua* 8(2): 223–48.
- Ide, Sachiko, Motoko Hori, Akiko Kawasaki, Shoko Ikuta and Hitomi Haga (1986) Sex Difference and Politeness in Japanese. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 58: 25–36.
- Ikeda, Tomoko (2003) The Organization and Functions of Laughter in a Japanese Face-to-face Interaction. *Shakai gengo kagaku* 6(1): 52–60.
- Inoue, Fumio (1995) Nihongo kyōiku ni okeru shakai gengo gakuteki kiban [Sociolinguistics for Japanese Language Education]. *Monbushō kagaku kenkyūhi sōgō (A) kenkyū seika hōkokusho* [MEXT Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research, General (A), Report on Research Results].
- (2007) Changing Economic Values of German and Japanese. In: *Language Regimes in Transformation. Future Prospects for German and Japanese in Science, Economy and Politics*. Florian Coulmas (ed.), 95–113. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- (2008) *Shakai hōgengaku ronkō – shin-hōgen no kiban* [Papers in Social Dialectology. Foundations of New Dialect]. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.
- Inoue, Miyako (2002) Gender, Language, and Modernity. Toward an Effective History of Japanese Women’s Language. *American Ethnologist* 29(2): 392–422.
- Iwama Akiko (2007) Nihon ni okeru mainoriti [Minorities in Japan]. In: *Mainoriti to wa nani ka*. Akiko Iwama and Hyo-chong Yu (eds), 25–63. Kyoto: Minerva Shobō.
- Iwasaki, Shoichi (2013) *Japanese* (revised edition). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Japan Foundation (2010) *Nihongo e na, Portal for Learning Japanese*. Online available at: <http://nihongo-e-na.com/eng/> (accessed 10 January 2016).
- Japan Foundation (2012) *Japan Foundation Survey Report on Japanese-Language Education Abroad 2012*. Online available at: http://www.jpf.go.jp/j/project/japanese/survey/result/dl/survey_2012/2012_s_excerpt_e.pdf, (accessed 20 August 2016).
- (2016a) *2015 nendo “kaigai nihongo kyōiku kikan chōsa” kekka (sokuhō)*. [Survey on Japanese-Language Education Abroad 2015. Online available at: <http://www.jpf.go.jp/j/about/press/2016/dl/2016-057-1.pdf> (accessed 29 January 2017).
- (2016b) *About us*. Online available at: <http://www.jpf.go.jp/e/about/index.html> (accessed 29 January 2017).

- Jian, Yue Zhen and Shinji Sanada (2011) *Taiwan ni watatta nihongo no genzai – ringa furanka toshite no sugata* [The Present State of Japanese Language that Crossed Over to Taiwan. It's Status as Lingua Franca]. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.
- JSL Research Division (2009) National Research Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics. Online available at: <https://www.ninjal.ac.jp/english/organization/chart/jslrd/> (accessed 15 March 2017).
- Kakazu, Katsumi (2011) *Gurōbarizēshon to nihongo kyōiku seisaku* [Globalization and Japanese-Language Policy]. Tokyo: CoCo Shuppan.
- Kataoka, Kuniyoshi (1997) Affect and Letter-writing. Unconventional Conventions in Casual Writing by Young Japanese Women. *Language in Society* 26(1): 103–36.
- Katō Yoshitaka (2010) *Ibunka sesshoku bamen no intāakushon – nihongo bogo washa to nihongo hibogo washa no intāakushon kihan* [Interaction in Intercultural Contact Situations. Foundations for Japanese Native and Non-Native Speaker Interaction]. Tokyo: Tokyo University Press.
- Kawaguchi, Ryo and Fumiyuki Tsunoda (2005) *Nihongo wa dare no mono-ka* [Who Owns Japanese?]. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
- Kawakami, Ikuo (2012) Children Crossing Borders and their Citizenship in Japan. In: *Language and Citizenship in Japan*. Nanette Gottlieb (ed.), 79–97. London: Routledge.
- Kawasaki, Akemi (2015) Neko kyarakuta no yakuwarigo “nya” ni miru kyara gobi no shiyō [Use of “Role Language Suffix” “nya [meow]” in Feline Characters’ Role Language]. *Kanazawa Daigaku ningen shakaigakuiki keizaigakurui shakai gengogaku enshū* 10: 19–43.
- Kim, Miseon (2005) Zainichi kankoku-chōsenjin no gengo shiyō [Language Use of Resident South- and North-Koreans]. In: *Nihon no tagengo shakai*. Shinji Sanada and Hiroshi Shōji (eds), 213–8. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Kinsui, Satoshi (2007) “Yakuwarigo” kenkyū to shakai gengogaku no setten [Crossroads of Research on “Role Language” and Sociolinguistics]. Paper presented at the 19th Meeting of the Japanese Association of Sociolinguistic Sciences. Online available at: http://skinsui.cocolog-nifty.com/sklab/files/JASS19kinsui_paper.pdf (accessed 25 March 2017).
- (2011) Yakuwarigo to nihongo kyōiku. [Role Language and Teaching Japanese as a Foreign Language]. *Nihongo kyōiku* 150: 34–41.
- (ed.) (2014) *“Yakuwarigo” shōjiten* [Small Dictionary of “Role Language”]. Tokyo: Kenkyūsha.
- Kumagai, Yuri and Shinji Satō (eds.) (2011) *Shakai sankā o mezasu nihongo kyōiku* [Japanese Language Education for Social Participation]. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobō.

