Edith Cowan University

Research Online

1-1-1999

Conversational code-switching among Japanese-English bilinguals who have Japanese background

Yoshiko Morishima
Edith Cowan University

USE OF THESIS

The Use of Thesis statement is not included in this version of the thesis.

Conversational Code-switching among Japanese-English

Bilinguals who have Japanese Background

by

Yoshiko Morishima

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Award of

Master of Arts (Applied Linguistics)

at the Faculty of Community Services, Education and Social Sciences
Edith Cowan University, Mount Lawley Campus

Date of Submission: 20 December 1999

Abstract

The aim of this study is to investigate the code-switching of native speakers of Japanese in an English-speaking context. The languages involved in code-switching therefore are English and Japanese. This is an instance of communication in the participants' first language, in a setting where the speakers' second language is dominant.

The research focused on a sample of twelve Japanese people. These participants were born in Japan, and their parents' native language is Japanese. Even though the length of time each has spent in residence in an English-speaking country varies, the minimum is two years. Further, all have previously studied English, for at least six years, during the high school period in Japan, and are regular users of English.

These participants were separated into six pairs of two age groups. The first was 20-30 years, the second was 40-60 years. Their informal conversation was recorded and transcribed for analysis. Moreover, a sociolinguistic interview was carried out in order to uncover the participants' intentions or strategies, (based primarily on their own interpretations), with regard to code-switching.

Despite a large number of loan words in the Japanese language (most deriving from English), and the prestigious status which the English language holds, Japanese people within Japanese society, tend to hold a negative attitude towards code-switching in conversational circumstances. In this study, however, code-switching was found to be a significant choice in the speakers' linguistic repertoire (in the English-speaking context) for informal interactions with their friends. Although there was some degree of constraints on the speakers' linguistic choices, primarily attributable to a particular topic and attitudes towards code-switching, the speakers demonstrated their ability to make a linguistic choice according to their intentions/ strategies.

Moreover, this study attempted to expose the linguistic features of English/Japanese code-switching. The type of code-switching which was most frequently used amongst the participants was intrasentential code-switching (which occurs within the same sentence). Specifically, singly occurring intrasentential code-switching was the most common amongst the speakers. It was found that the Japanese language played a dominant role in producing this type of code-switching. On the other hand, well-formed English phrases were also produced in intrasentential code-switching when there is a semantic/pragmatic mismatch between the two languages.

Declaration

I certify that this thesis does not, to the best of my knowledge and belief:

(i)   incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any institution of higher education;

(ii) contain any material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the text; or

(iii) contain any defamatory material.

Signature_____

Date_____ 20 December 1994

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my gratitude to my family, especially to my father whom without his support I would not have been able to carry out this thesis.

I wish to thank my supervisor Professor Ian G. Malcolm for his precious hints and suggestions on how to conduct this thesis.

Finally I wish to express my thanks to all the participants for their willingness and unremitting patience in participating to the survey.

Contents

List of Tables

List of Symbols

ABL	ablative
ACC	accusative
CAUS	causative
CONJ	conjunctive
COP	copula
DAT	dative
DESI	desiderative
FP	final particle
GEN	genitive
HON	honorific
INTERRO	interrogative
NEG	negative
NOM	nominative
NOMI	nominalizer
PASS	passive
PAST	past
PL	plural
POTEN	potential
PROG	progressive
TOP	topic

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Background to the Study

Generally, there is a negative perception amongst Japanese people with regard to code-switching in the monolingual setting. However, in the bilingual context, where, for example, there is a Japanese community residing in an English-speaking country, such attitudes have the potential to change. That is, a bilingual setting offers the speaker the opportunity to code-switch, and to display their available repertoire and communicative intent. Engaging in code-switching then may be dependent upon the speaker's linguistic repertoire, communicative intent, and language attitudes, as well as certain external factors.

In many multilingual communities, speakers sometimes introduce the alternate use of more than one language into the same conversation. In general, the speakers may be more proficient in one language than the other; the main condition which needs to be fulfilled is that the speakers must have the ability to produce monolingual utterances in either language. Consequently, these speakers are capable of switching language according to a variation in situation, such as the change of interlocutor, topic, or other major factors in the interaction. Moreover, this practice can be employed to achieve a greater sense of clarity and meaning in the conversation.

The units and locations of switches may vary widely. They may range from single word switches, to whole phrases and clauses. These switched units can be mixed with another language within a single sentence, or can take place at a clause or sentence boundary. This process is called code-switching.

Code-switching can be defined as an "alternation of linguistic varieties within the same conversation" (Myers-Scotton, 1995a, p1). Thus, code-switching can conceivably be any alternation between language varieties, including a switch between a standard variety, and non-standard variety, within the same language. In this paper, I shall deal with code-switching as the alternating use of two languages (Japanese and English) by bilingual speakers in the same sentence or conversation. In particular, this study will focus on code-switching as it is presented by Japanese-English bilinguals who have the capacity to communicate effective meaning as outlined above.

Despite the fact that many scholars have discussed the issue of the alternation between two or more languages (both within sentences and between sentences), there has been a lack of mutual agreement with regard to terminology. Terms such as 'code-switching', without hyphen 'codeswitching', 'code-mixing', 'codemixing', and sometimes 'codeshifting', have been employed by researchers in the academic literature. For instance, in Gibbons' studies (1983, 1987) of code-choice among English/Cantonese bilingual students in Hong Kong, the term

2

'code-mixing' is used to represent the language-mixing phenomenon in purely sociolinguistic terms. On the other hand, Bokamba (1988) articulates a more precise definition of 'code-mixing' and 'code-switching', in his investigation of the Bantu language, preferring to take a linguistic point of view. He states that 'code-mixing' is the appropriate term referring to an alternation within one sentence, whilst 'code-switching' is used to define the alternation between whole sentences. In fact, the two types of alternation are often classified by some scholars as intra-sentential codeswitching (the alternation within the single sentence), and inter-sentential codeswitching (the alternation between sentences). Since scholars do not agree on whether it is necessary to denote intra-sentential codeswitching as 'code-mixing' and inter-sentential codeswitching as 'code-switching', the terminologies can be used interchangeably (Jacobson, 1998, p52). In this study, the terms intra-sentential codeswitching, and inter-sentential codeswitching, refer to the alternation within a sentence and the alternation between sentences respectively. Moreover, 'codeshifting' can be defined, as Jacobson (1998, p52) has done, as the "kind of switch that occurs between varieties of the same language or dialects, geographic as well as social."

Furthermore, there has been much debate, and controversy, surrounding the distinguishing of 'code-switching' from 'borrowing'. However, my analysis will follow Myers-Scotton's (1995a, 1997) definitions of borrowing. 'Borrowing' can be classified into two types. They are *core borrowing* and *cultural*

3

borrowing. Core borrowed lexemes are understood as "concepts or objects already covered by the recipient language" (Myers-Scotton, 1997, p228). Core borrowing emerges from the code switching process. The borrowed elements begin their life as code switched items, and over a period at time, they evolve from being codeswitched forms to being established core borrowings. Cultural borrowings, on the other hand, do not begin as code switched items. Rather, they enter the recipient language abruptly, filling the lexical gap where there is no equivalent. The identification of 'code-switching' and 'borrowing' was determined in this study through an interview by the researcher, based on the transcription of each participant's conversation. This was done because each individual has a different repertoire of core borrowings.

Studies involving code-switching have been undertaken amongst various pairs of languages in the field of linguistics. Much of this research has been carried out on languages belonging to the Indo-European family. For example, Spanish/English bilinguals have been studied, particularly in the United States (e.g. Poplack 1980, 1988, Woolford 1983, and Jacobson 1990). Code-switching between Finnish and English has been studied by Poplack (1990). Alsatian/French amongst migrants (Bokamba, 1987), and Dutch/French speakers of different ages in Brussels (Treffers-Daller, 1992). Heller (1988a) has studied English/French bilinguals in both Montreal and Toronto. Italian migrants in French speaking and German speaking Switzerland,

4

have also been studied by Serra (1998) and Franceschini (1998) respectively.

Others have focused on code-switching between African and European languages. For instance, Blommaert (1992) studied Swahili/English code-switching. Swigart (1992) studied code-switching between Wolof and French in Senegal. Myers-Scotton (e.g. 1995a) has studied English/Shona and English/Swahili code-switching in Africa. Moreover, code-switching between Indian languages, and between Indian languages and English has been investigated (Kachru 1978, Naval 1989, and Pandit 1990).

Recently, researchers have also carried out studies on non-Indo-European languages, such as Turkish/German (Treffers-Daller 1998, Boeschoten 1998), Turkish/Danish (Jorgensen, 1998), and Hebrew/English (Maschler, 1998). Pilipino and English has also been studied by Marasigan (1983), Pascasio (1984) and Bautista (1991). Researchers such as Jacobson (1998) and Pandharipande (1998) have done contrastive studies in code-switching. In their studies, they employed two language pairs - Spanish/English and Marathi/Sanskrit (two genetically closer languages), and Malay/English and Marathi/English (both being distant languages). Code-switching between Japanese and English, a language pair which is regarded as being genetically distant, has also been studied by Nishimura (e.g. 1995, 1997) and Azuma (1996).

1.2 Significance of the Study

This study has three areas of primary significance: to investigate specifically the code-switching of native speakers of Japanese in the context of an English-speaking country; to find the relationship between code-switching behaviour, that is the way a speaker actually uses codeswitching in the course of conversation, and the attitude they hold toward code-switching; and to bring together the pragmatic and linguistic perspectives in order to give fuller account of the code-switching phenomenon.

The study of Japanese/English code-switching has previously been undertaken by some researchers (e.g. Nishimura, 1995, 1997; Azuma, 1996). Nishimura's studies have dealt with code-switching among second generation Japanese people living in Toronto, Canada. In her studies, three bilingual patterns (the 'basically Japanese' variety, the 'basically English' variety, the 'mixed' variety) have been found. These result from the language choices which the speakers make, depending upon their interlocutor(s). Her study (1995) has demonstrated the function of code-switched elements as presented by her subjects, within in-group speech, based on the three bilingual varieties. Nishimura's later study (1997) was centred more on linguistic aspects, and showed freely mixed Japanese and English elements between sentences, as well as within a single sentence, on the basis of the 'mixed' variety. These investigations, however, ignore the significance of the study of Japanese/English code-switching among native speakers of Japanese.

On the other hand, Azuma (1996) dealt with Japanese people speaking English in the U.S., in his elicitation experiment which focused on 'constraint-by-constraint' processing. His subjects were initially asked to speak on a given topic. Then, when they heard a tone (given at intervals between 8 and 12 seconds) they were directed to switch languages immediately. He claimed that his study presented evidence to prove that Japanese/English code-switching occurs at the word level. Therefore, switches take place between constituents. However, these findings have to be interpreted in light of the fact that the data did not derive from a social or natural setting. This current research sets out to study the switching of languages in a natural and informal situation.

Other studies have concentrated on code-switching among Asian bilinguals (e.g. Milroy and Li Wei, 1995; Li Wei, 1995; Yoon, 1996). For example, Li Wei (1995) studied variations in patterns of language choice and code-switching among Chinese/English speakers (including both first and second generation) from three different groups within the Tyneside Chinese community in Britain. He found that particular patterns exist based on social norms and values which cut across the three groups. That is, the speakers of a given network developed particular patterns of code choice or code-switching. Li Wei's study identified the social norms of the community to which the speakers belong as a determinant of code-switching. Li Wei's study however does not take into account the fact that

individual speakers themselves can also step outside of the 'normative' linguistic choice. In other words, the individual's strategies or intentions in making choices has not been considered.

Unlike Li Wei's study, Yoon's (1996) research explored the function of code choice in specific situations among Korean-English bilinguals who are first generation and American-born. He examined speakers' code choice, and code-switching, in accordance with the type of social relationship which existed between the interlocutors. The study revealed that the more distant the relationship, the more likely it is that the speakers will choose either to use English, or employ a higher frequency of code-switching. He concluded that in the case of Korean-English bilinguals, code choice and code-switching operates to indicate social relationships. Nonetheless, it seems that Yoon's study has only emphasised, on the whole, the discourse mode, and gives little attention to the most significant component in the study of code-switching at the micro level, that is, individual switches.

This present study takes into account some of the limitations evident in these investigations. Firstly, these all deal with either social or linguistic constraints. They do not take into account the fact that the speakers maintain the ability to make their own individual linguistic choices, despite the speech communities' normative social constraints. This study attempts to account for when (in terms of social factors), and why (in

terms of strategies and intentions) native speakers of Japanese engage in code-switching within a particular - that is English-speaking - language context. Furthermore, none of these studies take into account the individual speakers' attitudes toward code-switching. A second feature of the above studies is that they have all focused upon the much more established either first or second-generation migrant communities. This present study however differs, in that the subjects include exclusively first generation and temporary resident native speakers of Japanese.

'Linguistic choice' or 'code choice' is determined to some extent by the social context as well as the speakers' own choice. 'Linguistic choice' or 'code choice' refers to selections at all linguistic levels, among available alternates. For instance, the selection of one language rather than another, one dialect over another, and one style or register over another (Myers-Scotton, 1997, p176). In the linguistic choice process, two major factors are involved - these are external and internal. External factors include such things as the speaker's social identity (for example, age, sex, socioeconomic status etc), as well as certain features which play a role in shaping the general conversation (setting, topic etc). External factors themselves do not determine the speaker's choice, however these social elements do set the opportunity for the speaker to utilise their own available repertoire. In contrast, the internal factors can be understood as comprising the speaker's social norms, which govern

permissible linguistic choices. However, at the same time the speakers come to make their own choices as a means to achieve their goals (Myers-Scotton 1998a, p30).

The initial stage in the present research, therefore, focuses on the 'external factors', in an effort to explore certain aspects of Japanese/English code-switching, such as its frequency in accordance with certain components (i.e., topic and the gender of the interlocutors). The second stage of the research involves investigating each individual's communicative intent/strategies, and their attitudes towards both Japanese and English, and code-switching. This should reveal any relationships which exist between these factors, the units and locations of switches, and the functions that code-switching performs among Japanese/English bilinguals.

In the past, researchers have primarily focused on either one or the other aspect of code-switching. That is, through the sociolinguistic approach, or the linguistic approach. However, most of the recent studies, which have been carried out (e.g. Boeschoten 1998, Haust and Dittmar 1998, Rindler Schjerve 1998), have seen the value in combining the two approaches. Romaine (1995, p177), for example, argues that "Further research on code-switching must try to bring together the linguistic and pragmatic perspectives". This is because the character of code-switching is determined by two factors. Firstly, different speech communities display unique patterns of code-switching which are shaped by specific social forces.

Second, these patterns are constrained by certain grammatical limitations (Myers-Scotton 1998b, p91). These two aspects interact to produce variation within code-switching. This present research also conforms to this current theoretical trend, and attempts to apply it to the study of Japanese/English code-switching.

1.3 Purpose and Research Questions of the Study

Two factors are taken as primary constraints for the occurrence for code-switching in this sample. First are the social conditions, that is, the topic of conversation, and the gender of the interlocutors. The second factor that is taken into account is the attitude toward the practice of code-switching that each individual holds. Moreover, this study brings together the pragmatic and linguistic perspectives, in order to give a fuller account of the code-switching phenomenon. This research therefore considers the structural principles exhibited in code-switching in the community being studied. An examination of the linguistic form of the matrix language frames and the embedded language switches derived from this study's data provides support for the hypotheses put forward by Myers-Scotton's Matrix Language Frame model.

This study addresses, in respect to Japanese native speakers conversing in Japanese in an English-speaking social setting, the following questions:

1. Is the presence, or absence, of code-switching, or its frequency of occurrence, subject to variation related to certain components of the speech event (i.e., topic and the gender of the interlocutor)?

2. What communicative functions does code-switching accomplish in the course of the interactions?

3. In what ways does the occurrence, or non-occurrence, of code-switching relate to

   a) The speaker's attitudes towards both Japanese, English, and code-switching,

   b) The speaker's recalled communicative intent/strategies?

4. What linguistic features characterise switched items and the environments in which they are embedded?

Chapter 2

Prevailing Linguistic Condition in Japan

This chapter concerns itself solely with the Japanese language and bilingualism (in particular, the impact of English, and the attitudes towards its incorporation into the contemporary Japanese language) within Japanese society alone. Of course these attitudes do not necessarily represent those held by the twelve participants taking part in this study, however this summary will provide information with regard to the attitudes and values that these participants would all probably have been socialised into.

2.1 Japan as a Monolingual Country

Japan is thought to be both culturally and linguistically homogeneous (Maher 1995a, Maher and Kawanishi 1995). It could be said that even though significant ethnic minorities exist in Japanese societies, the Japanese language shows almost complete dominance over the entire population. Japan also has a literacy rate coming close to 100% (Maher and Yashiro, 1995, p3). With a minimum of opportunity for language contact, it is clear that societal bilingualism does not exist to any significant degree. The relatively small number of non-Japanese can be calculated, according to Fremy and Fremy (1993, p1025), at - Korean 0.64%, Chinese 0.14%, and others (e.g. Brazilians 0.05, Filipinos 0.05). The majority of those mentioned above are ethnically Korean, yet have lived in Japan for generations, and speak

Japanese as their first language. On the basis of these facts then, the conclusion could be drawn that Japan is overtly homogeneous in cultural and linguistic terms, the common phrase 'one race, one language' has thus been coined to express the supposed 'purity' of Japanese society.

2.2 Japan's Historical Multilingualism

Nevertheless, this has not always been the case. An analysis of Japan's historical experience would soon uncover, especially prior to the most intense periods of modernisation, a former linguistically multi-structured society. Maher (1995a, p104) explains that the earliest recorded existence of this can be found in the introduction of the Chinese writing system and Chinese literature. This enriched the Japanese vocabulary. Until that time, Japanese did not have a written form (about the 4th century) and therefore, Chinese characters (called kanji in Japanese) were used to write the language. Chinese was not only used in official documentation, but also creative literature and religious texts. By the 9th century two syllabaries, Katakana and Hiragana were developed from them. Since then, a combination of kanji and kana has been used for written Japanese. Appropriating Chinese elements, and then incorporating them into the Japanese languages has created the diglossic phenomenon which can be observed even today. That is a relatively stable language situation (Ferguson, 1959) in a society which has two functionally separate language codes. One code, that is kanji, is used in one set of circumstances. It carries greater social prestige, is a highly codified, more

complex, and therefore is usually the vehicle of written literature. Kanji operates in formal writing (the High), and is the language of ordinary conversation (a Low) (Maher, 1995b, p128). The Japanese government in 1948 on the recommendation of its council of National Language legislated on the number of characters deemed necessary for a basic vocabulary was reduced to about 2,000. And the same time the writing of some of the characters was simplified (Honna, 1995, P56). Today however, in some 3,000 to 5,000 kanji (Chinese characters) are still used in formal writing.

Dialects

Although Japan is considered to be a monolingual society as described above, Japan is extremely rich in dialectal variations since it geographically consists of numerous islands. There is a lack of agreement amongst scholars in terms of the division of dialects, however two major dialects are recognised. These are the Hondo (mainland) dialects, and the Ryukyuan dialects. The mainland dialects are divided into the Western dialect group and the Eastern dialect group (Shibatani, 1990, p185). These dialects, in general, form a linguistic barrier, so that it is difficult for speakers of each to understand one another. An example of this can be found in the speakers of the Kagoshima dialect, who occupy the southern island of Kyushu. The speakers of this dialect would have great difficulty in communicating with the majority of those who inhabit the main islands of Honshu. Similarly, those people who live in and around Tokyo would find the northern dialect

speakers from places such as Aomori and Akita quite unintelligible.

Standard Language and Common Language

The idea of a unifying, common language resulted from Japan's transformation toward a nation state during the period of the Meiji restoration (1866-1867). The intensity of the national drive toward cultural and linguistic homogeneity was displayed in the drive to establish 'standard' Japanese (the hyoojun-go). It was based on the dialect which was spoken in Tokyo, the place to which belonged both bureaucratic and political power (Shibatani, 1990, p186).

The need for a standard form of Japanese also came about as a response to the introduction of compulsory education and the accompanying requirement of associated Japanese language textbooks. It was in this context, that is, the enforced adoption of a standard Tokyo dialect in the name of educational reform, that speakers of peripheral dialects were made to subordinate their own language. This in turn cultivated within them what could be termed an 'inferiority complex'. One particular incident that illustrates this is the use of the 'hoogen huda' or 'dialect tag' which, for those unfortunate enough to use their own particularistic dialectal variation, was forcibly made to wear around neck. This policy was carried on until end of the Second World War (Shibatani, 1990, p186).

This, as it turned out rather obscure and ambiguous attempt at language unification was superseded after the war by an alternative concept, that of Kyootsuu-go or the 'common language'. Kyootsuu-go differs from the former standard language in that it came to incorporate elements from the peripheral dialects. Although it is heavily influenced by the former Tokyo dialect, it integrates dialect features such as accentual elements. The result is that Kyootsuu-go displays a wide variety of linguistic characteristics which are shared by many speakers of the different dialects within Japan (Shibatani, 1990, p187).

In the sphere of education in Japan today, efforts are still being directed at maintaining, or at least accommodating, a balanced view towards, dialectal variation. Even though the Tokyo dialect holds some form of dominance in the preparation of texts, many of these books still highlight the fact that dialects are being employed in various domains and situations of everyday life. The notion then of bilingualism is being retained in current educational policy. However, through high rates mobility, and such things as the mass media, the promises of Kyootsuu-go, in terms of the retention of its recognisable dialectal characteristics, are being eroded (Shibatani, 1990, p187). There is a flattening-out of distinct variations. This means that there is, in reality, a move towards the linguistic goals of modern Japan's founding fathers.

This process is also reflected in the case the of Ainu people. Ainu is an indigenous language to Japan and has been in contact with the Japanese language since the 8th century. The Ainu's settlement in Hokkaido (the north island) is almost immediately recognisable due to the distinct place names, deriving from the Ainu language, which can be found in the area. It is thought that the Ainu formerly lived on all four major Japanese islands, but were pushed northward over the centuries by the Japanese. The traditional Ainu are practically extinct because of intermarriage with and cultural assimilation by, the Japanese since the Meiji period (1868). The Ainu language therefore is steadily declining in use and is heading toward extinction (Hattori in Shibatani, 1990, p3). It no longer is being used as a regular, daily means of communication, and is perhaps only understood by a handful of people of advanced age. In fact, there are very few Ainu speakers, (N=30) among 15,000 Ainu (Loveday 1986), most of them being over 80 years old (Maher 1991).

Of the minorities existing within Japanese society, the most significant is the Koreans. The first groups of Koreans were either brought to Japan as a source of labour during Japanese occupation of 1910-1945 (reaching peak numbers, approximately 2.5 million, of the end of World War 2), or were forced to leave Korea to escape grinding poverty (Yamamoto 1991, Maher and Kawanishi 1995). These Koreans and their dependants now number almost one million. Approximately two-thirds of this number were born in Japan and are legally unable to gain

Japanese citizenship (Raik 1991 cited in Maher and Kawanishi 1995), despite the fact that even seventy percent of these are married to Japanese nationals. It was not until 1985 that it became legal for a child born to a Japanese woman and a foreign man to hold Japanese citizenship if they used a Japanese name for their family register. The Japanese language is becoming dominant amongst these second and third generation Koreans.

The second largest group of foreigners, Chinese residents in Japan, are referred to as 'zainichi Chugokujin' (Chinese residents in Japan). According to Maher (1995b, p127) they are found throughout Japan, especially in the urban centres of Tokyo-Yokohama, the Kansai region, and parts of southern Kyushu. There are in fact several bilingual (Japanese-Chinese) schools which serve this community. A number of these schools (called Chuka Gakko) are located in the traditional Chinese communities of Yokohama, Tokyo, Kobe, and Nagasaki. The language of instruction in these schools is either Chinese or the Japanese medium or both. Maher (1995b, p132) has reported that in Tokyo, most of students who attended the Chinese schools were fourth and fifth generation, and came from non Chinese-speaking homes. Therefore, these students learn Chinese as a second language. Moreover, there are many cases where Chinese students of primary school age attend ordinary Japanese elementary schools. Shin's (1991) case study shows that the third year primary school child, who was of second generation Chinese descent, gradually became more proficient in the Japanese language, rather than the Chinese language, even

though she was from a Chinese-speaking home. Maher (1995b, P137) points out that there is a growing desire to advance educationally in the Japanese secondary and higher education system amongst ethnic Chinese (proficiency in the Japanese language is a requirement of this) along with a desire to retain some knowledge of the Chinese language.

Borrowing

Despite the borrowing of a large number of lexical items from China in this period of integration, other Asian languages, such as Ainu and Korean, have had an extremely limited influence. This is due to the fact that, in terms of language attitudes taken by the Japanese people, both the Ainu and Korean languages hold a very low status. As a result, Ainu loan words are limited to a few names, and only a handful of loan words were borrowed from Korea before the 8th century (Loveday, 1986). Korean scholars have historically played an important role in bringing the Chinese language and culture to Japan in the early 5th century. However, in the sociocultural context described above, when Koreans were brought as a labour source in the first half of the 20th century, their language was not highly valued in cultural terms, and this has prevented much borrowing from Korean language.

The first contact with European languages began in 1543, when a Portuguese merchant ship arrived on Kyushu island. The Portuguese introduced into Japan not only Christianity, but also Western words, both the Spanish and Dutch followed. Since

Japan was closed to the outside world except for Dutch merchants in Kyushu (1640-1854), only limited loan words were used in the areas of trade at that time. Since at the time of the Meiji restoration, Dutch has been replaced as the major language of foreign learning. In its place, have come English, German, and French. In the period after World War II however, most foreign loans were drawn from America. Overall, since the Meiji period, English loan words have had the most influence as incorporations into the Japanese language (Shibatani, 1990, p148).

The Japanese lexicon therefore contains an extremely large number of loan words. According to Shibatani (1990, p142) the Japanese lexicon is identified with regards to three groups. They are Wago 'Japanese words' or Yamato-kotoba 'Yamato words' which refer to the groupings of the native vocabulary, and Kango 'Chinese words', loan words of Chinese origin (hereafter called Sino-Japanese words). All other loan words are taken from European languages and Korean and Southeast Asian languages, and are collectively known as gairaigo 'foreign words' (lit. 'foreign coming words'). Recently however, it seems that more and more English words are beginning to be absorbed into the Japanese language.

The incorporation of Sino-Japanese and foreign loan words has led to a large number of synonymous expressions. In other words, the Japanese language has incorporated equivalent words, which were already present in the language. According to

Shibatani (1990, p144) however, these synonymous words possess a different range of meanings and stylistic values. For example, native words carry, in general, a broader meaning whilst the Sino-Japanese equivalent word covers a more specific meaning. The Sino-Japanese terms carry with them a degree of formality which is not recognisable in their indigenous Japanese counterparts. Therefore, they usually designate higher quality entities (ie. ideas or objects) in comparison to that which is identified by the Japanese. Unlike the native language and Sino-Japanese however, the remaining foreign words are considered to convey modern and fashionable impressions.

Shibatani (1990, p144) argues that the characteristics of the Japanese grammar system have allowed for the ready acceptance of loan words. There are two major characteristics: first, Japanese does not mark gender, person, or number on nouns; and second, cases are indicated by separate particles. Therefore, a loan word can simply be embedded into any place in which a native nominal might appear, without morphological readjustment. Since most of the loan words are nouns, the verb 'suru', which has the general meaning 'do' is utilised to transform loan words to verbs. This suffixing Japanese verb '-suru' is simply attached to the nominal forms of loan words (Motowani 1991, p viii). For example, the Sino-Japanese word 'unten' ('drive') is verbified 'unten-suru' ('to drive'). Similarly, the English loan 'doraibu' ('drive') is verbified 'doraibu-suru' ('to drive'). In addition to this, the ending 'da' is added to the adjectives of the loan words, becoming

then adjective nominals. The English loan word *'riaru'*, for instance, links the *'-da'* ending in to the predicative function as *'riaru-da'* (*'it is real'*). The ending *'-na'* is taken in the attributive function as in *'riaru-na'* (*'real'*). Both *'-da'* and *'-na'* may be substituted by the adverbial ending *'-ni'* to make the adverbial form *'riaru-ni'*. Thus, the lack of nominal inflections, as well as the presence of a syllabary writing system, has lead to a further increase in loan words being drawn into the Japanese language (Shibatani, 1990, p144).

The presence of a syllabary writing system also assists in the borrowing of foreign words. One of these syllabaries 'katakana', is employed to adapt into Japanese, at the phonetic level, foreign words. In such cases, the original pronunciation is mostly changed. This is due to a characteristic of the syllabic structure of Japanese which is made up the basic pattern of C V (consonant/vowel). For example, the English loan word *'test'* is converted into Japanese *'te su to'*. When it is pronounced, each syllable would be of the same length. Some English sounds, which do not exist in the Japanese language, have their own special ways of being written such as *'fa'*, *'ti'*, *'vo'* (Quackenbush, 1995, p18). Many loan words also dismiss their semantic features and structure, although others retain their originality. Some types of borrowing patterns have been illustrated by Japanese linguists (Honna 1995, Iwabuchi 1993, Shibata 1993, Maruya 1993, Suzuki 1993, Ui 1985). One type is characterised by a shift or narrowing of meaning. Honna (1995, p47), for example, notes that English words which are

absorbed in to the Japanese language tend to have a reduced scope of reference: for example `car` (automobile), `essay` (short literary composition), `image` (mental representation of a thing), `loose` (lacking behavioural), `stove` (room warmer) or `veteran` (expert). Shibata (1993, p21) points out that English loans are often reconstructed in a Japanese manner. These loans retain their original structure however, in the semantic context they develop into a Japanese form. For instance, 'woman lib' (women's lib), 'image up' (improvement of image), 'front glass' (wind shield), 'speed down' (slow down), 'line dance' (chorus line), and so on. Suzuki (1993, p97) explains that in the case of some English words, certain grammatical function are erased such as the suffix '-ed', '-ing' and '-s'. These are some examples: 'smoke ham' (smoked ham), 'mash potato' (mashed potato), 'happy end' (happy ending), 'fry pan' (frying pan), 'sunglass' (sunglasses), and 'slipper' (slippers).

2.3 Attitude Towards English Loan Words

Within linguistic scholarship there is a vibrant debate, often carried out in books and journals, regarding the influx of foreign words into the Japanese language. According to Honna (1995, p45), 10% of the words which are found in the lexicon of the standard Japanese dictionary derive from, or can be classified as, loan words, most deriving from English. In addition to this, if we were to analyse the annually revised dictionaries of neologisms, we would find that between 60 to 70% of new words have been taken from the English language.

24

Furthermore, 13% of the words ordinary people use in daily conversation are foreign words. Suzuki (1993) argues that there is a causal relationship between the influx of foreign words and the growing diversity and individualism within Japanese society. Many English loans seem to have been adapted not for the purpose of linguistic efficiency, in order to better convey meaning, but rather for opportunistic reasons. This creates clear social and linguistic divisions, according to such factors as age and occupation (Suzuki, 1993, p81).

However, in a survey conducted by the Japan Times, (cited in Koscielecki, 1994, p122) it was shown that people, especially those living within a 50km radius of Tokyo, most readily accepted foreign words. Of the 2004 people surveyed, most claimed that foreign words were beneficial because they created new images. A further 33% said that such loan words had the ability to introduce more subtle nuances of meaning than could be obtained by use of the Japanese language equivalents.

2.4 Status of English

One of the reasons why English words figure so prominently as loans in Japanese derives from the status of English as one of the most prestigious disciplines in the educational system. In Japan, foreign language study is mandatory, beginning in middle school (7th to 9th grade) in the national curriculum mandated by the Ministry of Education for every public elementary, middle and high school. Although Japanese compulsory education finishes at middle school, (Junior high school), most of these

25

graduates continue on to high school. For instance, the Ministry of Education in 1994 (cited in Yamamoto, 1995, p66) revealed that 96.2% of all junior high school graduates enrolled in senior school. At both middle school, and senior high school, the study of the English language is built into the school's program even though no special language is required in the national curriculum. That is, most Japanese people end up studying English for at least six years, and spend a huge amount of time on it, since English is an important subject to pass in the entrance examinations for higher education. Moreover, the two standard tests, TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication) and STEP (Standard Test of English Proficiency) developed by the Japanese Ministry of International Trade, and supported by the Ministry of Education respectively, have attracted huge numbers of takers; 600,000 during the period of 1979 to 1994. More than 1,310,000 took the STEP test in 1994 (Honna, 1995, p57).

Yamamoto's study (1995) demonstrates the prestigious status that the English language holds amongst Japanese students. A small survey (a class of 44 college engineering students) was conducted to obtain the students' responses to the word 'bilingual'. The students were asked to categorise their own response as positive, negative or neutral. Of the 155 resulting 'images', 54.8% (n=85) were rated as positive images, illustrated by such descriptions as 'international', 'fluent in English', 'cool', 'smart', and 'elite'. In contrast to this, the negative responses were 'too much self-esteem', 'cold',

'affected', and not proficient in Japanese/native languages. The second question was on definition of 'bilingual ability', and finally the students were asked to describe what language(s) they had assumed when they answered all previous questions in terms of bilingualism. Although the researcher had not specified any particular language, the majority of students (84.1%) answered 'Japanese and English' (Yamamoto, 1995, p67).

2.5 Bilingualism in Japan

These language surveys support the contention that English enjoys a preferred status. Yamamoto (1995) has conducted studies regarding the pattern of language use in Japanese/English bilingual families who reside in Japan. Her survey shows a positive attitude toward bilingualism amongst the majority of international families. That is, parents highly evaluate the practical value of bilingualism citing such advantage as: sound personality development, intercultural understanding and cognitive development. According to Yamamoto (1995, p74), of 45 families, 92% answered that they actively were trying to promote a bilingual environment. Moreover, 82% of the cases indicated that either one spouse, or both, used two languages to their children at home.

Nevertheless, the parents' language use alone does not provide a sufficient condition to prompt bilingualism, although it might to some extent aid in building a level of bilingual proficiency in these children. In fact, many international families encounter two major problems. First since children

27

learn how to write and read only in Japanese (and not English) at school, the responsibility for instructing children in English is left to the parent in the confines of the home. Secondly, bilingual children are often excluded by Japanese children. This is due primarily to their distinct physical appearance, their bilingualism contrasting behaviour, cultural and personal (Yamamoto 1995, p82). A case study conducted by Maher and Yuasa (1991) illustrates that an 8year child, who has a Japanese mother and American father, reports that she was treated as 'gaijin' (foreigner) because of her appearance and bilingualism. This experience heavily influenced the child's sense of identity and bilingual ability. Maher, et al. reported that in an attempt to not be excluded by Japanese children, the child often tried to minimise her distinctiveness, and therefore she was unwilling to develop her English proficiency. Yamamoto reported that only 3.4% of a total of 742,264 marriages, which were registered in 1991, were between Japanese and non-Japanese. Because there is only a small number of non-Japanese living in Japan, intermarriage is not so common. This condition would contribute to, or account for, the lack of concerns for maintaining minority languages. Children born into an international family are thus considered deviations from the norm, and often encounter rejection from society.

Returnees are another linguistic minority. These include Japanese school age children who have returned from more than a year of living abroad. Although this category of children are not differentiated ethnically from mainstream Japanese, they do

hold a sort of minority status, both linguistically and culturally. Yashiro (1995b, p140) reported that 31,466 children, who are between primary to senior high school age, returned to Japan in 1992. She, however, states that the number should in fact be much larger than this, as The Ministry of Education in Japan defines returnees as those who have lived overseas for more than one, but less than three years. They are then eligible to return to primary or middle schools. Many Japanese children overseas attend international schools or host country schools, and they usually become bilinguals. After returning to Japan, these children are, in general, accepted into regular classes in Ukeireko (schools with a specia. quota for accepting returnees) or regular schools (public schools). Since most public schools plan an emphasis on readjustment back into Japanese life, they have no official program to maintain the bilingual abilities of returnees. Especially, in public primary schools, the returnees' non-Japanese language receives practically no recognition. The national language remains as the most important language at the primary level (Yashiro, 1995a, p232).

Yashiro (1995b) states that although some Ukeiriko have started positively dealing with foreign language maintenance (e.g. set up extra-curricular activities), they are facing some problems such as: a lack of qualified instructors, and adequate teaching materials and financial support. Therefore, returnees who want to maintain their bilingual ability, often have to rely on the activities outside of school, such as: attending private

29

language schools, studying with audio-visual materials, tuning in to foreign language programs on television, and subscribing to foreign magazines and journals. Yashiro (1995b, p162) claims that despite returnees' desire to retain both the language they have and cultural contacts they have gained in their former host country, they find themselves felt to their own devices to achieve this.

In addition there are more returnees outside of the category described above. For example, university age returnees and adult returnees. Yashiro (1995b) explains that Japanese people who have attained overseas university degrees are advantaged in that there are special conditions for their admission to certain prestigious national and private university in Japan. Similarly, those with overseas university qualifications find themselves in a better position to gain employment in large Japanese corporations. Adult returnees are professionals who have worked abroad for either companies or organisations, including: Japanese companies, foreign companies, government organisations, international organisations or academic organisations.

The types of attitudes and approaches to non-standard Japanese languages which exist within Japanese society have been classified by Yashiro (1995a). He employs the terms which have originated from Ruiz (1984). These are: a language-as-problem orientation; a language-as-right orientation; and a language-as-resource orientation. These three language planning

orientations are thought to be influential in providing the conceptual background which inform alternative language policies. The language-as-problem orientation is based on the belief that the power and efficiency of government is dependent upon one standard national language. In other words, th s attitude is rooted in the thinking one language for one nation, therefore, corpus planning emphasises the dominance of one standard language to the neglect of minority languages. The attitudes of the Ministry of Education and many educational boards throughout Japan towards Ainu language revival programs, and both Korean and returnee bilingualism, is based on this orientation. The language-as-right orientation implies that speech communities, whose first language is not Japanese, are legitimately able to carry out their affairs using their own first language. From the perspective of this orientation, status recognises the right of minority communities have the right to retain their languages. In terms of corpus planning this means that bilingualism is encouraged through maintenance programs and the minority language is not replaced by the national language. However, in reality, Japan is a long way behind in recognising minority language rights. According to Yashiro (1995b, p239), in terms of returnees' bilingualism, maintenance of minority languages heavily relies on private organisations such as Ukeireko. The language-as-resource orientation, on the other hand, originates from the idea that each language has its own value, and exists as the most efficient mode of communication within each of those communities. Yet regardless how judicious it may appear it does

not mean that the public school and the Ministry of Education do not experience difficulties in coping with the developing and changing need of the society and its people. The bilinguals themselves and businesses which regard them as valuable resources recognise that the dominant language cannot be justified as a means of social control even from an administrative or economic view point.

In the not too distant future however the potential for change seems likely. Returnees, whether they be university graduates or professional people with their families, bring with them to Japan a greater diversity in language. They also share a sense of marginalisation, of difference from the rest of Japanese society. This in turn may nurture a more sympathetic understanding of the experiences of minority language groups. The difference is that such returnees often come to occupy positions of influence and power, and in many cases they are likely to have the ability to shape corpus planning to some degree. In other words, they would probably be more open to seeing Japan as an optimistically multilingual society.

Chapter 3

Review of Literature and Theoretical Framework

3.1 Review of Literature

The sociolinguistic studies which have been carried out on code-switching have, in general, been divided into two primary categories. Firstly, from the social/pragmatic perspective, and secondly, from the linguistic perspective. The studies which have focused on the social/pragmatic aspect of code-switching have attempted to uncover how and when code-switching is used, and the social meanings of code-switching. At the same time however, more and more researchers have been attracted to the linguistic aspects of code-switching. This concerns the interaction between two grammatical systems occurring within a single sentence. The primary aim of this type of study is to formulate grammatical models in order to account for the linguistic constraints on code-switching, using socially situated naturalistic conditions. Additionally, this present study takes into account the concept of attitude toward code-switching. Research in this area has been limited, however a few studies have been conducted (e.g. Gibbons, 1983, Hidalgo, 1986).

3.1.1 Social/Pragmatic Aspect of Code-switching

External Factors and Code-switching

Early studies on code-switching have attempted to account for the reasons why, and in what contexts, speakers engage in code-

switching. Blom and Gumperz (1972), for example have studied language choice between standard Norwegian (Bokmål) in Norway, and the local dialect (Ranamål) of a particular area in Northern Norway. Their research found that there is a sharp change in code use which is determined by social settings, interlocutors, and particular topics. For instance, Bokmål is used in the schools and churches, and Ranamål is used in local conversation. They also observed an occurrence of code-switching between small groups of speakers in this study. In fact, Blom and Gumperz then have suggested two distinct types of code-switching - 'situational code-switching' (as has been above) and 'metaphorical code-switching'. Situational code-switching involves a shift of topic or participants, whereas metaphorical code-switching, a concept later developed by Gumperz (1982) as 'conversational code-switching', involves only a shift of emphasis.

Similarly, Sankoff (1972) explains that code choice is clearly predicted in accordance with three factors: the participants, the setting, and the topic. In his study of language choice among the Buang of Papua New Guinea, speakers presented their code choice (either Buang, Yabem, or Neo-Melanesian) and code-switched (between Buang and Neo-Melanesian) in accordance with their interlocutors (Buang vs. non-Buang), the setting (formal vs. informal), and the topic (e.g. religion and business). These studies view code-switching as one code choice in a speaker's linguistic repertoire, and illustrate the

relationship that exists between certain external factors, and the speaker's choice in their use of language.

McConvell (1985, pp95-97) maintains that code-switching can be determined by cultural elements. He explains that code-switching may occur when great cultural differences exist between languages. In other words, particular concepts in one language, which are based on cultural factors, may lead to the occurrence of code-switching. McConvell argues that cultural elements act as a 'trigger' for code-switching. Gale (1993, p13) highlights this type of code-switching in the analysis of Yolngu Matha and English in a church setting in North East Arnhem Land. She explains that in the church service, the culturally foreign concepts of *later on in the century* and *sin* may trigger the switch to English. As in this example "Christians dhu mala, *later on in the century, or later on* ngunhi...", and "Ngunhi nhakun walal *sin aginst* Gsna ga Moseskal".

Later investigations reported that interactions in two languages were conducted without a change in participants, setting, or topic. This is due to the fact that one code is not only associated with one interaction. More researchers therefore started to discuss socially conditioned code-switching. In Scotton and Ury's (1977) study, for example, they argue that Swahili/English bilinguals in Kenya codeswitch for a variety of reasons: as a means to redefine the interaction as appropriate to a different social arena, or to avoid, through

continual code-switching, defining the interaction in terms of any social arena. McConvell (1988) studied code-switching amongst Gurindji Aborigines of the Victoria River District in the Northern Territory of Australia. He argues that the choice of language between Gurindji and Kriol is not attributable to topic or other aspects of the situation. Rather, it is associated with a specific class of activities, and a network of inter-personal relationships.

McClure and McClure's study (1988), which focused on code-switching in a multilingual community in Romania, concludes that code choice is determined not only by external factors (i.e. setting, activity and participants), but also in light of communicative reasons. For instance, Vingard Saxon is usually used as an appropriated code for intragroup communication, while the German language is used for church sermons, and Romanian is chosen if their interlocutors are Romanian Gypsies. Code-switching however is employed for various purposes including, quotation, parenthetical remarks, reiteration, filling ʀaps, and role identification. McClure, et al. (1988, p47) however states that these are clearly subordinate to code-switching, which is determined by the external factors. They then state that in historical terms, external factors such as setting, activity, and participants almost solely determined code choice. More recently however, the speaker's communicative intent has gained greater significance.

Researchers, who have focused on bilingual children, report that at an early stage, children make a linguistic choice in response to situational factors (i.e. interlocutor, setting, and topic). For instance, Lanza (1992) found that a bilingual two-year-old can codeswitch in contextually sensitive ways. Her study illustrates that the child has the ability to switch back and forth between two languages (Norwegian and English). This is done in order to single out a particular addressee or to gain one or the other of her parents' attention. That is, the child refrains from lexical mixing with her mother, who negotiates more of a monolingual context with her. On the other hand, she uses lexical mixing with her father, who negotiates more of a bilingual context. Lanza maintains that the child's lexical mixing is not determined by topic or setting. Code-switching in some cases therefore is determined by the particular addressee.

Similarly, in a study of one Spanish/English child, Fantini (1985) observes that even at three years of age, he was able to make an appropriate choice in response to his addressee. Fantini also observes that switching from Spanish to English often occurred when the child started to go to school, and when at home, discussed topics which were related to his school subjects and homework. In Saunders' (1982) study, his subject (a four year old German/English bilingual child in Australia) code-switches between German and English when his German speaking father and a monolingual English-speaker is present.

As the children acquire increasing knowledge of their social and linguistic environment, code-switching seems not only to be related to social factors. In fact, Fantini (1985, p69) reports that at the age of 3;5, the child began to quote other people's utterances in the original languages. Moreover, Fantini observed the child to use 'marked language choice' (the selection of unexpected code) in order to amuse or tease the hearer, or, at the age of seven, even to exclude a third person from the conversation (Fantini, 1985, p66).