- Länsisalmi, Riikka (2016) Contents and Conceptualisation of Japanese Language Learning. “Charming” or “Arming” Learners? In: *Japanese Language Education in Europe* 21: 221–7.
- Moers: The Association of Japanese Teachers in Europe (AJE) and Associazione Italiana per la Didattica della Lingua Giapponese (AIDLG).
- Lauwereyns, Shizuka (2002) Hedges in Japanese Conversation. The Influence of Age, Sex, and Formality. *Language Variation and Change* 14(2): 239–59.
- Lee, Yeounsuk (2010) *The Ideology of Kokugo. Nationalizing Language in Modern Japan* (translated by Maki Hirano Hubbard). Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Long, Daniel (1996) Formation Processes of some Japanese Gay Argot Terms. *American Speech* 71(2): 215–24.
- (2003) The Unknown Linguistic Heritage of the Ogasawara (Bonin) Islands. Identity and Language Usage in a Japanese Minority Community. *Ogasawara Research* 29: 125–37.
- Long, Daniel, Sei’ichi Nakai and Hiroaki Miyaji (eds) (2001) *Ōyō shakai gengogaku o manabu hito no tame ni* [Introduction to Applied Sociolinguistics]. Tokyo: Sekai Shisōsha.
- Long, Daniel, Miseon Kim, Changsu Shin, Tien-shi Chen, Ichiro Miyamoto and Ellen Nakamizu (2002) Dai 8-kai kenkyū taikai wākushoppu – nihongo to tagengo no tsukaiwake [Workshop of the 8th Congress. Switching between Japanese and other Languages]. *Shakai gengo kagaku* 5(1): 145–50.
- Long Daniel and Keisuke Imamura (2013) *The Japanese Language in Palau*. Tokyo: National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics. Online available at: http://www.ninjal.ac.jp/research/project/a/creole/files/creole_Palau.pdf (accessed 15 June 2016).
- Loveday, Leo J. (1986). Japanese Sociolinguistics. An Introductory Survey. *Journal of Pragmatics* 10: 287–326.
- (1996) *Language Contact in Japan. A Socio-linguistic History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maher, John C. (2004) A Brief History of Pidgins and Creoles in Japan. *International Christian University publications I-A, Educational Studies* 46: 173–85.
- (2005) Metroethnicity, Language, and the Principle of Cool. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 175/176: 83–102.
- (2014) Reversing Language Shift and Revitalization. Ainu and the Celtic Languages. *Shakai gengo kagaku* 17(1): 20–35.
- Maree, Claire (2013) *Onee kotoba-ron*. [On onee Language] Tokyo: Seidosha.
- Matsuda, Kenjirō (1993) Dissecting Analogical Leveling Quantitatively. The Case of the Innovative Potential Suffix in Tokyo Japanese. *Language Variation and Change* 5(1): 1–34.

- Matsumoto, Yoshiko (2009) Beyond Stereotypes of Old Age. The Discourse of Elderly Japanese Women. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 200: 129–51.
- (2011) Painful to Playful. Quotidian Frames in the Conversational Discourse of Older Japanese Women. *Language in Society* 40(5): 591–616.
- Matsuo, Shin, Akiyoshi Kikuchi, J. F. Morris, Jo Matsuzaki, Ayako Uchinami-Koga, Yasusi Abe, Kazunari Iwata, Katsuichirō Nunō, Yufuko Takashima, Norie Oka, Rie Tejima and Ikuyo Morimoto (2013) Guaranteeing Equal Access to Information and Plain Japanese as a Means of Equal Participation for Everyone. *Shakai gengo kagaku* 16(1): 22–38.
- Maynard, Senko K. (1989) *Japanese Conversation. Self-Contextualization Through Structure and Interactional Management*. Norwood: Ablex.
- MEXT (=Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology) (2015a) *Gakkō ni okeru gaikokujin jidō seitora ni taisuru kyōiku shien ni kansuru yūshikisha kaigi – Heisei 27-nen 11-gatsu 5-nichi kara, dai 1-kai) gijiroku* [Support for Foreign Children and Pupils in Schools. Minutes of the First Expert Assembly 5 November 2015]. Online available at: http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chousa/shotou/121/gijiroku/1365291.htm (accessed 15 June 2017).
- (2015b) *Gaikokujin jidō seitora ni taisuru kyōiku shien ni kansuru kiso shiryō*. [Basic Information on Support for Foreign Children and Pupils in Schools]. Online available at: http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chousa/shotou/121/shiryō/_icsFiles/afiedfile/2015/12/22/1365267_01_1.pdf (accessed 15 June 2017).
- (2016a) *Nihongo nōryoku ga jūbun denai kodomotachi e no kyōiku ni tsuite* [About Education of Children Who Lack Sufficient Japanese Language Proficiency]. Online available at: <http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/singi/kyouikusaisei/dai35/sankou1.pdf> (accessed 15 June 2017).
- (2016b) *Clarinet e yōkoso* [Welcome to Clarinet (Children Living Abroad and Returnees Internet)]. Online available at: http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/clarinet/main7_a2.htm (accessed 5 June 2017).
- Meyerhoff, Miriam and James N. Stanford (2015) “Tings Change, All Tings Change”. The Changing Face of Sociolinguistics with a Global Perspective. In: *Globalising Sociolinguistics. Challenging and Expanding Theory*. Dick Smakman and Patrick Heinrich (eds), 1–15. London: Routledge.
- MHB (2016) *The Mother Tongue, Heritage Language, and Bilingual Education Research Association*. Online available at: <http://mhb.jp/> (accessed 17 January 2017).
- Miller, Laura (2004) Those Naughty Teenage Girls. Japanese *kogals*, Slang, and Media Assessments. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 14(2): 225–47.

- Miller, Laura (2011) Subversive Script and Novel Graphs in Japanese Girls' Culture. *Language & Communication* 31(1): 16–26.
- Miyajima, Tatsuo (1999) Gengo seisakushi kenkyū [On the History of Language Policy]. *Shakai gengo kagaku* 2(1): 82–8.
- Miyawaki, Hiroyuki (2005) Gaikokujin gakkō [Schools for Foreigners]. In: *Nihon no tagengo shakai* [Japan's Multilingual Society]. Shinji Sanada and Hiroshi Shōji (eds.), 128–31. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Miyazaki, Satoshi and Tetsuya Kimura (2014) Gimu kyōiku katei to kanren suru nihongo kyōiku seisaku [Japanese Language Education Policy and Compulsory Education]. *Waseda Daigaku daigakuin kyōshoku kenkyūka kiyō* 6: 29–40. Online available at: https://dspace.wul.waseda.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/2065/41313/1/KyoshokuKenkyukaKiyo_6_Miyazaki.pdf (accessed 1 June 2017).
- Mizumoto, Terumi (2015) *Jendā kara mita nihongo kyōikusho* [Japanese Language Education Materials: Gender Perspective]. Okayama: Daigaku Kyōiku Shuppan.
- Mori, Junko (2008) A Conversation Analytic Study of So-called “Cleft construction”. *No wa* clauses as preliminaries to preliminaries. *Shakai gengo kagaku* 10(2): 29–41.
- Mori, Yoshiko and Junko Mori (2011) Review of Recent Research (2000–2010) on Learning and Instruction with Specific Reference to L2 Japanese. *Language Teaching* 44(4): 447–84.
- Morita, Emi (2008) Functions of the Japanese Interactional Particle *ne* and its Socio-pragmatic Implications. *Shakai gengo kagaku* 10(2): 42–54.
- Mühlhäusler, Peter and Rachel Trew (2000) Japanese Language in the Pacific. *Shakai gengo kagaku* 3(1): 24–38.
- Murata, Kazuyo (ed.) (2015) *Kyōsei no gengogaku – jizoku kanōna shakai o mezahite* [Welfare-Linguistics. Toward a Sustainable Society]. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobō.
- Nakajima, Kazuko, Junko Tanaka and Jun'ya Morishita (2011) Keishōgo kyōiku bunken dētābēsu no kōchiku [Creation of Heritage Language Education Literature Database]. *Bogo, keishōgo, bairingarū kyōiku (MHB) kenkyū* 7: 1–23.
- Nakamizu, Ellen (2001) Imin kotoba [Immigrant Languages]. In: *Ōyō shakai gengogaku o manabu hito no tame ni* [Introduction to Applied Sociolinguistics]. Long, Daniel, Sei'ichi Nakai and Hiroaki Miyaji (eds.), 100–7. Tokyo: Sekai Shisōsha.
- (2005) Zainichi burajirujin no gengo shiyō [Language Use by Resident Brazilians]. In: *Nihon no tagengo shakai*. Shinji Sanada and Hiroshi Shōji (eds), 221–4. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Nakamura, Momoko (1995) *Kotoba to feminizumu* [Language and Feminism]. Tokyo: Keisō Shobō.
- (2001) *Kotoba to jendā* [Language and Gender]. Tokyo: Keisō Shobō.