Moreover, Kasuya (1997, p112) reports that Japanese bilingual children, even as young as three years of age, can switch between the English and the Japanese languages as a strategy for emphasis. In Kasuya's study, which focused on English/Japanese bilingual families in the United States, one of her subjects demonstrates the ability to switch from Japanese to English, in order to emphasise his intentions, or to get attention during the interactions with his mother or the author. For example, the child employs an English sentence between turns to protest his mother's comment in Japanese. Kasuya (1997, p113) concludes that even young children can at least choose a language as the main language for interaction with a particular addressee and switch it to another language purposefully, not randomly.

Code-switching as a Discourse Mode

Since switching often appears within a single conversation, researchers like Gumperz (1982) and Auer (1984) have studied

code-switching with an emphasis on the individuality of the interaction. They see code-switching as a 'contextualization cue' used in signaling and interpreting the speaker's intentions. In other words, speakers make a linguistic choice in order to convey intentional meaning, not because of situational factors. They also consider that individual interactions create the social meanings of linguistic choice.

Gumperz (1982, p69) states that acceptable usage or appropriate speech is learned by bilingual speakers through participation in a group. This language is susceptible to variation within the confines of the group, in a similar vein to lexicon selection and style variation in monolingual groups. Gumperz points out that prior to any experimentation with code-switching styles, a bilingual is compelled to know something of the interlocutor's background and attitudes in order to avoid serious misunderstanding. Gumperz then sees "languages in a bilingual environment as inevitably expressing meanings of either solidarity, informality and compassion (the in-group of *we-code*), or formality, stiffness and distance (the out-group or *they-code*)"(Gumperz, 1982, p66).

Many researchers have argued that interpersonal usage patterns in code-switching reflect group values and norms associated with the varieties in a community's repertoire (e.g. Heller 1988a, McConvell 1988, Heller 1988b, Jacobson, 1990, Eastman, 1992). In other words, speakers who are members of the same ingroup recognise that the same interaction communicates

roughly the same social intention. Heller (1988a, p83), for instance, states that in some situations, code-switching operates as an in-group strategy. It is based on the semantic associations of language, and the domain of language use, in terms of we/they ingroup/outgroup distinction. Code-switching therefore can be used to appeal to the shared understandings and characteristics of co-membership. Alternatively, it can be used to create distance, by associating one self, even momentarily, with the out-group.

Some researchers have focused on code-switching at the macro level. For instance, in Heller's recent study (1995, p161), she argues that "code-switching is a form of language practice, in which individuals draw on their linguistic resources to accomplish conversational purposes". Heller shows how these practices are closely linked in terms of authority and power in Quebec. Others have investigated the impact of demographic variables in the frequency of code-switching (Poplack, Sankoff, and Miller, 1988). These studies illustrate that, in French-Canadian communities, both borrowing and code-switching involving English is mostly used by speakers with different sociopolitical profiles. They conclude that the linguistic proficiency of the individual is constrained when in interaction with the community. That is, attitudes and norms of the community ultimately override the individual's own abilities (Poplack et al., 1988, pp97-98). Amongst these studies, however, very few researchers have analysed the use of

code-switching in terms of the group identities of the speakers involved.

The Functions of Code-switching

Many linguists have found that code-switching reflects or operates as a mechanism for social functions within certain communities. For instance, Scotton (1988) argues that the code-switching style of speech used in Kenya, plays a significant role in indicating 'solidarity' or 'inequality' within a group. Similarly, McConvell (1988) maintains that indigenous people in the Victoria River District, engage in code-switching in the form of a 'social message' which is designed to either include or exclude the listeners. Additionally, Blommaert (1992, p68) reports that the use of Campus Kiswahili (an English-interfered variant of Swahili spoken in Dar es Salaam in Tanzania) by academic staff functions to exclude those of a different educational background. Others (such as Scotton 1976, Heller 1988a) believe that code-switching creates 'ambiguity' or 'neutrality'. Alternatively, code-switching might operate as an instrument of self exclusion, when an individual wishes to disassociate themselves from a particular linguistic group.

Some researchers who have looked at the social functions of code-switching have done so at the micro level (e.g. Auer 1984, 1988, Blom and Gumperz 1972, Gumperz 1982, Heller 1988a, Romaine 1989, Sankoff 1972, Scotton 1988, McConvell 1988, Eastman 1992). These authors have argued that each group displays, in its repertoire, a socially permissible pattern of

41

code-switching which is determined by shared norms and group values. For example, Auer (1988) has argued that code-switching indicates shared membership in a particular social network. That is, each group displays its own particularistic and established pattern of code-switching which may differ from other groups.

Some of these authors refer to code-switching under 'discourse strategies' or 'conversational strategy', and claim that code-switching sets out to achieve certain goals. Christie (1990) explains that in Dominica, French Creole (Patois)/English bilinguals engage in code-switching in order to express their identities as member of Dominican society. For the speakers in this study, switching from English to Patois functions as a way of expressing a greater sense of ingroup intimacy, and is often employed when discussing specific issues and concerns relating directly to the community.

Gumperz (1982) however, who introduced 'conversational code-switching', argues that social identity, as well as situational factors do not exist as sole determinants in the explanation of why it is that people use language in the way that they do. Rather, a variety of alternative linguistic choices are sifted through with the final aim of conveying intentional meaning of a socio-pragmatic nature. Gal (1988, p247) explains that code-switching is a conversational strategy. It is employed as a means of emphasis, to indicate a change in 'footing'. The

result attained may be designed to alter relations between individuals, or between groups.

A taxonomy of functions which operate within individual interactions has been suggested by various scholars, for instance; there is quotation, (Gumperz 1982, Romaine 1989, MacCure et al. 1988, Nishimura 1995), addressee specification (Gumperz 1982, Romaine 1989), referential (Appel and Muysken, 1987), expressive (Poplack, 1980, Appel et al., 1987), seeking agreement or parody (De Heredia-Deprez 1990), and as a discourse marker (Auer 1995).

Amongst these analysts, Nishimura's (1995) study highlights the functions presented by second generation Japanese people living in Toronto, Canada. In her study, three bilingual patterns (the 'basically Japanese' variety, the 'basically English' variety, the 'mixed' variety) have been found. These result from the language choices which the speakers make depending upon their interlocutor(s) during three in-group actions. Nishimura then classifies the functions into six categories, based on the 'basically English' variety and the 'mixed' variety. Within the 'basically English' variety (which is the pattern used amongst the second generation), her subjects transpose Japanese phrases into the English base language. Nishimura interprets this pattern as having a symbolic effect, expressing and confirming their ethnic identity (particularly the identity of the second generation as a generational group) (Nishimura, 1995, p165).

On the other hand, four major functions are presented by the subjects when both the second generation and native Japanese are present. These are; first, 'reach out strategy' - those switches which are related to the interactional processes between the speaker and the interlocutor; second, 'involvement intensification' - those calling for the hearer's agreement and confirmation; third, 'frame-making' and 'topic introduction' - concerning the organisation of structure and discourse; and 'quotations' - which give stylistic effects.

Moreover, in terms of Japanese/English code-switching amongst Japanese native speakers, English elements can be used in a euphemistic way as one of communicative functions. Honna's (1995) study, which discusses the English language in Japanese society, illustrates that particular English loan words play a euphemistic role. For instance, the word 'loan' has been widely used instead of the Japanese word 'shakkin' meaning 'borrowing money'. This is due to the fact that Japan developed into a consumer economy in the 1950's, yet the word 'shakkin' was thought to obstruct mass consumption because of the negative idea of borrowing money (Honna, 1995, p53). Even though Honna's study deals specifically with loan words in Japanese society, his logic - which emerges from his investigation - can be extended to the case of code-switching amongst Japanese in an English-speaking country. In fact, an incident which mirrored Honna's findings occurred in this study. For instance, the English word 'cash' was used by the speakers in order to avoid the negative implications which are associated with its

44

Japanese counterparts 'genkin'. Here it was found that a function of code-switching is that it is a means of circumventing terms which have a negative connotation.

Furthermore, Li (1999) in his study of intra-sentential code-alternation (this refers to code-switching) based on data from the Hong Kong Chinese Press, suggests that there are semantic reasons for code-switching. He investigated whether there were any semantic nuances which constrain Cantonese/English code-alternation with regard to the translation. Li's study showed that even though a dictionary 'equivalent' exists between two languages, there remains a semantic incongruence, such as the degree of specificity. For example, the English word 'audience' may refer to those who are perhaps watching television, or alternatively, those listening to the radio. However, in Chinese, there are specific words which denote either a 'watching-crowd', or a 'listening-crowd'. As a result, the translator may be reluctant to substitute the Chinese term for the given English expression. This may lead to the occurrence of code-switching. Code-switching therefore is a method of guarding against unwanted semantic loss or gain (Li, 1999, p37). Likewise in the present study, code-switching was employed as a means of conveying an accurate semantic nuance. For example, the English word 'business' was used in order to indicate a wide range of activities in the business field, since the Japanese equivalent has a much narrower meaning. If one were to describe business on a small footing, the term

would be 'shookigyoo'. In other words, different terms are employed to represent 'business' a variety of scales.

The functions of code-switching in classrooms have also been studied by researchers, including Merritt, Cleghorn, Abagei, and Bunyi (1992) and Gearon (1998). For example, Merritt, et al. has investigated three primary schools in Kenya studying code-switching between English/Swahili/mother tongue (more than 30 mother tongues exist in Kenya). Since English is selected by the Kenya government as the major medium of educational instruction, teachers' dominant language in classrooms is English. The teachers however still switch to Swahili or their mother tongue. This is usually motivated by cognitive and classroom management factors. Merritt illustrates some functions of code-switching, including; to get the students attention, to elicit the correct behaviour, and to clarify material. The teachers are then teaching not only the choice of which language to employ, but also choice in how each language is employed (Merritt et al., 1992, p118).

Similarly, Gearon (1998) details the functions of code-switching which operate in classes where French is taught as a foreign/second language in Victorian secondary schools. The instances of code switching between English and French amongst six teachers of French as a second language are mainly motivated by the desire to convey meaning and to move the pedagogical process along. Thus, switching from French to English is a common practice amongst the teachers, and is an

effective means of conveying the necessary information. Gearon (1998, p52) confirms one of Gumperz'(1982) functions of code-switching, 'reiterating a message'. This type of repetition in the two languages was aimed at ensuring an understanding of lexical items.

Social Constraints and Individual Choice

Early in the development of sociolinguistics, researchers espoused the view that members of the same speech community share norms of evaluation, even while not sharing exactly the same linguistic repertoires (e.g. Labov, 1972). Gumperz (1982) explains that code-switching is an indication that members of a specific speech community hold to an established, socially produced and recognisable notion of code, and grammatical system. Thus, community-specific or group-specific social forces determine which of the permissible patterns are preferred.

However, the concept of what is 'normative' has been questioned. For example, Boeschoten (1998, p22), in his analysis focused on migrant communities in Europe, points out that the process of migration comes to transform the 'standard' norms which exist in the country of origin. He argues that in such networks, the norms taken from the immigrants' home society and mother tongue speech interact with those of the adopted country. New 'conventions', over time, are worked out to accommodate both sets of norms. Such code-switching patterns

may differ from those of the speech community within their home country.

In contrast, Gardner-Chloros (1991, p47) adds another dimension to this argument. She claims that the code-switching practice of individuals should not be thought of as being solely limited to the acceptable social norms within the speech community. Rather, the social actor has the ability to step outside these structures, and creatively and imaginatively construct their own patterns of code-switching.

Unmarked and Marked Usage

Gal (1979, p99) holds the conviction that a violation of norms can occur with the speakers' choice of unexpected language. This violation is usually understood by interlocutor as a part of the speakers' strategy for expressing 'momentary communicative intent'. That is, speakers can select the unexpected (marked) language, even though one language may be more expected (unmarked) in that context, than the other.

For instance, the above studies conducted by researchers including Fantini (1985), Merritt, et al. (1992) and Gearon (1998) illustrate that speakers manipulate language by making marked codeswitches. The teachers in both cases, selected and used an unexpected language choice (i.e. Swahili or mother tongues in Merritt's study, and English in Gearon's study) in order to accomplish their intentions, which were explained

briefly above. That is, the contrast between the expected, and the actual code employed, functions to carry meanings.

Myers-Scotton (e.g. 1983, 1988, 1995a), who developed the concept of 'markedness', emphasises the speaker as a creative or rational actor. In other words, speakers select a code in order to invoke or maintain interpersonal relationships. She refers to code-switching as a tool available to the speaker, and an index for the addressee, in the negotiation of interpersonal relationships. That is, the use of each linguistic variety associated with multiple role relations, based on norms of rights and obligations. Rights and obligation can be understood as 'what participants can expect in any given interaction type in their community. It is another term for norms, or codes of behaviour, that are established and maintained by the social group' (Myers-Scotton, 1995b, p24). She maintains that speakers make choices, not norms. They weigh the costs and rewards of alternative choices, and then make their decisions (Myers-Scotton, 1995a, p110).

Goyvaerts and Zambele (1992) both of whom support Myers-Scotton's theory reveal that each individual makes a marked choice which carries significant meanings. In their study of code-switching in Bukavu in Zaire, marked choices made by speakers illustrate that they are seeking to replace one set of unmarked roles and obligations with another. For instance, marked code-switches by one student appear as an attempt to create solidarity with the headmaster, and curry favour. On the

49

other hand, for one son, marked choice is a way of creating social distance from his father.

Style Shifting

Some linguists see language switching as an extension of the monolingual's capacity to shift registers and styles. In other words, bilinguals routinely engage in code-switching in their everyday life, just as monolinguals routinely switch one linguistic variety to another (e.g. a regional dialect, the standard language, a formal or informal style) in the course of their daily interactions.

For example, Gardner-Chloros (1991, p93) reports that one of her subjects demonstrates stylistic variation by employing different forms of one language into another. Gardner-Chloros observes both ingroup exchanges (i.e. between salespersons and between customers) and outgroup exchanges (i.e. between a customer and a salesperson) in department stores in Strasbourg. One female salesperson, who is relatively proficient in both Alsatian and French, uses the construction and phonological elements of Alsatian (which is used for ingroup interactions) in the French language for the purpose of creating informality during ingroup conversation.

Southworth (1980, p140) views code-switching as a significant addition to the Indian's linguistic repertoire, since it goes 'beyond the style-shifting of monolinguals and allows the individual a flexibility of expression that could not be

obtained in a single system'. Therefore, 'the use of the switching style relates to, and in fact signals, social solidarity' (Southworth, 1980, p139).

3.1.2 Linguistic Aspect of Code-switching

In general, code-switching studies which have been focused on the linguistic aspect have attempted to provide answers for several questions. These are: how the speakers can best negotiate observable grammatical constraints, if these constraints are language specific, if they arise from and independently motivated principle of universal grammar, and if they derive from more general principle of discourse organisation. In this section, many studies are presented which attempt to answer some of these fundamental questions.

'Triggering'

Clyne (1967) calls switching caused by linguistic factors "internally conditioned words which belong to, or at least appear to belong to both languages" (e.g. a proper noun such as Canberra). That is, switching is 'triggered' by the occurrence of a word which appears to belong to both languages. This word acts as a trigger, which causes speakers to forget momentarily which language they are speaking in and to continue in the other language, until it is realised what has happened. Clyne calls this type of word a 'trigger word'. The switch may be made before the trigger word, in anticipation of it (i.e. 'anticipation switching'), or more usually after it (i.e. 'consequential switching').

Clyne however had a great degree of difficulty in explaining for passages which contained a significantly larger frequency of codeswitches – to these, he was unable to readily apply his theory. His solution was to classify such passages as instances whereby 'marginal switching' was taking place. His reassessing was then that the base language was unidentifiable.

Two-Constraint Model: Free Morpheme and Equivalent Constraint

Until recently, most studies on code-switching have been carried out on the syntactic constraints on intra-sentential switching. Sankoff and Poplack's study (1981) is usually considered as the first attempt to formulate general syntactic constraints. They have argued that Spanish/English code-switching can emerge from a model of grammar which is determined by two constraints – 'free morpheme' and 'equivalence constraint'. The 'free morpheme constraint' predicts that a switch may only appear between a bound morpheme and a lexical form if the lexical form has been phonologically assimilated into the language of the morpheme. Unlike the 'free morpheme', the 'equivalence constraint' predicts that switches are likely to occur at points where the word composition of the two languages does not violate the syntactic order of either language. In other words, codeswitches can take place at points where the surface structures of two the languages map onto each other. Nevertheless, there are a number of studies which have been focused on intra-sentential code-switching in different speech communities, where counter examples to the proposed

restrictions have been uncovered (e.g. Bentahila and Davies 1983 on French/Moroccan Arabic Code-switching; Nishimura 1995 on Japanese/English code-switching; Myers-Scotton 1988, 1993 on Swahili/English; Bokamba 1988 on Lingala/French code-switching).

Base Language in Code-switching

Others assume that one language must be the base or matrix language. Here the emphasis is on the different roles that the two languages play. For instance, Sridhar and Sridhar (1980, p209) employed the terms 'host language', which refers to the primary language of the discourse, and 'guest language', which is opposed to the 'host language' (i.e. embedded into the primary or dominant language. Their suggestion of a Dual Structure Principle states that a guest constituent can maintain its own grammatical system whilst still be inserted into a larger host language with a nonconforming grammatical system. In this instance, both guest constituent and host language retain their own grammatical structures.

On the other hand, Joshi (1985) argued that the matrix or embedded language is determined by the first word of a sentence or constituent. In this case, the matrix language rules the possible switching. That is, the grammatical system of the matrix language determines which guest constituent can be embedded into the dominant language, as it must conform to its grammatical structure. He then distinguished open-class morphemes (e.g. nouns, adjectives, verbs) from closed-class

morphemes (e.g. determiners, quantifiers, prepositions, possessive, tense), and suggested that only open-class morphemes can be switched.

Myers-Scotton (e.g. 1993, 1995b) elaborated this concept of matrix and embedded language, and proposed a Matrix Language Frame Model. She has suggested two ways of defining matrix language: firstly on the basis of the structure of the discourse, and secondly on the basis of sociolinguistics. In the former the matrix language is more grammatically dominant than the embedded language, and it contains relatively more morphemes in at least two sentences, either from a single speaker or from two speakers in the course of conversation.

From the sociolinguistic point of view, it is the speakers who themselves, when engaged in code-switching, come to recognise the matrix language as the "language we are speaking". In psychological terms, the speakers perceive that code-switching is, for them, part of the discourse which takes place within a single language. Therefore, code-switching discourse often corresponds to the unmarked choice. This model claims that intra-sentential code-switching will follow certain structural principles across diverse languages and speech communities (Myers-Scotton 1993, 1995b).

Alternative Perceptions on the Matrix Language Model

Due to a lack of agreement in terms of the universal validity of this kind of model, increasingly, more studies which employ

54

the notion of a matrix language discuss code-switching at the societal level. For example, Bentahila and Davies' (1998) study of Arabic/French code-switching by Moroccans, has illustrated the mechanisms of switching. They found it was the case that, in some instances, there was a matrix language which played a dominant role. However, in other instances, it was just as evident that it was not the case that there was a simple dominance of one language over the other. Here, they found that both languages carried equal responsibility.

They have suggested that the inequality which is evident between languages does not simply arise from the manifestations of grammatical structure, as argued by Myers-Scotton. Rather, code-switched discourse might possess a number of different and more complex levels. It is therefore necessary to consider the interaction between such variables as discourse dominance, proficiency, priority, usage patterns, and symbolic value. (Bentahila et.al, 1998, p49)

Pandharipande (1998), on the other hand, has focused on the role of genetic connection between the languages (matrix and embedded) in determining the structure of a mixed code (this refers to intra-sentential codeswitching). She argued that genetically closer languages (cf. Marathi/Sanskrit) appear to have a higher degree of assimilation than genetically distant ones (cf. Marathi/English). Pandharipande concludes that the constraints posited by Myers-Scotton apply only in part. That is, constraints on code-switching vary according to the

'distance' between the two languages. Pandharipande begins with the assumption that, in code-switching, the host code not only borrows the guest constituent, but appropriates as well that guest constituents inherent social function. Therefore, in order to maintain its unique social function, the guest code must also hold its distinct identity, and not become 'nativized'. Pandharipande for instance writes that:

"The more the guest constituent conforms to the host structure, the less separate is the identity of the guest code and, as a result, the less functional the guest code becomes. Therefore, all cases of code-switching involve strategies to keep the guest code separate from the host code". (Pandharipande, 1998, p202).

Furthermore, both Rindler Schjerve (1998), and Treffers-Daller (1998), investigated the possible relationship between the choice of code-switching patterns and certain factors such as age, gender, education, network, topic and interlocutor. For instance, Rindler Schjerve's study focused on Sardinian/ Italian code-switching in the context of language shift in Sardinia. They found that young speakers in particular use the Italian language as the matrix language rather than Sardinian. Moreover, women more frequently codeswitch than men, when the matrix language is Sardinian. Treffers-Daller's study, on the other hand, has shown that the interlocutor and topic play a decisive role in determining the matrix language, and also the frequency of code-switching.

Finally, Jacobson (1998, p63) recommends that researchers should show more caution in expanding the applicability of findings relative to one or two language pairs to situations

outside the range of languages studied. He argues that there is not yet enough information on all language settings, where code-switching occurs, to make generalised conclusions with regard to what is universally valid. His contrastive study focused on Spanish/English code-switching (genetically close) and Malay/English code-switching (genetically different), with an emphasis on the speakers' general intent, rather than a manifestation of the universality of specific constraints.

3.1.3 Language Attitudes

In the field of sociolinguistics the study of language attitude is considered to be important since it relates to the understanding of the speakers' linguistic behaviour (Cooper and Fishman 1974, Poplack 1988). It is believed that language usage or variation studies, should complement studies on language norms, values, and prestige in a community (Omdal, 1995). In terms of code-switching and language attitudes however, research has been relatively scarce, despite the fact that language attitude has been a primary focus in sociolinguistic studies. This is due firstly to inherent methodological problems, and second, to the lack of general agreement on the definition of attitude.

Definitions of Language Attitudes

There are many different definitions which set out to explain 'language attitude'. For example, Ryan, Giles and Sebastian (1982, p7) define language attitude as 'any affective, cognitive or behavioural index of evaluative reactions towards

different language varieties.' Another definition of language attitude, formulated by Williams (1974, p21) states that 'attitude is considered as an internal state aroused by stimulation of some type, and which may mediate the organism's subsequent response'. Although there is a lack of an agreed upon definition of language attitudes, two major views, in terms of the nature of attitudes, have been suggested. These are a 'mentalist' view, and the behaviourist view. According to Fasold (1984, p147), mentalists consider an attitude as an 'intervening variable between a stimulus and a response', whilst behaviorists view attitude as a 'behavioural response in themselves'. The former theory conceives problems for method, since an observable response, which derives from the speakers' reflections, may differ from the actual language usage. Therefore, researchers rely on the speakers' self-reports of what it is their attitudes are. In the latter theory, attitudes are to be simply observed as a representation of real language usage.