- (2007) *Onna kotoba* [Women’s Language]. Tokyo: Hituzi Shobō.
- (2013) *Hon’yaku ga tsukuru nihongo. Hiroin wa “onna kotoba” o hanashi-tsuzukeru* [Japanese Language Created by Translation. Heroines Continue to Speak “Women’s Language”]. Tokyo: Gendai Shokan.
- Nakane, Ikuko, Emi Otsuji and Willam S. Armour (eds.) (2015) *Languages and Identities in a Transitional Japan*. London: Routledge.
- Nakata, Shion (2016) Sunakku ni okeru gengo komyunikēshon kenkyū – taijin kankei o chōsetsusuru sekkyaku gengo sutoratejī [Research on Linguistic Communication in “Snack Bars”. Language Strategies that Regulate Interpersonal Relationships with Customers]. PhD dissertation. Sōgō Kenkyū Daigakuin Daigaku.
- Nishihara, Suzuko (2015) Kokugo kyōiku to nihongo kyōiku no renkei no igi [The Significance of Links between “kokugo” (J1) and “nihongo” (J2/JFL) Education]. *Nihongogaku* 10(34): 2–10.
- Noguchi, Mary G. and Fotos, Sandra (eds.) (2001) *Studies in Japanese Bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Nuibe, Yoshinori (2007) “Nihongo kyōiku” no kenkyū dōkō to tenbō [Analysis of New Directions of Japanese Language Pedagogy]. *The Bulletin of Japanese Curriculum Research and Development* 30(1): 69–78.
- Ogino, Tsunao, Yasuko Misono and Chitsuko Fukushima (1985) Diversity of Honorific Usage in Tokyo. A Sociolinguistic Approach Based on a Field Survey. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 55: 23–39.
- Ogino, Tsunao (1986) Quantification of Politeness Based on the Usage Patterns of Honorific Expressions. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 58: 37–58.
- Ohtaki, Sachiko (2013) Asymmetry in Doctor-patient Communication. A Comparison between Japan and the USA. *Shakai gengo kagaku* 16(1): 80–95.
- Okada, Kesao (2006) *Edo igengo sesshoku – rango, tōwa to kindai nihongo* [Language Contact in Edo – Dutch, Chinese and Modern Japanese]. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin.
- Okamoto, Shigeko (2013) Variability in Societal Norms for Japanese Women’s Speech. Implications for Linguistic Politeness. *Multilingua* 32(2): 203–23.
- (2016) Variability and Multiplicity in the Meanings of Stereotypical Gendered Speech in Japanese. *East Asian Pragmatics* 1(1): 5–39.
- Okamoto, Shigeko and Janet S. Shibamoto-Smith (2004) *Japanese Language, Gender, and Ideology. Cultural Models and Real People*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2016) *The Social Life of the Japanese Language. Cultural Discourses and Situated Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Onodera, Noriko O. (2004) *Japanese Discourse Markers. Synchronic and Diachronic Discourse Analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ōta, Makie (2009) Usain Boruto no “I” wa, naze “ore” to yakusareru no ka – supōtsu hōsō no “yakuwarigo” [Why Is Usain Bolt’s “I” Translated as “ore” in Japanese? Role Language in Sports Broadcasting]. *Hōsō kenkyū to chōsa* 59(3): 56–73.
- (2017) Saikō orinpikku hōsō no “yakuwarigo” – nihonjin senshu o shujinkō toshita “monogatari” to iu shiten kara [“Role Language” Used in Olympic Broadcasts. Analyzing Japanese TV Subtitles for Foreign Athletes’ Interviews and their Expected Roles in “Olympic Stories”]. *Hōsō kenkyū to chōsa* 67(3): 26–45.
- Ōtsu Yukio (2005) Dai-ni gengo kyōiku [Second Language Education]. In: *Nihon no tagengo shakai*. Shinji Sanada and Hiroshi Shōji (eds.), 29–31. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Ozeki, Fumi (2013) *Kodomotachi wa itsu nihongo o manabu no ka – fukusū gengo kankyō o ikiru kodomo e no kyōiku* [How Do Children Learn Japanese? Language Education for Children in Plurilingual Settings]. Tokyo: CoCo Shuppan.
- Pennycook Alastair and Emi Otsuji (2010) Metrolingualism. Fixity, Fluidity and Language in Flux. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 7(3): 240–54.
- (2014) Metrolingual Multitasking and Spatial Repertoires. “Pizza mo two Minutes Coming”. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 18(2): 161–84.
- (2015) *Metrolingualism. Language in the City*. London: Routledge.
- Ryang, Sonia (ed.) (2000) *Koreans in Japan. Critical Voices from the Margin*. London: Routledge.
- Saitō, Keita (2015) Burajirujin shūjū chi’iki no ringa furanka – Gunma-ken Ōizumi-chō to Mie-ken Iga-shi no hikaku [Lingua Franca in Areas with High Concentrations of Brazilian Residents. A Comparative Study of Oizumi-Town and Iga-City]. *Nihongo kenkyū* 35: 43–57.
- Sanada, Shinji (ed.) (2006) *Shakai gengogaku no tenbō* [An Outlook on Sociolinguistics]. Tokyo: Kurosio.
- (2009) *Ekkyōshita nihongo – washa no “katari” kara* [Japanese that Crossed the Border – Speakers’ Stories]. Tokyo: Izumi Shoin.
- Sanada, Shinji, Naoki Ogoshi and Young Cheol Yim (2005) *Zainichi korian no gengosō* [Aspects of Resident Koreans’ Language]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Sanada, Shinji and Hiroshi Shōji (eds) (2005) *Nihon no tagengo shakai* [Japan’s Multilingual Society]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Sanada, Shinji, Daniel Long, Yoshiyuki Asahi and Yuehchen Chien (2010) *Shakai gengo gaku zushū* [Japanese Sociolinguistics Illustrated] (second edition). Tokyo: Akiyama Shoten.