Within the mentalists' perspective, researchers have identified different dimensions of attitude with regard to values or motivations. For example, Gardner and Lambert (1972), in their pioneering research, discuss two dimensions, - instrumental and integrative - as attitudes to a particular language. They explain that an instrumental attitude derives from pragmatic or utilitarian motives. In other words, the speaker may seek to achieve social recognition, or economic advantage, through the use of a particular language. In contrast to this, an

58

integrative attitude to language may concern attachment to, or identification with, a speech community (Gardner and Lambert, 1972, p14). This attitude signifies that the speaker maintains a desire to be included within the speech community of a specific group. Edwards (1983), on the other hand, distinguishes 'positive attitude', from 'favourable attitude'. He asserts that instrumental motivation is a speaker's positive attitude. Therefore, it needs not be pleasant or favourable. Furthermore, Edward's distinction does not recognise the necessity of an integration. These studies of language attitude show the complexity of speakers' language evaluation.

Problems Associated With Methodology

Due to the conceptual problems associated with operationalisation, a wide variety of methods have been employed by researchers. According to Ryan, et al. (1982), data collection methods for the measurement of language attitudes can primarily be categorised into three types. These are; firstly, the analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties (content analysis); second, direct measures with interviews or questionnaires; and third, indirect measures within the speaker-evaluation paradigm.

The first type of evaluation does not require explicit questions to gain the respondents' view of their own reactions. A content analysis can be done through the interpretation of language use in public or official places, for example

newspapers, language policy by the government, education, and literature.

The second type of research, which is called direct measurement, has often been used for measuring language attitude. This measurement may employ techniques, such as self-report questionnaires, interviews, and observation. Both questionnaires and interviews can be on language evaluation, language preference, or the desirability and purpose of studying a second language, as well as views of language planning and maintenance. The validity of these methods is often rather questionable, chiefly because there is no guarantee that these are the respondents' true evaluation. In other words, speakers may control their actual attitude, or they may tend to report what they think is a socially favoured or culturally acceptable response (Baker, 1992, p19). Observational techniques involve inference on behalf of the researcher. If the observation technique is utilised by mentalists, then inference is needed to determine attitude (Fasold, 1984, p152).

The third type of language attitude study, indirect measurement, differs from the direct method, in that the subjects are kept from knowing the purpose of the measurement. It is claimed that this method can reveal covert language attitudes, rather than socially desirable responses. The matched-guise technique is considered to be the most popular form of indirect measurement. This technique, developed by

Lambert and his associates (1960), uses one bilingual speaker who reads or speaks in two different varieties of a language, or two languages. The listeners are not aware that they are hearing the same person's voice. Moreover, the matched-guise technique often involves semantic differential scales. The listeners will be given a series of antonyms, such as intelligent vs. unintelligent, or friendly vs. unfriendly. They will then be asked for their opinion of the speakers' accents, dialects, and languages (e.g. French or English speaking people in Canada). The listeners' subjective reaction to the two different guises (of the one speaker) is said to reveal the true attitude toward the variety.

Fasold (1984, p150) states that "the matched-guise technique is direct in the sense that the listeners are explicitly asked to give their opinions of the speaker's characteristics. It is indirect in the sense that listeners are asked to react to speakers, not languages, and they are not aware that they are hearing the same person in each guise." He then points out same problems within the matched-guise technique. Firstly, hearing each speaker reading the same passage, in each language, may cause listeners to judge the speakers as performers of readings. This is due to its artificiality in other words it is not derived from a natural context. Second, controlling the topic of guises in a diglossic community (where the High and Low forms exist) may influence the speakers' evaluations of the guises. Since a certain language is used to discuss a particular topic in a diglossic community, one guise might

61

receive a low evaluation (Fasold, 1984, pp152-153). In other words, insufficient attention may be paid to the appropriacy of a specific code or style in specific situations.

Thus, measuring the affective domain of the speakers is extremely difficult. Some researchers (Larsen-Freeman and Long 1991, Giles, Hewstone and Bail 1983) discuss the fact that attitudes and their effects would have to allow for many possibilities. For example, measuring a speaker's attitude toward a language itself is difficult, since a language does not exist in a vacuum. Furthermore, as language is always connected with speakers, the construct of an attitude could certainly include the language users in its definition (Ryan et al. 1982, p7).

3.1.4 Attitudes Towards Code-switching

One of the more perplexing aspects of code-switching is the fact that just because a speaker holds a negative attitude toward the performance of code-switching, this does not hinder them from actually engaging in this language behaviour. In many bilingual communities, the whole concept of code-switching has been veiled. This is due to speakers' notion that their language should remain unmixed. However, many researchers have reported robust use of code-switching in the same speech communities. For example, Romaine (1989) concludes, in her research on Punjabi/English code-switching, that speakers' allegiance towards their own language did not prevent them from code-switching. Similarly, Gumperz (1982, p62) claims that even

though participants had expressed puristic notions, they in fact practised code-switching in the course of conversation.

These studies seem to suggest that the investigation of language attitudes, and their relation to the actual use of language, is necessary.

Gibbons' Study

Although the study of attitudes towards code-switching is thought to be important in terms of understanding the speaker's linguistic behaviour, only a few studies have been undertaken (e.g. Gibbons 1983, Hidalgo 1986). Gibbons (1983) has investigated 99 Chinese University students in Hong Kong, who were English/Cantonese bilinguals. His study, which focused on the question of covert and overt attitude toward code-switching (referred to as 'Mix' by Gibbons), assumed that code-switching may be positively valued as a marker of group solidarity. However, code-switching may also possibly be negatively valued, since English has some association with status and prestige, yet also arrogance. The conclusion which Gibbons comes to is that within the speech community being researched, code-switching is met with feelings of hostility, primarily because it is associated with western elitism. In contrast however, code-switching can also indicate neutrality. Simultaneously, Gibbons result also strongly asserts that code-switching is often used as a strategy of neutrality. It is a way of escaping the negative connotations of strictly using English without abandoning English completely; it is a compromise.

Hidalgo's Study

Hidalgo (1986) has studied attitudes toward English, Spanish, and English/Spanish code-switching in Juarez, a Mexican town on the United States border. Her 85 informants consisted of residents within this town. As the city of Juarez is situated very close to a major U.S city (El Paso, Texas), both languages, Spanish and English, have traditionally been in close contact with one another. Hidalgo's investigation found: firstly, that the use of English was positively evaluated, since her informants saw the value of the English language as equally instrumental and integrative; second, there was a strong loyalty to the Spanish language, the intention being to maintain their ethnic identity; and third, that code-switching was negatively evaluated because it was perceived as being incorrect and mixed. One puzzling aspect of Hidalgo's study however, is the fact that she engaged a sample of 85 informants from the town of Juarez, to assess their response to the practices of code-switching, as carried out by the residents of El Paso. She, neglects, however, to elicit any responses with regard to attitudes from those people in El Paso themselves.

3.2 Theoretical Framework

The present study in code-switching falls primarily within the field of sociolinguistics. Sociolinguistic studies have investigated the social meaning of code-switching at both the societal, and the individual level. This present study concentrates on the occurrence of code-switching at the

individual (or micro) level by employing five main conceptual approaches, these are; the descriptive framework within sociolinguistics, Speech Accommodation Theory, Alan Bell's, 'Language styles as audience design', Brown and Levinson's Politeness model, and the Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model. The Matrix Language Frame Model is also employed in order to examine linguistic factors.

3.2.1 Descriptive Framework Within Sociolinguistics

Research undertaken within the framework of descriptive sociolinguistics has attempted to account for a speaker's language choice by domain. This notion, which has been developed by Fishman (1972), asserts that social situations determine which language a speaker will use. Three components are suggested as determinants of language choice: the social group to which one belongs (this includes both the more objective structures of community 'norms', and the subjective dimension pertaining to individuals), the situation in which one finds oneself at the moment of communication, and the topic which is being discussed. In other words, it is the fusion of interlocutor, topic and setting that structures language choice. Since this framework has been proposed to account for language use only in stable bilingual or multilingual communities, many researchers have employed this concept in order to study interactions at the individual level (e.g. Gumperz 1982, McGregor and Li Wei 1991). Even though the purpose of the present study is not to account for a bilingual's language choice in terms of domain, this framework

is useful in the investigation of the relationship between certain social factors (i.e. topic and interlocutor), and code-switching as a language choice in one bilingual community.

3.2.2 Speech Accommodation Theory

Speech Accommodation Theory developed as an attempt to uncover why it is that speakers, during various social encounters, come to alter their styles of speech. The Speech Accommodation Theory proposes that two processes are at work. Firstly, a speaker may choose a linguistic strategy whereby their speech converges with that of their interlocutor, thus having the effect of creating a consonance in speech rates, pauses, utterances etc. On the other hand, a speaker may choose to accentuate the differences that exist between themselves, and their interlocutor, through the manipulation of similar linguistic features. This is known as divergence. The idea behind this theory is that speakers can achieve certain goals (i.e. to enhance either a sense of difference, or to consolidate a sense of solidarity or identity within a group). Of particular significance in the Speech Accommodation theory is the notion that the speaker can conform to a social group through language use, and thus gain its approval.

The concept of the Speech Accommodation Theory can be applied to the present study in terms of convergence and divergence. For example, during the course of the taped conversation, there were several instances whereby one or both of the interlocutors came to adopt similar styles, or patterns of speech. This is in

part due to the fact that Japanese people tend to emphasise respect for other's feelings, rather to than be overtly concerned with ones own self-expression. In other words, individuals tend to be viewed in terms of the role they perform in a group, rather than in and of themselves, and their happiness may depend on supportive gestures from others certifying their sense of belonging to the group. Code-switching can be one of the social markers or elements which is manipulated during the course of their interaction. Rather than analysing linguistic strategies which are associated with monolingual speech, such as speech rates, pauses, etc, code-switching as the focus of this analysis is taken as that primary linguistic strategy which marks attempts to either converge or diverge with an interlocutor's speech in the bilingual context.

3.2.3 Alan Bell's 'Language Styles as Audience Design'

Bell (1984) argues stylistic variation in monolingual speech shares a functional similarity with code-switching amongst bilinguals. 'Audience design' suggests that speakers design their utterances in response to the requirements of different audiences. Audiences include the addressee in the conversation, and auditors (a person who is participating, but not directly addressed), the overhearer or eavesdropper, and the reference group (either the speaker's own group, or some group with which the speaker wishes to be identified).

Bell (1984, p167) then illustrates three major positions which speakers take, in order to respond to their different addressees. Firstly, speakers assess the personal characteristics of their addressee, and then adapt (or design) their style to suit. Second, speakers evaluate the general style level of their addressees' speech, and transfer towards it. Third, speakers assess their addressees' levels for particular linguistic variables, and then change their speech in order to correspond to those levels. He claims that speakers in general, respond at all three levels.

According to the 'audience design', the auditor's influence on language choice amongst bilinguals is more significant than the choice amongst monolinguals. Since there are clear differences between codes, the pressure to accommodate the audience is greater than in monolingual situations (Bell, 1984, p176). 'The formal/informal continuum is therefore simply expressed in different code sets in different societies: by language choice in bilingual societies, by dialect switching in diglossic situation, and by style shift in monolingual societies.'

The data from the current study support Bell's theory. During the recording sessions, one of the subjects was clearly very self-conscious about her speech. The interaction with a partner was supposed to be 'informal', since the relationship between each pair was based on an established 'friendship', and the setting was familiar to both speakers. However, the speaker attempted to produce utterances without mixing Japanese and

English, which goes against the nature of her actual speech style in such an exchange. The speaker selected this style because she designed her speech to suit her particular audience. In this instance, the speaker is not so much concerned with her immediate interlocutor, but with the microphone in front of her, and the knowledge that her speech will be analysed by the researcher at a late time.

3.2.4 Brown and Levinson's 'Politeness' Model

Brown and Levinson (1990) attempt to explain why various strategies exist in languages and speaker decisions in choosing one strategy rather than another during the occurrence of face threatening acts. Brown and Levinson firstly assume that the ideal person is endowed with the capability of rational practical reasoning, that is, acting in a rational manner towards their interlocutors. Secondly, they also assume that a speaker also possesses 'face'. Brown and Levinson (1990, p61) state that 'face' consists of two related aspects: 'negative face' and 'positive face'. Negative face' is defined as "the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to nondistraction (i.e. to freedom of action and freedom from imposition)". On the other hand, 'positive face' refers to "the positive consistent self-image or 'personality' (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants."

According to Brown and Levinson, the term 'face' is derived from the term 'to lose face', meaning to suffer from

embarrassment or humiliation. 'Thus face is something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in an interaction' (1990, p61). They argue that the concept and content of 'face' is culturally relative, in other words, a loss of face may occur for different reasons across cultures, nevertheless, they assume that it is a more or less a universally present phenomenon. Following from this, it is only logical to assume that members of a particular speech community have a shared or mutual knowledge with regards to what it is that constitutes a 'face threatening act'. Similarly, these members are aware of the social necessity of employing strategies which will ensure the avoidance of situations whereby 'face' is threatened.

Brown and Levinson (1999, p322) state that face exists not so much as a social 'norm' but rather, as a basic 'want' of each individual. More accurately, face (and its preservation or enhancement) exists as a common desire shared by practically all members within a community. To a large extent then, the maintenance of face depends largely on the mutual cooperation of those within this community. In cases where a participant's face is threatened, the individual may choose in turn to retaliate, by acting in a similarly threatening fashion to that of the offender. Overall however, it is to the benefit of all, if a balance is retained, and individuals refrain from acts which may threaten face. In instances of face threatening acts, there are strategies which may be employed to save the

70

individual's self-image. These strategies typically include politeness forms and mitigations.

This study has shown that in certain situations engaging in code-switching can be both threatening and offensive. For instance, some of the younger participants in this study claimed that engaging in code-switching with older Japanese people would be rude. They assume that they should maintain 'proper', that is completely monolingual, speech in such circumstances.

3.2.5 Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model

The Markedness model evolved as a way of explaining how speakers come to innately recognise, during the course of their speech interaction, the relative social consequences of choosing a particular linguistic expression. The idea of a 'markedness evaluator', as formulated by Myers-Scotton (1998d), emphasises the way in which the speaker comes to self evaluate, in terms of the degree of relative markedness, the significance of a marked choice over an unmarked (i.e. expected) choice to achieve a certain goal. In other words, the divergence between the unmarked expression and the marked expression which is chosen by the speaker, must carry a significance in meaning.

Myers-Scotton calls this specific type of conversational code-switching as 'code-switching as an unmarked choice'. For example, in the case of informal group interactions amongst peers, bilinguals often come to switch codes and produce many

instances of intra-sentential code-switching. She also states that 'code-switching as an unmarked choice' may be the community norm, but at same time, it may be the norm for certain speakers, or certain interactions. In other words, speakers can recognise that it is a norm and expect it in a specific context.

According to Myers-Scotton (1995a, p119), there are four conditions which must be met in order for bilinguals to produce code-switching as the unmarked language choice: first, the speakers must be bilingual peers; second, the interactions have to be of a type in which speakers wish to symbolise dual membership; third, the speakers must positively evaluate the languages involved; and finally, the speakers must be proficient in the two (or more) languages. The results of the present study support the conditions for the production of 'code-switching as the unmarked choice' as they are put forward by Myers-Scotton. The participants conformed to the specific requirements as they exist, and in fact intrasentential code-switching was by for the dominant form.

These four conditions propose that there exists a relationship between the bilinguals' attitude towards the languages involved, and the type of code-switching produced. Using this, Myers-Scotton's (1993) notions of marked and unmarked choice may lead to uncovering the relationship between speakers' linguistic choice, speakers' attitude towards code-switching, and their intentions/strategies.

3.2.6 Myers-Scotton's Matrix Language Frame Model

The Matrix Language Frame (MLF) model is based on the assumption that within a code-switched sentence, there exists a base (or matrix) language. The model predicts that the matrix language sets the grammatical frame for intra-sentential codeswitching (that is, where code-switching occurs within the one sentence). Specifically, Myers-Scotton focuses on an analysis of code-switching within a complement phrase. She claims that "it is in such a unit that the grammars of the components of code-switching are in contact" (Myers-Scotton, 1998b, p92). Myers-Scotton then employs four theoretical constructs in order to discuss possible structuring in codeswitching within the Matrix Language Frame model. These are: the complement phrase as the unit of analysis; the matrix language vs. the embedded language distinction; and the content vs. system morpheme distinction; and the three types of constituents which appear within the complement phrase.

The Complement Phrase as the Unit of Analysis

The Complement Phrase (CP) is considered to be the best for discussing the grammatical structuring in code-switching within the MLF model. A CP is understood as a syntactic structure, expressing the predicate-argument structure of a clause (e.g. *'she walked'*, *'she kicked the ball'*, *'the boy is naughty'*). Moreover, the CP is a clause with a complementizer node. For example, this sentence [*I wish that the sun would shine everyday*] contains two CPs, one which is led by an element in

73

complementizer 'that', and the other headed by a null element. Therefore, "the CP can be defined more precisely than either the sentence or the clause" (Myers-Scotton, 1997, p92).

Defining the Matrix Language

The matrix language can be defined in two ways; firstly on the basis of the structure of the discourse, and secondly, on the basis of sociolinguistics. In the former, the matrix language becomes recognisable through its presentation of a morphosyntactic frame for the CP. In other words, the matrix language is more grammatically dominant than the embedded language in mixed constituents. Secondly, the matrix language can be identified because it contains relatively more morphemes in at least two sentences, either from a single speaker, or from two speakers in the course of conversation. From the sociolinguistic point of view, it is the speakers who themselves, when engaged in code-switching, come to recognise the matrix language, as the "language we are speaking". In psychological terms, the speakers perceive that code-switching is, for them, part of discourse which takes place within a single language. Therefore, the code-switching discourse often corresponds to the unmarked choice.

Content vs. System Morpheme Distinction

The MLF model suggests that content morphemes and system morphemes do not show similar patterns of occurrence in code-switching. According to Myers-Scotton (1998b, p93) the distinction between the content and system morpheme becomes

explainable through evidence from other linguistic research. For instance, in general, each morpheme figures differently in terms of how both content and system morpheme are affected by aphasia (brain disorder). *'He backed up the truck'* may *become* *'He trucked up the back'*. In this case, the content morpheme (*truck*) is interchanged whilst the system morpheme stays in place.

Content morphemes are understood in that they constitute the predicate-argument structure, by either assigning or receiving thematic roles. Content morphemes, such as most verbs and some prepositions, assign thematic roles, while nouns, descriptive adjectives, and some pronouns receive thematic roles.

Unlike content morphemes, system morphemes neither assign, nor receive, thematic roles. Some of them possess the feature [+Quantification], and a plus setting for quantification restricts possible referent(s) of lexical category. For example; articles limit the potential reference of nouns either to a smaller set (the boys vs. Boys) or to an individual (the boy); tense and aspect limit the possible reference of predicates (i.e. verbs and adjectives); and degree adverbs (e.g. very) restrict the reference of events and adjectives. Most function words (determiners, possessive adjectives, and intensifier adverbs) and inflections (affixes) are prototypical system morphemes.

Three Types of Code-switching Constituents

In the model of the constituents of the CP, these are separated into three types. They are; mixed constituents (matrix language + embedded language constituents), matrix-language islands, and embedded-language islands. The characteristic of mixed constituents (ML + EL) is that morphemes are carried over from both the matrix language (ML) and the embedded language (EL), though the ML controls the grammatical frame. The matrix islands (ML islands) also keep their own grammatical frame, however, ML islands consist of only morphemes from the ML. The embedded language islands (EL islands) are framed by the EL grammar, and all morphemes derive from the EL.

According to Myers-Scotton (1997, p96), within the terms of the hypothesis derived from the constructs of the MLF model, all code-switching illustrates the same coherence. She sets two principles of the MLF model: the morpheme order principle, and the system morpheme principle. The former principle is that ML + EL constituents (mixed constituents) consist of singly occurring EL lexemes and a number of ML morphemes, and surface morpheme order will be that of the ML. On the other hand, the latter principle is that in ML + EL constituents, all system morphemes that have grammatical relations independent to their head constituent will come from the ML. Therefore, only EL morphemes that may occur in the mixed constituent are content morphemes. However, not all EL content morphemes may be embedded into the matrix language. EL content morphemes are checked in terms of congruency with their corresponding ML morphemes.

A Language Production Model

In order to illustrate how EL content morphemes are selected, Myers-Scotton postulates the three levels of the process of language production based on the concept of lemmas. 'Lemmas' can be characterised as comprising all the information (non-phonological aspects of an item's lexical information) which is used to produce a surface level form. The lemmas link speakers' intentions (i.e., semantic and pragmatic features) to the surface level form through the three levels. These levels are: the 'conceptual' level, the 'functional' level, and the 'positional' level (see the Table 3.1 below).

Table 3.1 A Language Production Model

Conceptual Level:	Speaker's intentions regarding referential information and socio-pragmatic messages
Functional Level:	Select lemmas from mental lexicon; Lemmas send direction to the formulator
Positional Level:	Select phonological representations (Results: lexemes are realised)

(adapted from Myers-Scotton 1995b, p237)

First, a speaker makes a choice based on one's own intentions at the conceptual level. If discourse includes code-switching, the ML is selected, and content morphemes are checked to convey specific semantic and pragmatic intentions at best. At this abstract level of production, only lemmas (not lexemes) are activated to support surface morphemes. Therefore, in order for an EL lemma to support an EL content morpheme in an ML frame,

the EL lemma is filtered for congruency with an ML lemma counterpart. For example, if the EL content morpheme has an equivalent in the ML system morpheme, then it will not appear in a mixed constituent, since the selection of a language-specific lemma derived from speaker's semantic and pragmatic information (lexical-conceptual structure) designates a certain predicate-argument structure and specific morphological realisation patterns.

Second, at the functional level, the formulator receives directions from lemmas to build the CP frame and support surface level lexemes. At this stage, an EL content morpheme must match its ML counterpart in terms of its thematic roles (their assignment in the case of verbs and prepositions and their reception in the case of nouns, descriptive adjectives, and pronouns). Myers-Scotton (1995b, p248) explains such an instance by using a mixed constituent (Japanese/English) from Nishimura's study (1986).

She **wa**, took her a month to come home **yo**.
   TOP   EMPHATIC

"Talking about her, (it) took her a month to come home, you know."

Even though a long EL island is contained in this sentence, Nishimura claims that Japanese is the ML. According to Myers-Scotton (1997, p248), "The EL pronoun (*she*), an emphatic here, encodes the discourse thematic role of TOPIC, and occurs with the Japanese topicaliser '*wa*' (a system morpheme)".

78

Thus, if the result of congruence checking is sufficient for the supporting lemma, and appears in a mixed constituent, phonological presentations are then selected at the positional level. Moreover, the position of lexemes is also directed at this level.

In the present study, the Japanese language is clearly dominant in terms of discourse, since all participants are native speakers of Japanese. Therefore, the Matrix Language Frame model is a useful guide for examining intrasentential code-switching. That is, the MLF model enables the researcher to investigate the structural principles exhibited in code-switching in the community being studied.

Chapter 4

Method

This thesis investigates code-switching amongst Japanese native speakers in an English-speaking country. The general approach to this research has been primarily qualitative and inductive. However, the analysis also incorporated selectively used quantitative approach. Two major aspects of code-switching have been studied. These include: first, the sociolinguistic/pragmatic aspect. That is, language choice in relation to external factors (such as the topic and the gender of interlocutor), as well as communicative intent/strategies; second, the linguistic aspect. This examines the linguistic form of the matrix language frames, and the embedded language switches. In addition to this, attitudes towards both Japanese and English, and the practice of code-switching that each individual holds, are taken into account as the affective element in language choice.

4.1 Subjects

Twelve subjects participated in this study. All are Japanese native speakers who were born in Japan, and whose parents' native language is Japanese. In terms of English language competency, all participants have studied English for a minimum period of six years at high school level in Japan or equivalent (two participants completed high school in Australia). Moreover, the duration of uninterrupted residence in an

English-speaking country is no less than two years, and all use English regularly in the course of their daily affairs. Half the subjects fall into the age grouping of 20-30 years, and all are university students. The other half fall into an older age bracket of 40-60 years. Five speakers of this group are working, and one speaker is a home-maker. Each age grouping then consists of three pairs. Within each age group, the three pairs were organised as follows: one female pair, one male pair, and one mixed sex pair. Since the best code-switching data would be naturally-occurring conversations among the participants, the researcher asked one of each pair to select their partner. Therefore, all pairs consist of participants who are familiar with one another in that they have a pre-established friendship.

The study of code-switching with a relatively small number of subjects has been carried out by some researchers. For example, Blom and Gumperz (1972) recorded the presence of two groups which consisted of only six individuals in their study of dialects in a specific Norwegian speech community. Similarly, Nishimura's (1995) paper was constructed from the speech of only three subjects. She recorded three in-group interactions so as to analyse the possible functions of code-switching operating amongst these subjects. The advantage of having small scale subject participation is that a greater depth of analyses can be achieved by the researcher through individual, person-to-person interviews.

The aim of creating six pairs according to their age and gender was to uncover different patterns of code-switching use and to discover if these variables influence the type of code-switching (intersentential or intrasentential) being employed by the interlocutors. In fact, only one person, who was of the older age group, produced intersentential code-switching. Rindler Schjerve (1998) also investigated the choice of code-switching patterns in relation to both age and gender in her study of Sardinian/Italian code-switching. She concludes that the young speakers use the Italian language rather than Sardinian as the matrix language and women codeswitch more than men do.

Table 4.1 Participants Data

PAIR	SPEAKER	AGE RANGE	GENDER	STATUS	LENGTH OF TIME IN AUSTRALIA
1	A	20-25	f	student	5 years
	B	25-30	f	student	2 years
2	C	20-25	m	student	6 years
	D	20-25	m	student	5 years
3	E	20-25	f	student	9 years
	F	20-25	m	student	6 years
4	G	51-55	f	working	19 years
	H	46-50	f	working	14 years
5	I	41-45	m	working	8 years
	J	46-50	m	working	13 years
6	K	55-60	f	home maker	13 years
	L	41-45	m	working	8 years

There is more detailed information regarding the information of each of these participants in the discussion of data's section.

4.2 Data

There were five stages for the collection of data in this study. These consisted of: an initial questionnaire, the recording of the natural conversation of the participants, a two-part second questionnaires, a 'recollection test', and a 'sociolinguistic interview'.

4.2.1 Initial Questionnaire

All participants were, at the beginning of the research, required to fill out a questionnaire in order to ensure that they conformed to the criteria which the researcher required. It therefore consists of the sociolinguistic background questions, and self-report on the participants' English proficiency. The questions included: age range; gender; status (ie. student, working, home maker, other); type of course/degree and the year of study; type of occupation, and occupation duties; length of time in Australia; length of time in an English-speaking country other than Australia; age at which you began formally learning English; name of institution; the duration of formal English study; previously completed English examinations; the context in which English is used during the course of their everyday routine. A self-report on their own English language proficiency level was estimated with a five point scale ('natives', 'near-natives', 'good', 'fair', and 'poor'). Types of examination are classified into four, included: 'speaking', 'understanding' 'reading' and 'writing' (Appendix 1).

Code-switching studies which include a discussion of the speakers' language proficiency often use indirect measures. In most cases, the survey questionnaires contain questions like: time of immigration, length of stay, education, and self reports (eg. Azuma 1987, Bentahila and Davies 1992, Poplack 1980, Treffers-Daller 1992). The self rating of language proficiency can be problematic in terms of validity and reliability (Baker 1992). Lasimbang, Miller and Otigil (1992, p343) also point out that this type of assessment can only indicate relative strength or weakness in languages. Since this study does not include a discussion of the speakers' English language proficiency, the subjects' self rating of language proficiency will be taken in conjunction with the sociolinguistic background profiles to provide more substantial evidence to support or justify their English competence. In this study of twelve participants, eight reported that their speaking proficiency was 'good', and four reported that it was 'fair'. It shows that most participants have relative confidence with their spoken English.

4.2.2 Recording Sessions

The natural interaction of the paired participants was recorded with an audio cassette player for a total period of 40 minutes. A small portable cassette player with a sensitive microphone was placed between them. The pairs were asked to talk about two topics: their study or work; and their hopes and fears for Japan in the new millennium. Since the first topic was closely related to the participants' everyday life in the English-

speaking context, the topic seemed to be conducive to more relaxed and natural interaction. The second topic, on the other hand, was selected not only because it is a culturally related issue, but also because it opens space for discussion of a cross cultural nature. Because of the participants' diverse backgrounds, it is thought that this very broad topic will not limit or restrict the speakers in their discussion. Rather it will expand their opportunities to demonstrate their linguistic repertoire.

Moreover, in order to capture the natural interactions amongst each pair, subjects were told that the researcher was studying the informal conversation of Japanese. Therefore, no mention of code-switching was made prior to the recording sessions. Saragih (1997) employed a similar method in her study of Simalungun/Indonesian code-switching. Her subjects were given the explanation that the researcher was studying the usage of Simalungun, as an example of a regional language. Similarly, in Myers-Scotton's (1992) study comparing codeswitching and borrowing, the Shona speakers were interviewed by the native speaker of the same language, and recorded without mentioning the real purpose of their being interviewed. In doing so, she managed to obtain a set of naturally-occurring conversations.

Each pair's conversation was recorded at a location which was familiar to both in order to capture their informal speech. The conversations of all pairs of students (pair 1, 2, and 3) were recorded at their campus. The conversation of pair 4 was

recorded at their friend's home, and both pair 5 and 6 were at one of each partner's home. Prior to the recording sessions, the researcher had a small discussion with each pair about their study or work, in order that they might naturally commence discussing the topic for the first recording session. Labov (1972) has given some attention to the role of the observer in monolingual interactions. He suggests that the presence of the researcher has the overall effect of impinging upon (and altering) the character of natural speech. He labels this the 'observer's paradox', because although the intention is to capture natural speech, the observer's very presence renders this highly unlikely. Milroy, Li Wei and Moffatt (1991) argue however that the 'observer's paradox' especially afflicts studies of code-switching in bilingual communities, and more so in cases where the investigator is from a different ethnic background from those being studied. Many researchers, even 'insiders' - those from the same ethnic background, choose to remain absent during the course of the recording session. Mishoe (1995), for example, asked a family member to videotape a gathering in which she felt her presence would be intrusive.

However, in order to ensure that the intended procedures were followed (for instance to ensure that the operation of the recording equipment was carried out properly), the researcher was present at the beginning of each session. After twenty minutes the researcher returned to end the first session on the particular topic. After a short break, the second session (on the second topic) commenced, and the researcher left, returning

again after a twenty minute interval to conclude the session. Since relationships between each pair were 'pre-established friendship', and they interacted in a familiar environment, no hesitation or awkwardness was demonstrated. In fact, one of the more practical problems that did occur was that the subjects regularly veered off the course of the assigned topic. Although there was some self-correction, once this pattern was established between certain interlocutors it tended to recur. Moreover, it was anticipated that the interaction within the small size of the group would avoid the dominance of conversation by one of the speakers. In fact, most of time both speakers contributed equally to the conversations during the recording sessions.

4.2.3 Second Questionnaire

This questionnaire was based on the well-documented studies on language attitudes towards 'Welsh and English" (e.g. Baker 1992). It consisted of two separate sections. The first was aimed at gaining the respondent's general attitude toward both the Japanese language and the English language. Indirect statements were made about each language (both Japanese and English). The participants were asked to rank these statements on the following five point scale, such as: 1 strongly disagree; 2 somewhat disagree; 3 agree and not agree; 4 somewhat agree; and 5 strongly agree.

The statements were by nature quite general (e.g. *I like hearing English/Japanese)*, they related to language learning

(e.g. *English/Japanese is a language worth learning*), and also referred to motivation (e.g. *There are more useful languages to learn than English/Japanese, If I have children, I would like them to speak English/Japanese*). This has been done in order to obtain each subject's evaluation of English and Japanese language, and its relationship with the occurrence of code-switching.

The second part of the questionnaire attempted to elicit the speakers' instrumental and integrative attitudes towards English only. The questionnaire stated *how 'important' or 'unimportant' do you think the English language is for people to do the following?* Five items for each category of 'instrumental' and 'integrative' were used to determine both attitudes. For example, the questions which were used to evaluate instrumental attitudes include: 'Get a job', and 'Become smarter', whilst those that were put forward to evaluate integrative attitudes include: 'To make friends', and 'Be accepted in the community'.

4.2.4 Recollection Test

A 'recollection test' was administered on an individual basis to each of the participants. After listening to the recorded conversations, the researcher listed all the English items (including single words, and phrases) produced by each speaker. These items are listed separately according to the topic which the participants discussed. The passages which contain these English items were also edited. The recollection tests were

conducted at a time, and in a location, which was convenient to each individual. These included their home, campus, office and coffee shop. A few participants found it difficult to find the time for the recollection tests, because of their work, therefore it was administered during their extended lunch break or straight after their work. The researcher presented the listed items orally, and then asked each individual whether or not they knew a Japanese equivalent for the English word which they produced. The participants then responded by giving the equivalent of each item in Japanese, or by explaining that there was no equivalent for these items in Japanese. In order to distinguish loan words from English language codeswitched items, the researcher also asked whether or not this particular word was recognisable to them as a Japanese loan word (borrowed from the English language). The researcher anticipated that each speaker would hold a different repertoire of loan words.

The recollection test was done in order to determine whether or not switches from the matrix language have been associated with linguistic gaps. That is, if the speakers are not able to provide the Japanese equivalents, this would indicate that they used English items to fill lexical gaps. If the speakers are able to provide the Japanese equivalent, it means that the English items are being used as either loan words (English words which are commonly used in Japan) or speakers' intentions/strategies. Rayfield (1970) used a similar recollection test in regard to Yiddish/English bilinguals. She found that although her subjects possessed Yiddish competence,

they still employed English expressions in their speech. Saragih (1997) also conducted this kind of recollection test, employed in her study of Simalungun/Indonesian code-switching. Saragih was able to demonstrate that the explanation of lexical gaps can only be applied to a small proportion of code-switched expressions in her data. Therefore, code-switching was engaged in as a conversational strategy.

4.2.5 Sociolinguistic Interviews

The sociolinguistic interviews followed right after the recollection tests. Each participant was given the passages which contained the code-switched items by the researcher. This was done in order to prompt the subject, so as to make more recognisable the context of the conversation which they had during the course of the recorded conversation. Each participant was asked why he or she used English items even though they knew the Japanese equivalent. Overall, the purpose of this procedure was to uncover the speakers' intentions, strategies and interpretations.

Moreover, in order to investigate each speaker's attitude toward code-switching, the researcher asked their opinions with regard to the phenomenon of code-switching. At this point in time the researcher mentioned mixed codes. Subjects were then asked: *Do you hear a mixing of Japanese and English at university/college/ or at work? If so, when do they speak like that?; Do you mix English and Japanese when you speak? When and to whom do you speak like that?; What are your views on the*

mixing of English and Japanese? And, why do you think people mix the two languages? All participants were aware of the phenomenon of mixing Japanese and English. In addition to this, participants were also asked their opinion with regard to different types of code-switching (i.e. intersentential and intrasentential) during each interview. Each of the interviews were conducted over one to two hours.

4.3 Transcription

Transcribing was done by the author. Since the focus of this study was to observe and analyse the nature of code-switching, the transcription of the tapes was limited. Therefore, only the relevant passages where code-switching occurred were transcribed and not the entire conversation. The passages were transcribed with conventional English and Japanese Hebon orthography. Transcription conventions used by Gardner were followed. All English code-switched items were indicated by boldfacing.

4.4 Analysis

4.4.1 Social/Pragmatic Approach

The Frequency of code-switching in Relation to Topic

The analysis of data primarily consisted of two approaches, social/pragmatic and linguistic. Firstly, the frequency of code-switching in relation to components of the speech event (i.e. topic and interlocutor) was investigated. In order to do this, the researcher counted the total number of turns each speaker took in the course of each topic. The total number of

code switched items which each speaker produced throughout the
course of the topic was then calculated. This figure was
divided by the number of turns to obtain the average number of
codeswitches made per turn for each of the interlocutors. These
were then tabulated according to each topic.

Number of turns for each interlocutor/topic = average no. of CS per turn
Number of codeswitches made by each interlocutor/topic

Topic two however differs somewhat as a distinction has been
made in terms of the responses produced and the way they relate
to three identifiable contexts, these are 1) reference to
Japanese cultural context   2) reference to English-speaking
context   3) inclusive of both, or not related to either
(neutral). The process described above then was applied to
these divisions. The number of turns that such speaker made
within these divisions were calculated and then divided by the
number of codeswitches corresponding to those divisions to get
the median number of codeswitches per turn for each division
and for each speaker.

Moreover, the researcher used a sound editing software timer
function to obtain passage duration in the Japanese-related
context, which were produced by each pair during topic 2. This
has been done in order to examine in more detail, the
relationship between the Japanese-related context and the
frequency of code-switching. This enabled the researcher to
calculate the number of turns which were made by each speaker

in the space of each passage, and their identity of the codeswitches (if any) that were then contained within each of these turns.

Frequency of Code-switching in Relation to the Gender of the Interlocutor

The next step involved taking this data to the individual level, as well as pairs, as they have been defined in terms of gender. First, the average number of codeswitches per turn for each topic was combined in order to calculate the total number of code-switching produced by each individual. Once this was accomplished, it was then possible to compare these individuals' scores, and rank the participants according to their codeswitching frequency. Second, the average number of codeswitched items produced per turn for each speaker was added to that of their partner, so that each pair obtained a combined total for each of the two topics. These figures were tabulated according to the gender of the interlocutors (i.e. f/f, f/m, m/m). It was then possible to make comparisons between the pairs. This was aimed at discovering whether gender played a role in influencing the frequency of code-switching amongst the participants.

Types of Code-switching in Relation to Topics

At the next level of analysis, each codeswitched item was classified into one of five categories (i.e. single word, phrase, clause, multiple clause, or sentence switch). For this, topics one and two were treated separately. The different types of codeswitches were tabulated for each individual. The

93

individuals' score received for each category was divided by the number of turns to obtain the average number of different types of codeswitches made per turn for each of the interlocutors. These were tabulated according to each topic.

Types of Code-switching in Relation to the Gender of the Interlocutor

First, the average number of different types of codeswitches per turn for each topic was combined in order to calculate the total number of each types of code-switching produced by each individual. These figures were tabulated according to the gender of interlocutors (i.e. f/f, f/m, m/m). This has been done in order to discover whether gender played a role in influencing the frequency of different types of code-switching amongst the participants.

Functions of Code-switching

The researcher attempted to interpret the possible functions of code-switching. These were related to the speakers' intention/strategy in the context of the interaction. Through the use the sociolinguistic interview, the researcher was able to identify, and then classify, the functions that the various codeswitched items came to fill. Moreover, the researcher attempted to take the participants out of the immediate context of the study, by asking hypothetical questions about how they would react in much more formal circumstances. In addition to the sociolinguistic interview, the researcher telephoned some of the subjects whose patterns of codeswitching stood out as markedly different from the majority of participants. This

helped to uncover some of the strategies used through codeswitching by the speakers. This interpretation was accomplished through the data based on speakers' comments on the practice of code-switching in everyday life.

4.4.2 Linguistic Analysis

Intrasentential code-switching refers to code-switching which occurs within the same sentence, from the single word to clausal level (more than a single word, including one finite verb). The utterances which contain intra-sentential code-switching were selected in order to analyse what linguistic features characterise switched items, and the environments in which they are embedded. This was accomplished by employing Myers-Scotton's Matrix Language Frame model.

4.4.3 Attitude Towards English, Japanese and Code-switching

The study also investigated the occurrence of code-switching in relation to the speakers' attitudes towards both the English and Japanese languages, and code-switching. The scores of each individual respondent's general attitude towards both English and Japanese were tabulated. This information derived from the attitude survey (the first section of questionnaire two). This was done to establish the overall average attitude score for the entire group. This then allowed for a comparison, to find where the individual resided, in terms of language attitude, in relation to the rest of the group. Then the average evaluation score of English and Japanese by each speaker was tabulated with the individual's average number of codeswitches per turn.

Furthermore, the scores of each individual respondent's instrumental and integrative attitudes toward English were also tabulated. These derived from the second section of questionnaire two. The average scores for both instrumental and integrative attitudes, of each speaker, were also tabulated with the individual's average number of codeswitches per turn. The ultimate goal was to discover whether a speaker who held a positive attitude towards English, or the practice of code-switching, was more likely to codeswitch than somebody who held a negative attitude. In addition to this, the researcher used the sociolinguistic interview as an opportunity to gauge the individuals' attitudes towards the practice of code-switching (the phrase the researcher used was the 'mixing of languages'). As in the previous two cases, the attitude held by each speaker towards code-switching was compared to the actual production of codeswitches.

In summary, the methodology has three primary areas of significance. The first is the sociolinguistic aspect, which highlights the influence of external factors (i.e. topic and gender) upon the frequency of code-switching, as well as the interlocutor's intentions and strategies as they relate to code-switching. The second involves speakers' attitudes. The methodology used allowed for the evaluation of each individual's own attitude towards both the Japanese and English languages, as well as code-switching. This was then used comparatively in order to establish the relationship between

these attitudes and actual practice of code-switching. Finally, the structural (or linguistic) aspect has been taken into account to uncover the nature of the production of intrasentential code-switching and its possible structural limitations.

Chapter 5

Results and Discussion

In this chapter, the results of the research, and a discussion of their implications will be presented. First, in order to investigate the patterns of language choice, the code-switching data will be analysed in relation to specific components of the speech event (i.e. topic and gender). Second, the frequency of the different types of code-switching will also be analysed in relation to topic and gender. Third will be an analysis which sets out to explore any possible relationships which exist between the actual production of codeswitched items as they have been recorded, and the speakers' attitudes towards the English and Japanese languages, and code-switching. Fourth, the pragmatic aspects of code-switching will be discussed with regard to the speakers' linguistic choice. Fifth, the strategies/intentions and functions of code-switching will be analysed, and finally the linguistic form of the base language frames and the embedded language switches will be examined.

5.1 Patterns of Language Choice

Sociolinguists have studied the bilingual speaker's language choice and code-switching extensively. They have attempted to uncover when and why these take place in the social context (e.g. Blom and Gumperz 1972, Sankoff 1972). These studies have shown the speakers' ability to select language according to the interlocutor, the situational context, and the topic of

conversation. This thesis attempts to establish the relationship between the frequency of code-switching, and two variable components, topic and gender (of the interlocutor).

5.1.1 Code-switching Data

The data, which was presented by twelve Japanese participants, was taken from naturally-occurring conversations. The relationship amongst the six pairs was what could be termed 'friendship', and the setting for each recording was familiar to the participants. The speech that was recorded was therefore both informal and relaxed. Both the older and younger age group consisted of an entirely male pair, an entirely female pair, and a mixed pair. The older age group discussed their work and then the year two thousand, as topic one and topic two respectively, while the younger age group discussed their study as topic one, and the year two thousand as topic two. The duration of the recording for each topic was twenty minutes.

5.1.2 The Codeswitched Component

Researchers such as Rindler Schjerve (1998, pp228-229), in her study of language shifts between Italian and Sardinian, have come to classify codeswitched utterance into two primary groupings, these are 'turn' and 'intraturn' specific switches. 'Turn' switches are counted when 'a speaker takes up his turn with a switch to the other language' (Rindler Schjerve, 1998, p227). 'Intraturn' switches however, occur when only a portion of the turn is taken up by a switch to the other language. Furthermore, Rinder Schjerve has subdivided intraturn switches

into *interphrasal* switches, whereby a complete phrase inside the turn is spoken in the alternate language, and *intraphrasal* switches, where only a part of the phrase (for example a single word) is spoken in the alternate language. Basically, these categories have been determined on the basis of the length of the codeswitched item. The three categories therefore are finally: *turns specific*, *interphrasal*, and *intraphrasal* codeswitches.

If then become possible to calculate the relative frequency for each of these categories both at the collective or group level, and at the individual level where correlations and relationships may begin to be a distinguished, especially when extra linguistic factors (such as age, gender, education, communicative network, topic etc) are taken into account.

Similarly, Yoon (1996, pp403-404) has categorised codeswitches as small-size switches (e.g. one-word, multi-word, discourse connectors) and larger-size codeswitches (switches which occur at the clause-level in a complex sentence). However, his study did not concentrate on the frequency of code-switching, but on the types of code choice, and the social relationships between interlocutors.

In order to investigate the relationship between the frequency of code-switching and topics, as in this current study, the codeswitches are classified into five categories, single word, phrase (more than single word but not including a finite verb),

clause (more than a single word, including one finite verb),
multiple clause (complex or compound sentence), and sentence
switch. Examples of these types of switches are as follows.

Single word switch:

1) Sono **population** ga fuetemasu yo.
   The NOM increase FP
   'The population (would) increase.'

2) Watashi konkai wa **disappointed** datta kara ne.
   I this time TOP was so FP
   'So I was disappointed this time.'

Phrase switch:

1) Ima **unemployment rate** sugoi kara taihenda yone.
   now terrible since hard FP
   'Since unemployment rate now is terrible, it's hard (to get a job)'.