- Sasaki, Yoshinori (2005) *Compilation, Publication and Online Distribution of Review Articles on Acquisition of Japanese as a Second Language*. Online available at: <http://www.dc.ocha.ac.jp/comparative-cultures/jle/saizensen/kaken02-04/> (accessed 29 June 2017).
- Satake, Kuniko (2005) “Onna kotoba, otoko kotoba” – kihan o meguru sengo no shinbun no gensetsu – kokken “kotoba ni kansuru shinbun kiji midashi dētābēsu” kara [The Discourse of Post-WW II Newspapers Involving “Women/Men Language” Norm. From the Database of Newspaper Articles Related to Language of the National Institute for Japanese Language]. *Handai nihongo kenkyū* 17: 111–37.
- Seibert Vaipae, Sharon (2001) Language Minority Students in Japanese Public Schools. In: *Studies in Japanese Bilingualism*. Mary G. Noguchi and Sandra Fotos (eds), 184–233. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Shibamoto, Janet S. (1987) Japanese Sociolinguistics. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 16: 261–78.
- (2009) The Green Leaves of Love. Japanese Romantic Heroines, Authentic Femininity, and Dialect. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 13(4): 524–46.
- Shibuya, Katsumi (2010) Imin gengo kenkyū no chōryū – nikkeijin nihongo henshu no gengo seitairon-teki kenkyū ni mukete [Current Trends in the Study of Immigrant Languages. Toward an Ecolinguistic Study of Nikkeijin Immigrant Varieties of Japanese]. *Machikaneyama ronsō* 44: 1–23.
- Shōji, Hiroshi, Peter Backhaus and Florian Coulmas (eds) (2009) *Nihon no gengo keikan* [Linguistic Landscapes of Japan]. Tokyo: Sangensha
- Shukuri, Yukiko (2012) Kyarakuta no taipu to yakuwarigo ni kansuru ishiki chōsa hōkoku – “watashitachi” taipu ni chūmoku shite [Investigation Report on Character Types and Role Language in Modern Japanese in the Real World. Focusing on “Watashitachi” Type]. *Gengo kagaku ronshū* 16: 85–96.
- Sibata, Takesi (1985) Sociolinguistic Surveys in Japan. Approaches and Problems. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 55: 79–88.
- Sibata, Takeshi, Fumio Inoue, Tetsuya Kunihiro and Daniel Long (1998) *Sociolinguistics in Japanese Contexts*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- SturtzSreetharan, Cindi (2004) Students, sarariiman (pl.), and Seniors. Japanese Men’s Use of Manly Speech Register. *Language in Society* 33(1): 81–107.
- (2006a) Gentlemanly Gender? Japanese Men’s Use of Clause-final Politeness in Casual Conversations. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 10(1): 70–92.
- (2006b) “I Read the Nikkei, too”. Crafting Positions of Authority and Masculinity in a Japanese Conversation. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 16(2): 173–93.