2) Ima choodo **one hundred thirty four million** toka.
   now about such
   'About one hundred thirty four million such.'

Clause switch:

1) **As far as leadership is concerned.** Nihon no hitotachi wa zenzen
   Japan of people TOP at all
   kitai shite nai.
   expect do NEG
   'As far as leadership is concerned, Japanese people don't expect
   (that) from politicians) at all.'

2) **Yes, yes, I, I believe that** Seijika ga inakutemo kuni wa ugoku.
   Politician NOM withiout country TOP carry on
   'Yes, yes I, I believe that. A country carries on without
   politicians.'

Multiple clause switch:

   Unless, you have very active life. nanika **going out everyday,**
   something
   today is [   ], tomorrow is swimming and tomorrow is, you know,
   going out for dinner.
   'Unless, you have very active life, something (like) going out
   every day, today is [   ], tomorrow is swimming and tomorrow
   is, you know, going out for dinner.'

Sentence switch:

   Hutsuka, mikka, Ok. **I can manage, I can sleep every day.** Yokka...
   The second day the third day The fourth day..
   'The second day, the third day is OK. I can manage. I can sleep
   every day. The four day ....'

5.1.3 Division of Topic 2

For the recording sessions, the participants were given two topics. The first was work or study, the second, their hopes and fears for the year two thousand. The second differed from the first in that the participants' discussion tended to be broader and more comparative in perspective. For instance, although the question was focused specifically on Japan, it was common for the speakers, especially when the discussion turned to politics and the economy, to compare the Japanese situation with that of other countries, or, to talk of the external influences which impact on Japan. The speakers often reverted back to a discussion associated with an English-speaking country context as well. As a consequence it was decided to divide their discussion concerning the second topic into three separate groupings which are set out under the 'method' section in Chapter 4.

5.1.4 The Relationship Between the Frequency of Code-switching and Topic

The total number of turns, and a count of the codeswitches which were made by each speaker was calculated, in order to find the average number of codeswitches per turn for each topic, and for each individual (refer to analysis section [4] in Chapter 4). The raw numerical data of the average number of codeswitches per turn, for each topic by each individual, is shown in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 Average Numbers of Codeswitches per Turn by Each Speaker in Relation to Topics

	Topic 1	Topic 2		
		Content of Topics		
	Study or Work	Japanese	English	Neutral
Younger age group				
Speaker A	0.33	0.06	0.36	0.31
	25/76	1/18	5/14	8/26
Speaker B	1.1	0.42	0.5	0.85
	84/77	8/19	6/12	22/26
Speaker C	0.58	0.15	-	0
	48/83	7/46	-	0/10
Speaker D	0.87	0.14	-	0.2
	73/84	6/44	-	2/10
Speaker E	0.37	0.2	0.6	0.53
	42/115	11/55	3/5	18/34
Speaker F	0.18	0	0.4	0.15
	20/114	0/55	2/5	5/33
Older age group				
Speaker G	0.22	0.31	0.33	0.8
	10/46	11/36	3/9	4/5
Speaker H	0.47	0.74	0.63	2.33
	21/45	26/35	5/8	14/6
Speaker I	0.14	0.02	-	0.14
	10/71	1/42	-	3/21
Speaker J	0.6	0.05	-	0.05
	42/70	2/41	-	1/22
Speaker K	0.24	0.03	-	0.67
	13/55	1/35	-	2/3
Speaker L	0.16	0.16	-	0
	9/56	5/32	-	0/3

Table 5.1 shows that there is a clear pattern as to the language choice for most of the speakers in relation to topic. Since topic one (study or work) was closely related to the twelve participants' every day life in an English-speaking

context, four speakers (B, C, D and J) recorded their own highest average number of codeswitches per turn (in the range of 0.58-1.1) within this topic. Additionally, one speaker (I) received an equal highest number of codeswitches per turn for both of the topics which referred to their work and the 'neutral' context. Three speakers (A, E, and F) marked the highest average number of codeswitches per turn (in the range of 0.36-0.6) when they discussed the subtopic which related to the English-speaking context, during their second recording sessions. That is, of the twelve participants, seven speakers engaged in code-switching most often during their discussion of the topics which refer to the English-speaking, context rather than the other two topics (the Japanese related context and the neutral category). In fact, seven speakers obtained the lowest average number of codeswitches per turn (in the range of 0.02-0.42) for the topic which related to the Japanese cultural context, and one of them (speaker F) actually did not produce any codeswitches at all. However, one speaker (L) marked the same average number of codeswitches (0.16) for both of the topics which referred to the English-speaking and Japanese cultural context.

However, it is significant to note that three out of the six pairs did not, in the course of their discussion on topic two, choose to focus on an English related subject, and thus no turns were recorded. A distinction should be made in this case however, between what occurred in this instance – that is where a subject was not discussed (and therefore quite obviously no

codeswitches were produced), and an instance whereby a subject is actually spoken of within a conversation and no codeswitches were produced. The dashes in table 5.1 therefore, do not represent the fact that no codeswitches were produced, but that the speakers did not engage in the topic itself.

In addition to this, it should also be taken into consideration that overall, the older age group category displayed the highest frequency of codeswitches per turn, in their discussions which have been categorised as 'neutral' (that is, including both the English speaking and Japanese cultural context, or not related to either). This group recorded a median average number of codeswitches per turn of $\bar{X} = 0.665$, compared to the younger group which showed a median of $\bar{X} = 0.34$. Comparatively, across the topics, three of the older age group participants (G, H, and K) recorded their highest individual frequency levels of codeswitches within this 'neutral' category. Out of all the subjects within the confines of this 'neutral' category, speaker H marked the highest average number of codes switches per turn (2.33).

Furthermore, across the topics, half of those who attained their highest individual frequency scores were paired. For example, speaker C recorded his highest average number of codeswitches per turn whilst discussing topic one, as did his partner speaker D. As it turned out, both were paired together for this session. They are the only pair which marked such a result in topic one. However, in topic two (the English

speaking context category) the same phenomenon was recorded by the paired speakers E and F, whilst in the 'neutral' category, the same occurred in relation to paired speakers G and H.

Table 5.1 reveals that firstly, code-switching as a type of language choice, is influenced by topic. That is, certain topics set the opportunity for speakers to engage in code-switching, as is evidenced in their more frequent use of English items during their discussion of work or study in an English speaking country, and less frequent use of English items during their discussion within the frame of a Japanese cultural context. Second, the younger speakers tended to engage in codeswitching when they were discussing a topic which directly related to the English-speaking context alone, whereas the older speakers tended to produce more codeswitches during their discussions which related to both the Japanese cultural, and English-speaking context, (or not related to either).

Haugen (cited in Clyne, 1998, p308) argues that different languages have attached to them, a distinct cultural domain. Within these cultural domains, the individual becomes integrated into a common social experience, one that the speaker shares with the other members of community. For example, as in the case of this research, the speakers' home (i.e. Japan) or country of migration/residence (i.e. Australia). When the individual is taken from one cultural environment and placed into another, they come to absorb, to varying degrees, the culture of their new surroundings,

including elements of the language. In terms of those experiences which then come to unfold - for instance one's present leisure activities, jobs, school studies, particular forms of sport, new technological developments - the individual comes to incorporate into their linguistic repertoire the language elements inherent in that activity.

Fishman (1972, p246) argues that there is a regular use of code associated with particular topics in multilingual settings. Since one language is more appropriate or capable of conveying actual meanings than another language for certain topics, a speaker employs a particular code in the context of that particular topic. Over a certain period of time, this practice tends to become habitual. Similarly, McClure (1981, p79) claims that 'when a topic which is habitually discussed in one language happens to come up in a conversation in the other language, there is a higher incidence of code-switching and code-changing'.

Table 5.2 Number of Codeswitches by Each Speaker During the Discussion of Japanese-related Context

	Passage Duration	Context	Turns A	Turns B	Switches A	Switches B
Pair 1	1) 2:51	Young generation	8	8	0	1
(A & B)	2) 0:56	Jobs	3	4	0	7
	3) 0:47	Jobs	7	7	1	0
			C	D	C	D
Pair 2	1) 5:57	Jobs	18	18	2	6
(C & D)	2) 10:03	Life employment	22	22	5	0
	3) 0:26	Father's job	2	1	0	0
	4) 0:28	Going back to Japan	4	3	0	0
			E	F	E	F
Pair 3	1) 2:47	Education system	8	8	8	0
(E & F)	2) 2:10	Consumer tax	13	14	0	0
	3) 8:28	Pension system	25	24	0	0
	4) 3:43	Politicians	9	9	3	0
			G	H	G	H
Pair 4	1) 2:20	Politicians	6	5	4	11
(G & H)	2) 1:36	Politicians	2	2	3	0
	3) 4:30	Company policies	15	15	1	7
	4) 0:58	Politicians	4	5	0	5
	5) 3:15	Japanese citizen	9	8	3	3
			I	J	I	J
Pair 5	1) 10:03	Religion, Welfare	35	35	1	1
(I & J)	2) 1:59	End of Year Gifts	7	6	0	1
			K	L	K	L
Pair 6	1) 6:36	The depression in Japan	11	12	0	0
(K & L)	2) 6:00	Imperial Throne	24	20	1	5

The results of this study appear to show that the participants come to employ fewer English items in discussions which are related to the Japanese cultural context, than in discussions which did not. In fact, as in the case of speaker F, no code-switching occurred within this category of topic, even though the speaker made 55 turns throughout the course of four passages. For example, during the first passage (which lasted a total of 2:47 minutes), the speaker made eight turns discussing his hopes for Japan in the year two thousand. Speaker F, and his partner speaker E, chose to focus on the Japanese education

system. The second passage was about the consumer tax, and the previous Prime Minister. Speaker F made fourteen turns during the 2:10 minutes of interaction. The third passage was an 8:28 minute discussion (the speaker made twenty-four turns) on life in Japan with regard to the pension system, the inadequacies of paid holidays, and religion. The last passage was a criticism directed towards Japanese politicians, and an expression of opinion as to what they ideally should be more like. The speaker made nine turns during this a 3:43 minute discussion.

A similar instance occurred during the discussion of topic 1 (about study) by the same speaker (F), and the speaker's partner (E). Since in this case, the shared relationship between this pair was quite long - standing, many times in the past they had discussed this topic in regards to study. They chose therefore to broaden the discussion to include not only their study in the present, but also in the past context of Japan, in a comparative manner. Speaker E discussed the degree of difficulty between studying in Japanese high schools and Australian high schools. During the 3:42 minutes of discussion (both speakers E and F made 16 turns) on study in Japanese high school, both speakers E and F conformed solely to Japanese monolingual utterances. Then, speaker E used an English word to describe the name of the subject (physics) she took immediately after reverting back to a discussion on Australian high schools. However, this is the only instance in which the topic was clearly discussed within a Japanese related context amongst

all the speakers in topic 1. The following passage sets out the
codeswitched item and the context in which it was embedded:

Topic 1
Passage 10
232. E: Datte watashi chuugaku de sono chishiki o tsukawanai de
itsu kore detekurundaroo tte mattetandakedo kekkyoku dete
konakatta mon. Kocchi no kookoo mo hidoi janai? Suugaku tte
kekkoo...
233. F: Zenzen imi nakattan janai?
234. E: Imi nakatta. Datte **physics** yatte mo dete konakatta mon. Are
wa nande detekuru hazu? Kookoo de dete kuru hazu dattandaroo
ne.

<u>Translation</u>
232. E: I was expecting to use my knowledge at Junior high school
in Japan), but I didn't have to use it. High schools here are
terrible, especially mathematics, aren't they?
233. F: So, there was no point in learning it.
234. E: That's right. I didn't come across it even in the study of
physics. When was I supposed to learn it? Perhaps, I was
supposed to learn it at high school (in Japan).

Other speakers similarly did not engage in code-switching
during certain passages of Japanese-related context. For
instance, speaker A produced three passages with her partner,
speaker B, employing no English expressions during the first
and second passages. During the first passage, which lasted a
total of 2:51 minutes, they discussed young people in Japan,
including themselves. The second passage was a discussion of
how to get a job in Japan after finishing university here in
Australia. They argued that the general tendency of companies
in terms of employment is still conservative. However, speaker
A did employ a single English expression during the third
passage, which was again a discussion of job-hunting in Japan.
In contrast to this, speaker B, who received the highest
average frequency of codeswitches per turn out of all the

speakers, did not engage in code-switching at all during this discussion

In the case of pair 2 (speaker C and D), they produced four passages. They engaged in some code-switching during the first and second passages, however there was no occurrence of code-switching during the third and fourth passages. During the third passage, speaker C responded to speaker D's question about 'is father's job. He then explained the type of job that his father has. During the fourth passage, the speakers discussed their return visit to Japan during the next summer holiday. Speaker D was explaining that he is going to attend his cousin's wedding ceremony. Although the third and fourth passages were rather short (0:26 and 0:28 minutes respectively), the discussions concerning speaker C's father and D's cousin, which were strongly related to a Japanese context, appears to have had a significant influence on the occurrence of code-switching.

On the other hand, pair 5 produced only two passages, even though one of them was one of the longest recorded amongst the pairs. During the first passage, which lasted a total of 10:03 minutes, speaker I and J made 35 turns, but both speakers engaged in only one instance of code-switching. Their discussion covered crucial issues affecting Japanese society, such as religion, welfare, and pollution. In the second passage, the emphasis changed to a criticism of a traditional custom in Japan - the end of year gifts. During this

discussion, speaker I employed only one English word while speaker J did not produce any.

In a similar way to pair 5, pair 6 (speaker K and L) also produced two passages which were relatively long. During the first passage speakers K and L made 11 and 12 turns respectively (for 6:36 minutes), but no code-switching occurred. They discussed the current depression in Japan, arguing about the historical evidence in the Japanese economy in order to find the possible causes of the depression. Unlike their first passage, in the second they discussed (for 6:00 minutes) the Imperial Throne, a topic which was heavily related to Japanese culture. During this discussion, speaker K used only one English word, and her partner, L, likewise employed only a single English word, which was repeated five times in succession, with the purpose of emphasising his opinion about the topic.

Topic 2
Passage 3
61. L: Sore wa ne, akogare to iu yori, moshi soo iwareru to sore wa
    sugoi **pressure** dato omoimasu yo. Gyaku ni iwareru, kore wa
    pressure desu yo.
62. K: Dare ga puresshaa desuka?
63. L: Otoko ni totte wa sokushitsu o motte danshi o tsukuranakya
    ikenai nante josei nimo **pressure** desu kedo danshi o agenakya
    ikenai koto jitai ga **pressure** desu yo.
64. K: Soo ne. Dansei no kata ni ichiban puresshaa ga kakatte kuru
    kamo shiremasen ne. Ja kore wa yameta hoo ga ii wa, kawaisoo.
65. L: **Pressure** desu yo. Motto ima no kootaishi no nantoka iu hito
    datte soodesu yo.

Translation
61. L: There is going to be big **pressure** on (him the Crown Prince),
    rather than considering it to be something fortunate if (he)
    is asked (to have a mistress), this will only put **pressure** on
    him).
62. K: Who feels pressure?
63. L: Of course the woman would feel pressure, but the man would
    feel more **pressure** because he would have to face greater
    consequences.

64. K: I agree with you. Perhaps there is more pressure on the man.
    I feel sorry (for the Crown Prince). It is not such a good
    idea.
65. L: This is **pressure**, big **pressure** on the Crown Prince.

Romaine (1995, p304), in her study of Panjabi/English
bilingualism in Britain has found that language and culture are
perceived to be closely related amongst Panjabi/English
speakers. Her informants assert quite strongly that culture
could not be presented without language. One of them pointed
out the difficulty of translating meanings between languages as
one aspect of the link between language and culture.

Similarly, an earlier study by Ervin-Tripp (1964), who
considered topic to be one of the three major variables, along
with 'speakers' and 'situation', explored the concept of
congruence in regard to topic and code choice amongst Japanese
bilinguals. In her study of Japanese bilinguals in the United
States, the subjects were asked to speak about Japanese topics,
in English, to a Japanese interlocutor. These topics were
associated with Japanese culture, for example Japanese
festivals, Japanese New Year's Day, and Japanese cooking.
Ervin-Tripp found that this unsettled the speakers, causing
them to hesitate, pause, and finally resort to using Japanese
words. The topics which were the focus of pair five and pair
six's discussion were very much linked to core aspects of
Japanese culture, especially that concerning the Imperial
Throne and the customary end of year gift giving. As a result,
a very low frequency of code-switching occurred in these

instances. This would seem to support Ervin-Tripp's contention that topic does in fact influence code choice. All of the occurrences described above provided evidence that the topic (which was related to Japanese context) influenced the frequency of the code-switching.

Speaker G and H, who were of the same pair (4), demonstrated a very different pattern of code-switching use from the other speakers. That is, they engaged in code-switching more often during their discussion of the Japanese-related context than their discussion of topic 1 (work)(as Table 5.1). It appears that amongst this pair, the Japanese-related topic did not influence, in the same way, the occurrence of code-switching. An explanation of why this may have occurred amongst these speakers will be given after the discussions of the occurrence of code-switching in relation to the other topics.

Faltis (1989, p119) explains that coordinate bilinguals (who attribute partly or wholly different meanings to corresponding lexical units in the two languages) come to learn each of their languages in a different, and often independent, social setting. Within this setting are distinct linguistic and cultural associations. Similarly, Hasselmo (1970, p196) describes what he terms as 'lexical conditioning', that is, when terms and concepts are innately attached to a topic as it exists in one particular language. Since the participants in this current study were born in Japan, and their parents' native language is Japanese, all of them have officially learnt

English in Japan and expanded their English proficiency in an English-speaking country, such as Australia. Therefore, the speakers have different sets of associations for words in Japanese, and their 'equivalent' in English. In the case of the frequent use of English items by the eight speakers during their discussion on topic 1, and the English-speaking context in topic 2, it indicates that English expressions are both more meaningful, and come closer to reflecting 'reality' in their recently lived experience (especially in terms of those activities - work and study which consume most of their time and energies) in the Australian cultural setting.

Amongst the six younger age group speakers, whose discussion was focused on their study, the codeswitches which most frequently appeared were 'assignment', 'exam', 'semester', and the name of the course and unit they were actually taking. Other codeswitches were also made which were closely related to their study at university. However, some of the name of the units, courses, and terms which are used to represent academic results (e.g. 'distinction', 'high distinction', 'credit') were recognised as borrowings by the researcher, basically because there are no Japanese equivalents. Some codeswitches which they produced were general terms within the university, such as 'report', 'project', 'presentation', 'essay', 'major', 'elective', 'pass', 'fail', 'writing', 'grammar', 'lecturer', and 'research'. Other switches were closely associated with the individual's field of study, for instance 'environment', 'ethics', 'travel agency', 'insurance', and 'service'. However,

only two speakers (B and F) employed some English items which were not related to their study at the university (e.g. 'disappointed', 'unfair') in order to express their opinions or feelings, rather than simply describing their study.

Unlike the students in the younger age group, the older age speakers tended to engage in more code-switching during their discussion of the `neutral' context rather than their work. One explanation of this may be that people who have been living in an English speaking environment for a lengthy period of time have a greater ability to employ English expressions outside of the more restricted context of their everyday situation, and apply them to a much broader field of topics. In fact, of these six speakers, four speakers have been in Australia more than ten years (G: 19 years, H: 14 years, J: 13 years, K: 13 years). Speaker H obtained the highest score throughout the course of the discussions.

Bentahila and Davies (1998, p32) explain that 'particular individuals may differ in the extent to which they use each language, depending on the nature of their work or the people with whom they are most frequently in contact'. Of the six speakers of the older age group, three speakers (G, H, and J) have an English-speaking spouse. Furthermore, speaker G has one child who can only speak English, whilst speaker J has two children, both of whom are bilingual. Therefore, these speakers, as a greater means of communication, most frequently use the English language when they are with their family. In

terms of jobs, all participants except one (speaker K) possess

a full time job which requires English language proficiency,

while speaker K often takes a temporary job which also requires

English language proficiency. These circumstances may

contribute to the fact that the older age group, unlike the

younger students, has a much more varied repertoire of English

expressions, as English is used not only within the domain of

work, but also the domain of family.

Within the discussions of the 'neutral' category, most speakers

in the older age group freely exchanged their opinions about

such things as the politics and economy of Japan. Since these

speakers have been away from Japan and the Japanese system for

a long time, their discussion mostly took the form of a

comparison between Japan and other countries, or the influence

other countries have had on Japan. Since the speakers generally

receive information about contemporary Japan in relation to

global events through the media in the English language, their

discussions employed a higher number of English codeswitches

which would probably seem more realistic to them. In fact, in

the sociolinguistic interview, most of them stated that their

expressions derived from television news, the newspapers, and

radio. An example of one of these passages (speaker G and H)

is as follows:

Topic 2
29.G: ..... Yappari koonattara ato wa kokumin no doryokushidai de
      atte, yappari sono aru imi de jibuntachi no riten to shiteiru
      seijika ga tateruyoona **system** ni kaete iku to iukoto ga
      hitotsu nanja nai kana.

30.H: Ano seijika jitai ga kawaranakutemo kokumin tte iuka ano
      global, zenbu **global** ni natte irudesho? Ano kigyoo ni shitemo

> zenbu **combine** sarete amerika to nihon no kigyoo to zenbu
> issho ni natte nanika doitsu no ginkoo ga BT o kattaritoka
> zenbu ano **merger** ga tsuite irukara zenbu shakaiteki zentai na
> keizai ga keizai tte iuno ga ittaika shite iru to omoo none.

Translation

29.G: .... Therefore, it is the responsibility of the people
themselves to change the **system** which allows people to select
the right person as a politician.

30.H: Although politicians have not changed, nations have
globalised, everything has **globalised.** Even many enterprises
were **combined** and the German bank bought BT. It seems to me
the whole economic system has been integrated due to **merger.**

In addition to this, these speakers (G and H), who are of the
same pair, actually recorded a higher frequency of code-
switching during their discussion within the Japanese-related
context, rather than topic 1 (work). Although the researcher
recognised four passages within topic 2 as being Japanese-
related (as listed in the Table 5.2), there was not such a
clear-cut distinction (as there were amongst the discussion of
other pairs) between this category and the 'neutral' category.
Since these speakers have been living in an English-speaking
environment for a lengthy period of time, and also because they
both have an English speaking spouse, the speakers tend to
discuss Japan from a more international point of view. They are
blurring boundaries between their lived, contemporary
experience in Australia, and the former experience they were
exposed to when living in Japan.

Another explanation of this may be that they choose one of the
two languages according to their intentions, but not topic. A
short interview over the telephone to speaker G by the
researcher was done in order to obtain her comments on the
result. The aim of this was to find the reason she employed

more code-switching in the Japanese-related context, rather than topic 1 (work). She explained that she tends to employ English expressions when the discussion centres on criticism in general. She believes that negative opinions in Japanese are typically expressed in a humble manner, because of the concept of 'self-modesty' in Japanese society. In fact, during their discussion of the Japanese-related context, speaker G and H focused on criticism towards such things as Japanese politicians and company policies. Speaker G therefore chose to employ English expressions rather than Japanese expressions in order to create a more assertive tone, which she is not able to produce in the Japanese language with its limitations and characteristic 'humble' manner. An example of one of passages (of speaker G and H) is as follows:

Topic2
7.G: Soona no, dakara yappari dooshite **leader** ga inaikatte iuto yahari aruteido kokusaiteki na **level** de katsuyaku shite itadakeruyoona seijika ga inaittekoto....
8.H: Demo sore wa watashi wa omookedo sore wa **politician** no mondaija nai to omoo.
9.G: Sore wa dare no mondaikashira?
10.H: Sore wa **politician** jishin no mondaija nakutte **politician** ga erabu **bureaucrats** no nooryokuda to omoo, tte iunowa tatoeba **politician** tee iuno wa tokubetsu na ano nante iuno... **very very particular job. Politician** tte iuno wa tokuni nihon dewa otoosan, ojiisan, ojiisan ga **politician** ni natte sonomata musuko ga **politician** de tsunagatte irujanai?

Translation
7.G: That's it. There is no politician who can actually work at the international **level**, this is the reason why there is no **leader**..
8.H: I don't think that it has anything to do with politicians.
9.G: who them?
10.H: I don't think that there is a problem with the **politicians** themselves, rather, it is the ability of the politicians to select capable **bureaucrats**. For example, **politicians** are special.. what can I say... **very very particular job. Politician**, especially in Japan, their fathers and (their) grand fathers, the grand father becomes a **politician**, then his son becomes a **politician,** and then his son becomes a **politician** too. It seems to me that **politicians** hand their job down through each generation, keeping it within the family.

Similarly, during the sociolinguistic interview, speaker H stated that she often uses English Expressions (e.g. *'yes'*, and *'no'*) when she wants to emphasise her strong belief in regard to certain issues. She feels that clearly expressing *'yes'* or *'no'* in the Japanese language might be considered abrupt, therefore the use of English expressions allows her to avoid these negative implications. This type of incident was obvious during the discussion of the Japanese-related context.

Topic2
Passage 3
54.H: Un kuni wa ugoite ikumonoda to seijika ga inakutemo.
55.G: Ya, hontoo?
56.H: **Yes, yes, I, I believe that**. Seijika ga inakutemo kuni wa ugoku.

Translation
54.H: Yes, a country can carry on without a leader.
55.G: Is it true?
56.H: **Yes, yes, I believe that**. A country carries on without a leader.

Passage 4
62.H: **No**, ano watashi wa seijika no nihonjin ni kansuru kagiri wa seijika no **leadership** wa zenzen nai to omotte imasu.
63.G: Aa, ja anata ga ossharuno wa nihon no baai ne seiji..
64.H: **Yes**, nihon no seijika ni **as far as leadership is concerned**, seijika no **leadership** wa nai to omoo.

Translation
62.H: **No, as far as Japanese politicians are concerned** they don't have **leadership**.
63.G: Oh, you're only talking of the Japanese case, aren't you?
64.H: **Yes**, in Japanese politicians' case, **as far as leadership is concerned**, I don't think they have **leadership**.

As the case of speaker G and H shows, code-switching can be engaged in as a discourse strategy which the speakers use to achieve certain goals. A further discussion of 'strategies' or 'intentions' amongst the speakers will be given after the discussions of the occurrence of code-switching in relation to the attitudes towards code-switching.

Davies and Bentahila (cited in Bentahila et al., 1998) however argue that, for the individual, the first acquired language or 'mother tongue' retains a dominance which is not displaced when a speaker, such as a migrant, moves into a second acquired language environment, even over long periods of time. The first acquired language therefore retains a special status, and is the language that the speaker will most closely identify with. A long established and habitual use of English expressions gained, through their experiences in the English-speaking context, coupled with the special status that they hold in terms of the Japanese language, seems to reflect the patterns of code-switching use that they displayed. This fact, along with different time durations in the English-speaking country, led to the different patterns of code-switching use from the younger age group.

Clyne (1982, p108) explains that certain circumstances are closely and uniquely associated with a particular language. The two languages represent a contrast between the speaker's present and past or between the home and away-from-home setting. Since these speakers possess a habitual use in each language which is oriented from their experience in the Japanese cultural environment, and in the English-speaking context, the individual comes to incorporate into their linguistic repertoire those language elements which are inherent in the specific activity. In fact, some speakers in this study commented that the language choice often depends on

the context of the topic in which certain social activities are played out, these include: the place where the incidents happen/happened, and people who are/were presented or talk/ talked to, if the discussion is associated with their own experiences or incidents.

This strong relationship between the occurrence of code-switching and topic seems to be based on the cultural distance between Japan and various English-speaking countries. For instance, in terms of the use of the English word 'lunch' in speaker L's utterance, he explained that since the episode about 'lunch' took place in Australia (an English-speaking context), and was associated with his colleagues (English speakers) in a 'lunch bar' that he went to, he employed the English word. The speaker also commented that if the episode about 'lunch' had taken place in Japan, and had been associated with his Japanese colleagues at a 'sobaya' (a Japanese noodle restaurant) he used to go to, he would have used a Japanese word 'hirugohan' ('lunch').

Topic 1
83.L: Tatoeba koko e kite saisho no toki ni, eeto ku-gatsu ni ijuu shite kitandesu kedo sono toshi no juuni-gatsu atsukattadesu yo. Moo konna atsui oostoraria de shigoto shitetandesu kedo ne, reiboo mo nai heya de ne. Ohiru wa nyoobo ga **lunch** tsukutte kureru wake dewa naidesukara. Iwayuru nante iundesuka, lunch bar, lunch bar ka nanka ni itte katte taberundesukedo......

Translation
83.L: For example, I emigrated here in September and that December it was so hot. I was working in the Australian heat without an air conditioner. Since my wife did not prepare **lunch** for me, I usually got take away from, what it is called..., lunch bar, lunch bar.

122

Similarly, speaker B stated that she used the English phrase 'social security' in her utterance because of the context of the English-speaking setting (Australia). Her main point is that the use of English expressions is much more authentic than employing Japanese expressions for experiences which occur in Australia. However, if she had focused on the social security system within Japan, she probably would have employed the Japanese phrase 'shakai hoshoo' ('social security').

Topic2
74.B: Watashi mo suki. Watashi mo sukida kedo **inconvenient** na
     koto toka oosugiru datte nihon mitai ni hokenseido ga naishi
     ippai minna kommate irukoto ga aru. Nihon towa chigau sisutemu
     de, kaisha no **social security** toka zenzen yokunaitte hontoo ni
     sunde yoku wakaru. Haisha nanka sa, ikkai iku noni sen doru
     ikkai naosu noni zenbu de.

Translation
74.B: I like it here too, but there are some things which are
     inconvenient. For example, there is no insurance system like
     the Japanese one and also, people have trouble because of the
     (social security) system, which is different from the Japanese
     one. I feel that **social security** here is not good enough. If
     you go to see a dentist, it would cost you $ 1000, and then if
     you have the complete treatment it would be a total.

A great deal of the code-switching literature would seem to suggest that code-switching occurs mostly in informal, in-group interactions. Myers-Scotton (1998b, p98), for example, states that code-switching is typically an in-group mode of communication. This indicates that code-switching as a language choice is strongly correlated with interlocutors and settings, rather than topic. The predetermined relationship of the speakers in this current study translates to in-group conversations. The research design also ensured that the participants would be interacting in an informal situation.

Therefore, if friends are interacting in an informal situation, they will engage in code-switching during their discussion regardless of the topic.

However, the data from this study suggests that in general, topic, which was related to the Japanese cultural context, does in fact influence the frequency of code-switching amongst speakers. In other words, the speakers in this study employed each code (i.e. Japanese and English) according to the topic which attaches to a specific cultural domain. When the individual becomes immersed in that culture and takes an a specific and active role such as, for example, a student in a university or employee within a company, they become exposed to the terms and concepts which are inherently associated with these roles. The habitual exposure to such language is an important aspect in the forming of a particular code-switching behaviour.

Topic is an important factor which influences code-switching behaviour. However, just as important are other, perhaps more internal factors, such as intentions and strategies of the speaker. What should be taken into account is that some topics set the opportunity for speakers employ English words and expressions in order to achieve certain outcomes. Further discussion on these internal factors will be forthcoming in a later section.

5.1.5 The Relationship Between the Frequency of Code-switching and the Gender of the Interlocutor

The data in Table 5.3 shows that of the six females, two speakers (speaker B and H), both of whom participated in an entirely female pair, marked the highest individual average number of codeswitches amongst the entire group (0.9 and 0.7) per turn throughout the course of the recording sessions. However, the partners of these two high scoring individuals (speakers A and G) did not achieve the same kind of high score, only 0.3 and 0.29 respectively. These scores share a similarity with one of the other females who participated in a mixed sex pair (speaker E: 0.35). On the other hand, the other female within a mixed pair (speaker K) marked the lowest number of codeswitches per turn (0.18) amongst all of the female speakers.

In contrast to this, the male speaker (of an entirely male pair) who recorded the highest average number of codeswitches per turn (speaker D: 0.67), had an interlocutor (speaker C) who recorded 0.4. These scores in fact are the highest recorded amongst all the males both in same sex and mixed pairs. Speaker I, who was in the other entirely male pair, made the lowest average number of codeswitches per turn (0.1) amongst all of the subjects both male and female, (while his interlocutor [speaker J] recorded 0.34). In addition, two male speakers (F and L), who were of a mixed pair, scored a relatively low average number of codeswitches per turn, which were 0.13 and 0.15 respectively.

Moreover, it appears that the same sex pairs, both in the younger and older age group categories, recorded a higher number of codeswitches per turn, than their mixed pair counterparts. For example, in the younger age group category, the all male and all female pairs recorded a $\overline{X} = 0.56$, compared to a mixed pair mean of $\overline{X} = 0.24$. In the older age group the all male and all female pairs scored a $\overline{X} = 0.33$, compared to a mixed pair $\overline{X} = 0.17$.

Table 5.3 Average Numbers of Codeswitches per Turn by Speaker in Relation to Interlocutor (gender)

Age group	Pair	Speaker	Gender	Total Topic1&topic2		Combined average for the pair	
Younger	1	A	female	0.3	(39/134)	0.6	(159/268)
		B	female	0.9	(120/134)		
	2	C	male	0.4	(55/139)	0.53	(147/277)
		D	male	0.67	(92/138)		
	3	E	female	0.35	(74/209)	0.24	(101/416)
		F	male	0.13	(27/207)		
Older	4	G	female	0.29	(28/96)	0.5	(94/190)
		H	female	0.7	(66/94)		
	5	I	male	0.1	(14/134)	0.22	(59/267)
		J	male	0.34	(45/133)		
	6	K	female	0.18	(16/90)	0.17	(30/181)
		L	male	0.15	(14/91)		

These results show that firstly, of the twelve speakers, the three speakers who most frequently engaged in code-switching were the speakers who had same-sex partners. Their partners, however, did not generally display the same tendency, although in one instance the divergence was not so significant. Secondly, the three pairs who demonstrated this relatively frequent occurrence of code-switching were the two entirely

female pairs, and one entirely male pair. Third, of the two mixed pairs, the speakers of one pair both obtained a similar score to each other (they recorded a quite low frequency of code-switching).

On the whole, only two speakers C and D (both of the same entirely male pair) received a relatively higher average number of codeswitches throughout all of the topics. Thus it turns out that it is difficult to establish a clear relationship between the frequency of code-switching, and the gender of the interlocutor. In other words, same-sex partners did not increase the frequency of code-switching.

McGregor and Li Wei (1991) investigated the patterns of language choice amongst Chinese students at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne. In this study, a sample of 117 Chinese students were asked to respond to 50 questions. These were designed to gather information in regards to 1) personal information about the respondents 2) language attitudes 3) language choice in a variety of situations. In connection to this last category, six hypothetical 'types of interlocutors' were listed. These included fellow students of the same gender, fellow students of the opposite gender, older local Chinese, younger local Chinese, strangers and people of a higher social status, and in the presence of third party. It was found that, in terms of language choice patterns for the various types of interlocutors, the Chinese language was used for the hypothetical interlocutors in most of the cases. The study also

found that code-switching was used in equal proportion for both the same gender, and opposite gender amongst the peer group. They conclude that their subjects are, by and large, Chinese-dominant bilinguals, and that code-switching occurs most frequently amongst in-group interactions. This study shows that among in-group members, code-switching occurs regardless of whether their interlocutor is of the same, or opposite gender. Similarly, in this current study, the gender of the interlocutor does not appear to influence the occurrence or frequency of code-switching.

5.2 Types of Code-switching

Stretches of code-switched items are either intersentential or intrasentential. Intersentential code-switching involves switches from one language in terms of whole sentences. It can occur within an utterance, and also between speaker turns. Intrasentential code-switching occurs within the same sentence, from the single word to the clausal level (more than a single word, including one finite verb). In this study, the participants engaged in both intersentential and intrasentential code-switching. These are examples of both types of code-switching from the data of this study:

1) Intersentential code-switching
64.H: Nihon de nihon no jooshi no tame ni hataraitakoto wa arimasu?
    'Have you ever worked for a Japanese boss?'
65.G: Naidesu ne.
    'No, I haven't.'
66.H: **You've never worked for Japanese**.

2) Intrasentential code-switching
12.K: Dochirade? Ano **office** ni irashite itadaita hoo ga sakidesuka?
    'Where? Did I see you at the **office** first?'

In this study, the most common switches were intrasentential code-switching, especially single word. In fact, of the twelve speakers, only one participant engaged in intersentential code-switching. Therefore, only four of the categories previously outlined in the section 5.1.2 will be employed in order to establish the relationship between the types of codeswitching which occurs (single word, phrase, clause, and multiple switches) and the variables of topic and gender.

5.2.1 Types of Code-Switching in Relation to Topics

Table 5.4 shows that all participants produced both single and phrase switches for topic 1 (study or work). In fact, across all the topics, topic one came to record the highest total number of single and phrase switches (single switches: 4.19, phrase switches: 0.65). Topic one recorded no clause switches, whilst only one speaker (H) produced multi-clausal codeswitches and sentence codeswitches (intersentential code-switching). This in fact was the only instance of intersentential code-switching recorded throughout the entire research.

The data in Table 5.5 shows that single switches were likewise the most frequently recorded category of code-switching used by the majority of subjects in topic two. Phrase switches were produced by two speakers (B and E) within the Japanese related context, by two speakers (B and H) within the English-speaking context, and by four speakers (A, B, E, and F) within the 'neutral' category. This shows that of the twelve participants, only speaker B produced both single and phrase switches across

the topics. Moreover, this speaker also received the highest and the second highest average number of phrase switches per turn (0.35 and 0.33) for the topics which referred to the neutral context and the English context respectively. While only one speaker (H) produced clause switches for both the Japanese related context and neutral context, and multi-clausal switches for the Japanese related context. The interesting thing is that no one produced clause and multiple-clause switches for the topic which referred to the English-speaking context.

In addition to this, the four speakers (A, B, E and F) who produced phrase switches within the 'neutral' category were all participants of the younger age group, even though, as can be seen in Table 5.1, the total average number of codeswitches per turn is lower than that of the older age group within this category. Furthermore, the two speakers who produced phrase codeswitches within the Japanese related context were also members belonging to the participants in the younger age group. Within the English-speaking context, two speakers produced phrase switches, one from the younger age group (B), and one from the older age category (H).

Table 5.4 Average Number of Different Types of Codeswitches per Turn by Each Speaker in Relation to Topic 1

	Intra-S CS				Inter-S CS
	Single	Phrase	Clause	Multi-clause	Sentence
Speaker (Younger)					
A	0.25	0.08	0	0	0
	19/7ᶠ	6/76	0/76	0/76	0/76
B	0.9	0.18	0	0	0
	70/77	14/77	0/77	0/77	0/77
C	0.53	0.05	0	0	0
	44/83	4/83	0/83	0/83	0/83
D	0.83	0.04	0	0	0
	70/84	3/84	0/84	0/84	0/84
E	0.3	0.07	0	0	0
	34/115	8/115	0/115	0/115	0/115
F	0.12	0.05	0	0	0
	14/114	6/114	0/114	0/114	0/114
Subtotal	**2.93**	**0.47**	**0**	**0**	**0**
(Older)					
G	0.17	0.04	0	0	0
	8/46	2/46	0/46	0/46	0/46
H	0.24	0.02	0	0.04	0.16
	11/45	1/45		2/45	7/45
I	0.1	0.04	0	0	0
	7/71	3/71	0/71	0/71	0/71
J	0.4	0.02	0	0	0
	28/70	14/70	14/70	14/70	14/70
K	0.22	0.02	0	0	0
	12/55	1/55	0/55	0/55	0/55
L	0.13	0.04	0	0	0
	7/56	2/56	0/56	0/56	0/56
Subtotal	**1.26**	**0.18**	**0**	**0.04**	**0.16**
Total	**4.19**	**0.65**	**0**	**0.04**	**0.16**

Table 5.5 Average Number of Different Types of Codeswitches per Turn by Each Speaker in Relation to Topic 2

(content) Japanese				Topic2 English				Neutral			
Intra-sentential codeswithes											
S	P	C	M-C	S	P	C	M-C	S	P	C	M-C
Speaker (Younger)											
A 0.06 0 0 0 1/18				0.36 0 0 0 5/14				0.23 0.08 0 0 6/26 2/26			
B 0.32 0.11 0 0 6/19 2/19				0.17 0.33 0 0 2/12 4/12				0.5 0.35 0 0 13/26 9/26			
C 0.15 0 0 0 7/46				- - - -				0 0 0 0			
D 0.14 0 0 0 6/44				- - - -				0.2 0 0 0 2/10			
E 0.15 0.05 0 0 8/55 3/55				0.6 0 0 0 3/5				0.32 0.21 0 0 11/34 7/34			
F 0 0 0 0				0.4 0 0 0 2/5				0.09 0.06 0 0 3/33 2/33			
Subtotal 0.82 0.16 0 0				1.53 0.33 0 0				1.34 0.7 0 0			
(Older)											
G 0.31 0 0 0 11/36				0.33 0 0 0 3/9				0.8 0 0 0 4/5			
H 0.63 0 0.06 0.06 22/35 2/35 2/35				0.38 0.25 0 0 3/8 2/8				0.39 0 0.03 0 13/6 1/6			
I 0.02 0 0 0 1/42				- - - -				0.14 0 0 0 3/21			
J 0.05 0 0 0 2/41				- - - -				0.05 0 0 0 1/22			
K 0.03 0 0 0 1/35				- - - -				0.67 0 0 0 2/3			
L 0.16 0 0 0 5/32				- - - -				0 0 0 0			
Subtotal 1.2 0 0.06 0.06				0.71 0.25 0 0				2.05 0 0.03 0			
Total 2.02 0.16 0.06 0.06				2.24 0.58 0 0				3.39 0.7 0.03 0			

Table 5.4 and 5.5 reveal that firstly, single switches appeared the most frequently throughout the topics. Second, all participants produced both single and phrase switches within topic 1, whilst less phrase switches were employed within topic 2. Only one speaker demonstrated use of all types of code-switching, ranging from, single, phrase, clause, multi-clause

(both within topic 1 and 2) and sentence codeswitching (intersentential code-switching)(This occurred only in topic 1)

These results indicate that the speakers employed more phrase switches during their discussion of topic 1 (study or work). Many English phrases are used to express certain things, such as the name of a unit, system, section, or job. These English phrases seemed to be employed as a single unit. For instance, environment science, double major, a summer school, a cake room, day shift, night shift, and public servant.

An interesting phenomenon was that a few phrases appeared to be a combination of a Japanese numeral and English words, these include: *juuni* point (*'twelve point[s]'*), and *ni* semester (*'the second semester'*). The (younger) speakers who demonstrated this type of code-switching commented that they tried to avoid their utterances becoming more English dominated. These phrases are in fact interchangeable, that is, the switched item can remain constant (as in the cases above), whilst the numeral, which is spoken in Japanese, can be subject to change. This differs from the situation where phrases are employed as a single unit because these words are not interchangeable in the same way. This can partly account for the frequent use of single word switches across topics amongst the speakers.

Topic 1
55.E: Ja sore ga dekinakkatara (institution's name) toka de yaru no?
Ja tsugi no **semester** de juuni point toranakkatara **summer school** de yaranakya dame? Ma, docchi ni shitemo…

133

55.E: If you can't take it, then are you going to do it at
(institution's name)? if you don't get twelve **points** for the
next **semester**, do you have to do it in **summer school**?

Topic 1
35.B: De benkyoo do? Nan **semester** me korede?
36.A: Eeeto ne. Ni **semester**, san **semester** atto, chigau ninenme ni
naruno kana.

Translation
35.B: So, how's your study going? Which **semester** is this for you?
36.A: Ah.. the second **semester**, the third **semester**, no, this is the
second year.

Topic 1
17.D: ....Waraeru nowa dai ikkaime no assignment o gojuppa
choishika toretenakkata yan. Dakara gojuppa choishika torete
nakattakara, kon **semester** de toran to yabai to omottakara.

Translation
17.D: ....but we had a different lecturer, this **semester**, and it made
the unit much more difficult. I had a funny story when the old
lecturer with us. I got about 50% in my first assignment.

Topic 1
86.C: Oredatte **law** yaranakya ikenaindakara. Ore mo kon **semester,** **law**
ga arukara ne. Dooshiyoo kana.

Translation
86.C: I also have to learn **law**. I have a unit studying **law** this
semester. What should I do?

Even though the older age category speakers produced a higher

overall average number of code switches per turn within the

neutral category, the younger age group speakers produced

specifically more phrase switches when compared to the older

age group members. The discussion amongst one of the younger

pairs (pair 1: speaker A and B) centred on the 'millennium

bug', since both speakers' study was related to computer

engineering. Therefore, most of the English phrases which were

employed during their discussion, derived from the speakers'

study at university (e.g. *embedded system, data system*). Pair 2

(speaker E and F) discussed atomic energy, which was related to speaker E's study, also at university. English phrases, such as 'capital cost', and 'unlimited growth' were used during this course of discussion. Additionally, the discussion between speaker C and D, (pair 3) was about a friend of speaker C, and no phrase switches were employed within the 'neutral' category. Thus, it appeared that the use of the younger speakers phrase switches was based on their restricted knowledge acquired through study at university.