- Tagengoka Genshō Kenkyūkai (ed.) (2013) *Tagengo shakai nihon – sono genjō to kadai* [Japan as Multilingual Society. Present State and Tasks]. Tokyo: Sangensha.
- Tajima, Junko (2003) Chinese Newcomers in the Global City Tokyo. Social Networks and Settlement Tendencies. *International Journal of Japanese Sociology* 12(1): 68–78.
- Takahara, Kimiko (1991) Female Speech Patterns in Japanese. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 92: 61–85.
- Takagi, Chie (2016) Shakai gengo, gengo seikatsu [Language and Society, Language Life]. *Nihongo no kenkyū, tokushū* 2(3): 91–8.
- Takagi, Hiroyuki, Katsumi Shibuya and Yoko Iyeiri (eds) (2015) *Rekishi shakai gengogaku nyūmon* [Introduction to Historical Sociolinguistics]. Tokyo: Taishūkan.
- Takano, Shoji (1998) A Quantitative Study of Gender Differences in the Ellipsis of the Japanese Postpositional Particles *wa* and *ga*. Gender Composition as a Constraint on Variability. *Language Variation and Change* 10(3): 289–323.
- Takano, Shoji (2000) The Myth of a Homogeneous Speech Community. A Sociolinguistic Study of the Speech of Japanese Women in Diverse Gender Roles. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 146: 43–85.
- Takase, Yutaka, Takashi Yoshino and Yukiko I. Nakano (2017) Taninsū kaiwa ni okeru chōsei kainyū kinō o yūsuru taiwa robotto [Conversational Robot with Conversation Coordination and Intervention Functionality in Multi-party Conversations]. *Jōhō shori gakkai ronbunshi* 58(5): 967–80.
- Tanaka, Hiroko (2001) Adverbials for Turn Projection in Japanese. Toward a Demystification of the Telepathic Mode of Communication. *Language in Society* 30(4): 559–87.
- (2005) Grammar and the Timing of Social Action. Word Order and Preference Organization in Japanese. *Language in Society* 34(3): 389–430.
- Tanaka, Riina (2013) Nihongo kyōiku ni okeru “neitibu/nonneitibu” gainen [Concepts “Native” and “Non-native” in Japanese Language Education]. *Gengo bunka kyōiku kenkyū* 11: 95–111.
- Teshigawara, Mihoko and Satoshi Kinsui (2011) Modern Japanese “Role Language” (*yakuwarigo*). Fictionalised Orality in Japanese Literature and Popular Culture. *Sociolinguistic Studies* 5(1): 37–58.
- Tranter, Nicolas (2008) Nonconventional Script Choice in Japan. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 192: 133–51.
- Tomosada, Kenji and Masataka Jinnouchi (2004) On the Diffusion of the Kansai Dialect and the Kansai Way of Speaking among Youth in Japan. *Shakai gengo kagaku* 7(1): 84–91.

- Tomozawa, Akie (2001) Japan's Hidden Bilinguals. The Languages of "War Orphans" and their Families after Repatriation from China. In: *Studies in Japanese Bilingualism*. Mary G. Noguchi and Sandra Fotos (eds), 133–63. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Toyohashi City (2016) *Nihongo shidō. Nihongo shidō ga hitsuyōna jidōseito* [Japanese Language Assistance. Children and Pupils Requiring Japanese Language Assistance]. Online available at: <http://www.gaikoku.toyohashi.ed.jp/kyouikunotebiki/4nihongo.pdf> (accessed 16 June 2017).
- Tsuji, Kayoko (2002) A Diachronic Study of *haru-keigo* in the Kyoto City Dialect Female Speech. Focusing on Treatment Expressions Referring to a Third Person. *Shakai gengo kagaku* 5(1): 28–41.
- Usami, Mayumi (2002) *Discourse Politeness in Japanese Conversation. Some Implications for a Universal Theory of Politeness*. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobō.
- (2008) Frontiers of Studies on Politeness Theories. New Trends in Politeness Studies and Discourse Politeness Theory. *Shakai gengo kagaku* 11(1): 4–22.
- (2015) On Styles in Japanese Language. Focusing on "Speech-Level Shift" in Japanese Conversation. *Shakai gengo kagaku* 18(1): 7–22.
- Usami, Yō (2012) "Shakai" bun'ya ["Society" as a Field of Study]. *Nihongo kyōiku* 53: 55–70.
- Yamamoto, Masayo (2001) Japanese Attitudes towards Bilingualism. A Survey and its Implications. In: *Studies in Japanese Bilingualism*. Mary G. Noguchi and Sandra Fotos (eds), 24–44. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Yamazaki, Kei'ichi (2011) Soshiaru robotto to shakai gakuteki kenkyū – esunogurafī, kaiwa bunseki, esunomesodorōjī [Social Robots and Sociological Research. Ethnography, Conversation Analysis, Ethnomethodology]. *Nihon robotto gakkaiishi* 29(1): 10–13.
- Yasuda, Toshiaki (2004) Gakumon to gakumon no aida – kokugogaku to nihongogaku [Between Disciplines. Research on Japanese National Language and Japanese]. *Hitotsubashi ronshō* 131(4): 337–54
- Yim, Young Cheol (2001) Nihongo fukyū seisaku – senzen, kaigai [Policy for Spreading Japanese, Pre-WWII, Overseas]. In: *Ōyō shakai gengogaku o manabu hito no tame ni*. Daniel Long, Sei'ichi Nakai and Hiroaki Miyaji (eds), 193–200. Tokyo: Sekai Shisōsha.
- Yoshinaga, Mioko (2015) Nihongo kyōiku to "yasashisa" – nihonjin ni yoru nihongo no manabinaoshi [Japanese Language Education and "Easiness". Japanese People Relearning Japanese]. In: *Kotoba no "yasashisa" to wa nani ka. Hihanteki shakai gengogaku kara no apurōchi* [What Makes Languages Easy? An Approach from Critical Sociolinguistics]. Mioko Yoshinaga and Hitoshi Yamashita (eds), 19–43. Tokyo: Sangensha.
- Yoshioka, Yasuo (2004) Regional and Generational Variation of Politeness Observed in Communication Consciousness and Honorific Behaviour. Comparison of Native Speakers from Metropolitan Areas and Osaka. *Shakai gengo kagaku* 7(1): 92–104.

¹ In a translator's note to Lee (2010: xiv) Hirano Hubbard explains that the expression "Japanese language" in English corresponds to the Japanese terms *nihongo* and *kokugo*. Symbolic of the nation-state (*kokka*), *kokugo*, including its history and nationalistic connotations with "our language" and development as a scholarly discipline have been widely discussed (e.g., Nishihara 2015; Yasuda 2004). See Galan (2005) on learning how to read and write in Japanese.

² "Historical speakers" are not discussed here. For overviews, see Takagi, Shibuya and Iyeiri (2015); Frellesvig (2010); Okada (2006).

³ The Agency for Cultural Affairs (Bunkachō 2016: 58) categorizes its policies related to the Japanese language under the headings "Japanese-language policy" and "Japanese-language education policy", the former covering mainly issues pertaining to L1 Japanese and the latter to those relevant to "Japanese language education for foreigners". It has surveyed the "current status and efforts for the preservation and succession" of Ainu, Hachijo, and the Ryukyuan languages.

⁴ The concept of "native speaker" has been discussed widely elsewhere (e.g., Meyerhoff and Stanford 2015).

⁵ *Kokugo* usually refers to Japanese mother tongue education at school. *Kōyōgo* is the de facto Japanese in use. If Japanese is contrasted with other languages, the term *nihongo* is used.

⁶ For overviews in Japanese sociolinguistics, past and present, see Heinrich and Masiko (2015); Ide (1986); Loveday (1986); Sanada (2006); Sibata (1985); Sibata et al. (1998); Shibamoto (1987).

⁷ In her study of western middle- and upper-class residential Yamanote and eastern lower-middle class and blue-collar Shitamachi Hibiya (1995) shows that change and variation pertaining to velar plosive have been particularly influenced by the extralinguistic factors of age and contact with the socio-economically more affluent Yamanote.

⁸ Satake (2005) examined discourses on male and female language norms in post-war Japanese newspapers. The majority of comments showed concern about an increasing masculinization, neutralization, or increased "roughness" of language use by women.

⁹ The latter are usually "characterized in terms of a set of specific linguistic forms involving features such as self-reference and address terms, sentence-final forms, and honorifics, and also in terms of general stylistic features such as politeness, gentleness, and refinement (for *joseigo*) and forcefulness, decisiveness, and roughness (for *danseigo*)" (Okamoto 2016: 10–11).

¹⁰ "[O]nabe refers, not to female homosexuals in general (*rezu* 'lesbian' serves this function), but specifically to a 'lesbian who dresses and acts like a man' (cf. English nouns *butch*, *passing woman*, or *dyke*)" (Long 1996: 216).

¹¹ The Clarinet site (Children Living Abroad and Returnees Internet) includes a lengthy manual on *Dialogic Language Assessment For Japanese as a Second Language* (MEXT 2016b).

¹² The *burakumin*, estimated to number circa three million people, are ethnically Japanese. They "remain – albeit less now than formerly – victims of status discrimination" (Gottlieb 2001: 983).

¹³ Imperial expansion during the colonial period 1905–1945 brought with it an influx of Korean, Chinese, and Taiwanese immigrants to Japan referred to as *zainichi*.

¹⁴ "For half a century, Japan has permitted ethnic minorities, notably Koreans, to run their own schools while refusing to recognize these schools' graduates by denying their students the right to sit for entrance examinations

at national universities. The controversy has centered above all on the rights of graduates of pro-North Korean schools.” (Arita 2003: 1)

¹⁵ See also Long’s (2003) publication on the linguistic heritage of the Ogasawara (Bonin) Islands.

¹⁶ See Kawaguchi and Tsunoda (2005) on language ownership. In English-language literature “new speakers”, as opposed to “traditional speakers” is conventionally employed in the context of minority languages, particularly when discussing language endangerment, maintenance and revitalization.

¹⁷ The Ministry of Justice currently puts the number of illegal residents at 60,000 (Hōmushō 2015).

¹⁸ One example from Toyohashi City (2016: 53), Aichi Prefecture, schematically describes how an individual study path, stretching from the first six months to two years and beyond, can be composed of “survival”, “basic” and “skill-specific” Japanese. This is supplemented by learning Japanese through other school subjects and extra support in them. The Japanese writing system receives some treatment in the instructions, but they also point out that it is difficult to learn to write kanji characters during the time reserved for Japanese language guidance. Thus assigning daily kanji writing homework or other additional measures of “support” for non-kanji background pupils is necessary (Toyohashi City 2016: 57).

¹⁹ For example the Castanet site includes a collection of extra learning materials in twelve languages for a number of school subjects such as maths, society, *kokugo* and *nihongo*. Furthermore, guidelines and tools to help implement special Japanese as a Second Language (JSL) curricula in various subjects have been developed for primary and middle school, and senior high schools in some prefectures have special quota for returnees and foreign students.

²⁰ More than 20,000 students are enrolled in some 200 *gaikokujin gakkō*, i.e., Korean, (English-language) international school, Brazilian, Peruvian, Chinese and other ethnic schools. The School Education Act recognizes no more than a handful of these schools, whilst about 120 are accredited as “miscellaneous schools” or “quasi-incorporated educational institutions”. The rest of the schools are unaccredited (Miyawaki 2005).

²¹ NINJAL’s JSL Research Division (2009) defines its scope as follows. “In addition to producing purely linguistic descriptions and analyses, it also seeks to clarify the nature of social and cultural problems that non-native learners are likely to face in the process of adjusting themselves to Japanese society.”

²² Whilst some surveys on the current and future demand for foreign languages now rank Chinese highest, followed by English, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian and Spanish (IALC 2016), others exclude Japanese from the category of the most useful languages when estimated on economic terms. The British Council (2013), to name an example, now ranks Japanese in tenth place, but it is no longer specifically listed as a language needed for economic purposes, neither for cultural, educational and diplomatic ones.

²³ A *Portal for Learning Japanese* maintained by the Japan Foundation, *Nihongo e na* (2016), currently lists over 350 links to online sites for learners and teachers of Japanese, and dozens of applications for mobile devices exist.

²⁴ See Mizumoto (2015) on gender, Heinrich (2005) on language ideology in Japanese language learning materials, Kinsui (2011) on role language by Japanese language learners, and Abe (2014) on “universal design” in language learning. Inoue (1995, 2008) notes that Japanese language education does not yet incorporate sociolinguistic perspectives and proposes that it should include attention to variation and discourse.

²⁵ Speech recognition and research and development of social and chat robots are thriving fields in Japan (see Takase, Yoshino and Nakano 2017; Yamazaki 2011).

²⁶ Shukuri (2012) reports that for example the first person pronoun *watashi* used by male characters was associated to gay language by NS but to polite language by NNS.

²⁷ See *vācharu hōgen* “virtual dialect”, *nise hōgen* (“fake dialect”), etc. Okamoto and Shibamoto-Smith (2016: 67–68) note that it is “necessary to place changes in dialect representations in media texts against a non-mediatized social shift.”