Topic 2
14.B: Soo toriaezu naka ni moo sono **data system, embedded system** ga
naka ni haitte irumono wa subete soonanda yone. Dakara
hontoo ni konpuutaa dakeja nakutte ningen ga kangarerareru
han'i de koko wa kore haitte iru kara naosanakya naranai tte
iunde hitotsuzutsu imamade nannenka de naoshitekite mochiron
daigaku toka **government** toka soo iu tokoro no **organisation** no
konpuutaa tokamo **fix up** sareterunda kedo, demo doko ni
irerare te iruka kizuite inai kaisha toka mo arushi, ato
chuushookigyoo toka soo iu mono ni okane o kakeru **budget** ga
naikurai no reberu no chuushookigyoo toka no kaisha tokamo
moshi nakattari surukara, mada chuugata no kigyoo wa chanto
jatte iru to omoo kedo…

Translation
14.B: That's right. Anything containing a **data system** or **embedded
system** is going to be effected. Actually, several things have
been **fixed up**, one by one, including the computers in the
government and **organisation**. But still, many things haven't
been fixed up, because we don't know about all the items which
are contained in the system. And also, small-scale companies
have only a small **budget** for doing such things. Middle scale
companies can afford to do it, I think…

5.2.2 Types of Code-switching in Relation to the Gender of the Interlocutor

The data in Table 5.6 illustrates that entirely female pairs in both the younger (pair 1: A and B) and the older age groups (pair 4: G and H) recorded a relatively higher than average number of single switches per turn. In fact, of the twelve subjects, speaker B received the highest average number of

single switches per turn (1.89), while her partner (speaker A), scored 0.9. On the other hand, speakers G and H, who together comprised the other entirely female pair in the older age group, marked a similar score between each other for single switches (G: 1.61, H: 1.64). However, the total average number of codeswitches per turn by each of these individuals was quite different (G: 0.29, H: 0.7), since speaker H, unlike her partner (G), engaged in a range of codeswitching behaviour which was scattered across the various typologies (single, phrase, clause, and multiple clause).

The same phenomenon was recorded by the other paired speakers, but in the category of phrase switches. They were C and D (an entirely male pair in the younger age category), I and J (an entirely male pair in the older age category), and K and L (a mixed pair in the older age category). All of these speakers obtained a similar average number of phrase switches per turn. (C: 0.05 and D: 0.04, I: 0.04 and J: 0.02, K: 0.02 and L: 0.04). However, again there was a difference in the total average number of codeswitches per turn by each individual, except in the case of the paired speakers K and L (C: 0.4 and D: 0.67, I: 0.1 and J: 0.34, K: 0.18 and L: 0.15).

Table 5.6 Types of Code-switching and Gender (of the Interlocutor)

			Topic 1 & Topic 2				
			Intra-S CS				Inter-S CS
Pair	Speaker	Gender	Single	Phrase	Clause	Multi-clause	sentence
Younger							
1	A	f	0.9	0.16	0	0	0
	B	f	1.89	0.97	0	0	0
2	C	m	0.68	0.05	0	0	0
	D	m	1.17	0.04	0	0	0
3	E	f	1.37	0.33	0	0	0
	F	m	0.61	0.11	0	0	0
	Subtotal		**6.62**	**1.66**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Older							
4	G	f	1.61	0.04	0	0	0
	H	f	1.64	0.27	0.09	0.1	0.16
5	I	m	0.26	0.04	0	0	0
	J	m	0.5	0.02	0	0	0
6	K	f	0.92	0.02	0	0	0
	L	m	0.29	0.04	0	0	0
	Subtotal		**5.22**	**0.43**	**0.09**	**0.1**	**0.16**
	Total		**11.84**	**2.09**	**0.09**	**0.1**	**0.16**

These results show that of the six pairs, five speakers recorded a similar average number of either single or phrase switches per turn, when compared to their partners across the topics. This occurred even though the total average number of switches per turn differed from their partners. Moreover, amongst these speakers, all the speakers who were paired with an interlocutor of the opposite gender produced a similar average number of phrase switches per turn. This indicates that the frequency of the certain type of code-switching as they are being produced by the speakers if this study is somehow being influenced by their partner. One clear piece of evidence is that speaker H received a similar average number of single switches per turn when compared to her partner, even though

speaker H demonstrated different types of code-switching use across the topics.

5.3 Attitudes Towards English and Japanese

In this section, the relationship between the attitudes towards both the Japanese and English languages, and the occurrence of code-switching amongst the speakers will be dis:ussed. Firstly, in order to gain the respondent's general attitude toward the two languages, of a set of 15 statements, answers were elicited from the questionnaire and their results were tabulated. Then the average score of the evaluation amongst the speakers (Table 5.7) was calculated. Second, the average scores of the evaluation of two languages by each speaker were also calculated (Table 5.8). Third, in order to elicit more detail of the speakers' attitudes towards English, ten questions were asked in another questionnaire. An overall average score of the evaluation amongst the speakers as well as by each speaker, was tabulated (Table 5.9 and 5.10).

5.3.1 General Attitudes Towards English and Japanese

The result of the first section of the questionnaire shows that most speakers positively evaluated both Japanese and English. Table 5.7 shows that in the evaluation of the English language, statement 6 ('English is a language worth learning') was the most highly ranked by the speakers (4.67). For statement 7, which received the second highest positive evaluation, ('English is useful for talking about study/work'), the average evaluation score was 4.42. While, for statement 8 ('Japanese is

useful for expressing my feelings') and for statement 9 ('Japanese is useful for corresponding with my best friend'), the average evaluation score was 4.50 and 4.33 respectively. Moreover, statement 4 ('I like talking in Japanese'), received an average score 3.92, which was slightly higher than the evaluation score of English. Out of the 15 statements concerning both English and Japanese, three statements (5, 10 and 15) were negatively posed. These statements were ranked relatively low. For instance, for statement 10 ('English/Japanese has no place in the modern world'), the average evaluation scores were 1.83 (English) and 2.42 (Japanese). Statement 15 ('English/Japanese is no longer important') scored 1.83 and 1.75 respectively. On the other hand, statement 5, ('There are more useful languages to learn than Japanese') scored 3.92, while the same statement about English scored 2.92.

Table 5.7 Evaluation of English and Japanese

Statements	English	Japanese
1. I like hearing Eng/Jap spoken	3.75	3.83
2. I prefer to watch the TV News in Eng/Jap rather than in Japanese	3.08	3.42
3. Eng/Jap is essential in order to take part fully in life	4.17	3.50
4. I like talking in Eng/Jap	3.25	3.92
5. There are more useful languages to learn than Eng/Jap	2.92	3.92
6. Eng/Jap is a language worth learning	4.67	4.00
7. Eng/Jap is useful for talking about studies/work	4.42	3.42
8. Eng/Jap is useful for expressing my feelings	3.17	4.50
9. Eng/Jap is useful for corresponding with my best friend	3.42	4.33
10. Eng/Jap has no place in the modern world	1.83	2.42
11. We need to perfect Eng/Jap	3.83	1.58
12. I prefer to be spoken to in Eng/Jap	3.50	3.42
13. If I have children, I would like them to be Eng speaking/ to speak Jap only	3.92	2.00
14. I would like to marry an Eng/Jap speaker	2.92	3.08
15. Eng/Jap language is no longer important	1.83	1.75

The speakers' positive evaluation of both English and Japanese may be due to the existence of different roles for each language, which operate amongst the speakers. This can be explained by the speakers' evaluation for statement 7, ('English/Japanese is useful for talking about studies/work'), 8, ('English/Japanese is useful for expressing my feelings'), and 9, ('English/Japanese is useful for corresponding with my best friend').

In fact, for statement 7, seven of the twelve speakers (A, B, C, E, I, K, and L) ranked 5 ('strongly agree'), three speakers (F, G, and J) evaluated English slightly higher than they did Japanese, and two speakers (D and H) evaluated Japanese higher than they did English. For statement 8, six speakers (A, C, D, E, H, and K) ranked 5 for Japanese, three speakers (B, F, and G) evaluated Japanese slightly higher than they did English, and three speakers (I, J, and L) evaluated equally both English and Japanese.

These attitudes toward the two languages reflected the patterns of code-switching amongst the speakers. For example, firstly, a higher frequency of codeswitches which was demonstrated by most of the speakers during topic 1 (study or work) is evidence of this. Second, the first acquired language (i.e. Japanese) retains a dominance which is not displaced even though some speakers in this study have been residing more than ten years in a second acquired language environment. In fact, only a few

speakers employed English items to express their feelings through the course of recording sessions.

Although most speakers positively evaluated both Japanese and English, many of them evaluated English slightly higher than they did Japanese. That is, of the twelve speakers, nine speakers (A, C, F, G, H, I, J, K, and L) evaluated English slightly higher than they did Japanese, and one speaker (B) ranked both languages equally. Only two speakers (D and E) evaluated Japanese higher than they did English. Additionally, these speakers (D and E), who rank English lower than Japanese, are from the younger age group. On the other hand, speakers I and K, who are of the older age category, most positively evaluated English amongst all of the twelve speakers (I: 4.1, K: 4.5).

Table 5.8 Average Evaluation Score of English and Japanese by Each Speaker and Average Number of Codeswitches per Turn

| | | | | | | Speaker | | | | | | |
| | Younger | | | | | | Older | | | | | |
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
English	3.6	3.7	3.9	2.9	3.2	3.4	3.5	3.6	4.1	3.8	4.5	3.9
Japanese	3.1	3.7	3.3	3.7	3.5	3.1	3.0	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.5
CS (Average numbers per turn)	0.3	0.9	0.4	0.67	0.35	0.13	0.29	0.7	0.1	0.34	0.18	0.15

For those statements in the negative form (5, 10 and 15) the score has been inverted so as to conform to the dominant (i.e. positively evaluated) scale.

A more positive evaluation for English rather than Japanese amongst most of the speakers indicates that English holds a

preferred status. As the researcher has discussed in the section 'status of English' in Chapter 2, this is due to the fact that English is one of the most prestigious disciplines in the educational system in Japan. At both middle school, and senior high school, the study of the English language is built into the school's program, even though no special language is required in the national curriculum. In fact, of the twelve speakers, four speakers (F, G, H, and J) had studied English for six years at both middle and senior high school. Similarly, the remaining eight speakers (A, B, C, D, E, I, K, and L) had studied English for more than six years. Furthermore, four speakers (A, C, D, and I) had taken one of the standardised English examinations (e.g. IELTS, TOEFL).

The speakers' positive evaluation of English, based on its preferred status, is represented in the scores elicited by statement 6 and 11. For statement 6 ('English is a language worth learning'), seven speakers (A, B, C, F, H, K, and L) scored 5, however most of them also positively evaluated Japanese. Similarly, for statement 11 ('We need to perfect English'), three speakers (B, K, and L) scored 5, six speakers (A, C, G, H, I, and J) scored 4. Whist one speaker (D), and two speakers (E and F) scored 3 and 2 respectively. In addition to this, in terms of statement 5 ('there are more useful languages to learn than English/Japanese'), four of the speakers' (A, B, D, and E) responses were in the 'agree' for English (the remaining eight subjects recorded responses which ranged from somewhat A/D to S/D). For the Japanese alternative in the same

statement, eleven speakers' (A, B, C, D, E, F, H, I, J, K, and L) responses were 'strongly agree'. This response may be thought of as a reflection of this attitude, that is, the esteem in which the English language is held, and in the case of the Japanese alternative to this statement, because it already exists as the first acquired.

These scores however do not clearly reflect the frequency of code-switching amongst the speakers as it occurred in this study. Table 5.8 shows that even though speaker I and K evaluated English higher than the other speakers, both speakers produced a relatively low average number of codeswitches per turn (I: 0.1, K: 0.18). On the other hand, speaker B, whose evaluation of the two languages was very much the same at 3.7 for each, marked the highest average number of codeswitches amongst all these speakers (0.9). Similarly, speaker H, who employed various types of codeswitches and recorded a high average number of switches, evaluated English slightly higher than Japanese, just as most of the other speakers did. Moreover, speaker D received the third highest average number of codeswitches per turn, but his evaluation of English was the lowest out of all the twelve speakers.

5.3.2 Instrumental and Integrative Attitudes Towards English
Unlike the statements in the initial section of this questionnaire which attempted to elicit the speakers' general attitudes towards both Japanese and English, the second portion was aimed at the elicitation of instrumental and integrative

143

attitudes toward English only. An instrumental attitude derives from pragmatic or utilitarian motives, while an integrative attitude to language may concern attachment to, or identification with, a speech community (Gardner and Lambert, 1972, p14). Baker (1992, p32) quotes examples of instrumental and integrative items taken from Gardner (1985) Attitude/Motivation Test Battery. These are follows:

Instrumental items
Studying French can be important to me because I think it will some-day be useful in getting a job.

Studying French can be important for me because it will make me a more knowledgeable person.

Integrative items
Studying French can be important for me because it will allow me to meet and converse with more and varied people.

Studying French can be important for me because other people will respect me more if I have knowledge of a foreign language.

Baker (1992, P32) discusses the fact that the casting of language attitudes under these two headings (instrumental and integrative) has often been criticised. One of the major criticisms concerns the tradition of measurement of these two orientations. Since the studies carried out by Gardner and Lambert in 1959, the methods which have been employed to measure both integrativeness and instrumentality have typically been diverse and small in number. For example in Gardner's study, only four questions were directly aimed at measuring integrative and instrumental attitude. This has led to questions being raised as to the reliability of such a measurement. Nevertheless, this distinction integrative and instrumental attitude has, from its inception, been thought of

as conceptual rather than empirical. In other words, it could be said that a 'common-sense' perception should prevail, even with the obvious inadequacies in the measurement process.

In this current study, five distinct questions were used for each instrumental and integrative attitude. As the study is interpretive, with quantitative analysis only complementing what are primarily qualitative assertions, the small number of questions employed should be sufficient for the occurrence of code-switching in relation to attitude towards English amongst the speakers who took part in this study. Of the ten items in this questionnaire, five questions were used to determine instrumental attitude, whilst another five questions were chosen to elicit integrated attitudes. The questionnaire stated as *how important or unimportant do you think the English language is for people to do the following? There are no right or wrong answers.*

(i) Instrumental attitudes
item 2   To earn plenty of money
item 5   Get a job
item 6   Become smarter
item 7   Go shopping
item 10   To do business overseas

(ii) Integrative attitudes
item 1   To make friends
item 3   Read
item 4   Write
item 8   Be accepted in the community
item 9   Talk to people out of university/work

Each speaker was asked to evaluate each item, and place their answer within one of these categories: 'important' (4points),

'not so important' (3points), 'relatively unimportant' (2points), and 'unimportant' (1point).

Table 5.9 shows that of the twelve speakers, only two (A and D) received higher average scores for 'instrumental' items than they did for 'integrative' items. On the other hand, six speakers (B, C, E, G, I, and L) obtained high average scores for 'integrative' items than they did for 'instrumental' items. The remaining four speakers (F, H, J, and K) scored equally both in terms of the 'instrumental' and 'integrative' items. Additionally, it is significant to note that none of the speakers in the older age group evaluated 'instrumental' items higher than they did 'integrative' items, though half of this age group scored equally on both items.

Table 5.9 Average Scores of an Instrumental and Integrative Attitudes by Each Speaker

| | SPEAKER | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Younger | | | | | | Older | | | | | |
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Instrumental	3.8	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.2	3.4	3.4	2.8	3.2	3.6	4	2.8
Integrative	3.6	3.8	3.6	3	4	3.4	3.8	2.8	3.8	3.6	4	3.8
Switches (Average numbers per turn)	0.3	0.9	0.4	0.67	0.35	0.13	0.29	0.7	0.1	0.34	0.18	0.15

Table 5.10 shows also that most of the speakers marked as 'important' both item 5 ('Get a job') and 10 ('To do business overseas') which fell within the category of 'instrumental' attitudes (nine and eleven speakers respectively). Within the

category of 'integrative' attitudes, item 1 ('To make friends') was evaluated as 'important' by ten of the speakers. The other three items (3. 'Read', 4. 'Write', and 8. 'Be accepted in the community) were evaluated as 'important' by nine speakers, eight speakers and nine speakers respectively. In terms of item 8 ('Be accepted in the community'), all of the older speakers responded to this as being 'important'. On the other hand, for item 9 ('Talk to people out of university/work) within this integrative category only five speakers (A, B, E, F, and K) responded as being 'important'. Interesting enough, four speakers out of the five belong to the younger age group.

Table 5.10 Elicited Responses for Each Item by Each Speaker

	Speaker											
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Instrumental												
2. To earn plenty money	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	1	3	4	4	2
5. Get a job	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3
6. Become smarter	4	4	3	4	1	3	1	1	3	4	4	4
7. Go shopping	3	3	2	2	3	4	4	4	3	2	4	1
10. To do business overseas	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4
Integrative												
1. To make friends	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4
3. Read	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4
4. Write	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4
8. Be accepted in the community	4	4	3	2	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4
9. Talk to people out of university/work	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	1	3	3	4	3

These results show that most speakers possess favourable instrumental and integrative attitudes, though there are some different evaluations between the younger and the older age speakers. The younger speakers (A and D) who recorded higher scores for the instrumental attitude may be expressing their motivation for getting a better job in Japan. Their perception is that their improved English capacity will give them an edge over others in their struggle to gain a good job. In fact,

during the course of the recording session, both speakers clearly emphasised both anxiety, and the hope for possibly getting a job after completing their course at university. A less favourable attitude towards item 8 ('Be accepted in the community') amongst the younger speakers rather than the older speakers might be due to the fact that they are overseas students, and most of them are planning to go back to Japan after finishing their course at university. Therefore, perhaps they have no strong future links to the community. Yet, the younger speakers' more favourable scores than those of the older speakers for item 9 ('Talk to people out of university/work') illustrate that they do have the will to expand their social network and social activities outside of the university.

Romaine (1995, p315) argues that migrants in particular may feel as though they are caught in a cultural no-mans-land. That is, after severing ties with their native country, and not being fully absorbed into their present environment, they may be overwhelmed by a feeling of anxiety at not belonging to either. The term 'anomie' has been used to describe such a feeling of disorientation. This statement may be an explanation for why all the older speakers demonstrated favourable scores for the item 'Be accepted in community'. In fact, speaker K commented that one of her strong motivations for acquiring the English language is establishing a strong link to the community in Australia. She believes that her difficulty in assimilation with English-speaking people here is based on her poor

proficiency in the English language. On the other hand, the older speakers received less favourable scores for the item 'Talk to people out of work'. This may indicate that they have already established some form of social network here.

The results again are not representative of the occurrence of code-switching since the speakers' evaluations for the items were diverse and particularistic. For instance, speaker B, who most frequently engaged in code-switching, and speaker I, who received the lowest average number of switches per turn, marked very similar average scores of both 'instrumental' (speaker B: 3.4, speaker I: 3.2) and 'integrative' attitude (both speakers B and I: 3.8). On the other hand, speaker H, who both employed various types of code-switches, and recorded the second highest number of switches, recorded the lowest average scores of both 'instrumental' and 'integrative' attitude amongst the speakers (both 2.8). Moreover, although speaker K marked as 'important' all of the items, the frequency of switches did not represent her favourable attitude towards these two attitudinal aspects.

The results of the elicited responses for 'instrumental' and 'integrative', for each item, by each speaker, may be expressed in terms of a rank order of attitudes given to English. Table 5.11 shows that there is quite a balanced response between integrative and instrumental responses, and also a tight clustering of mean scores.

Table 5.11 Ranked Responses of Both Instrumental and Integrative
Responses and the Speakers' Corresponding Means Scores

Order of Importance	Item	Mean
1st	To do business overseas	3.9
2nd	Read	3.8
	Get a job	3.8
3rd	To make friends	3.7
	Write	3.7
	Be accepted in the community	3.7
4th	To earn plenty of money	3.3
	Talk to people out of university/work	3.3
5th	Become smarter	3
6th	Go shopping	2.9

5.4 Attitude Towards Code-switching

As the results from the questionnaires which elicited the
speakers' 'general' attitude towards both the Japanese and
English languages, and 'instrumental' and 'integrative'
attitudes toward the English language have shown, most of the
speakers hold relatively positive views. However, these
attitudes seem not to represent the occurrence of code-
switching. In this section, each speaker's attitude towards
code-switching in relation to its occurrence will be
investigated. Each speaker was asked their opinion with regard
to the mixing of Japanese and English, during the course of the
interview. This is the first point in time the researcher had
actually made any mention of the 'mixing' of languages. The
questions were firstly, 'Do you hear a mixing of Japanese and
English at university/college/or at work? If so when do they
speak like that?', second, 'Do you mix English and Japanese
when you speak? When and to whom do you speak like that?, and

third, 'What are your views on the mixing of English and Japanese? Why do you think people mix the two languages?'.

For the first two questions (Do you hear a mixing of Japanese and English at university/college/or at work? If so when do they speak like that?), all of the participants responded that they do often hear people mixing Japanese and English at university/work. For example, all of the younger speakers stated that students frequently engage in 'language-mixing' when they talk about study to close friends. Of the six younger students, two speakers (A and E), who both have part time jobs at different Japanese restaurants, reported that they hear their coworkers mixing Japanese and English at work. According to speaker A, this often occurs when they instruct new waitresses about the job, or even when they talk to customers. Speaker A considers these incidents as a natural phenomenon amongst bilinguals, while speaker E commented that it is considered rude. She feels that older people and one's boss would feel uncomfortable or even slightly offended if they were spoken to in this manner.

Similarly, the older speakers reported that they often hear bilingual coworkers mixing Japanese and English when they interact in a casual situation. One states however that these people do not engage in code-switching in a formal situation, for instance, when they talk with their boss. Speaker G comments that her coworkers mix two languages not only during casual conversations, but also when they ask their coworkers to

do certain tasks (e.g. asking to make a photocopy). Most of the older speakers state that people engage in code-switching only when they interact with bilinguals, not monolinguals.

In terms of the second group of questions (*Do you mix English and Japanese when you speak? When and to whom do you speak like that?*), all of the younger speakers commented that they mix the two languages when they talk to their close friends, who can speak both English and Japanese, at university and at work. Two speakers (E and F) reported that they tend to codeswitch more frequently when they talk about study, rather than other things. Speaker E states that she always tries to avoid mixing the two languages when she interacts with older people. Another speaker (C) commented that he tries not to do so, if he talks with someone who has just come to Australia, or with a monolingual person.

The older speakers reported that they mix the languages when they talk to people who have been residing in Australia, and not people who are visiting here. Unlike the younger students, the older speakers emphasise that they try to speak without mixing the two languages to a Japanese person at first, even though they know the person is capable of understanding English. Speaker G commented that if the person keeps talking in Japanese only, speaker G will also continue to talk to the person without mixing the languages. Yet, if the person eventually begins to mix English and Japanese, then speaker G

will converge with the person's code-switching discourse, even if it is the first time they have ever spoken to each other.

Speaker L, on the other hand, states that he mixes the languages when he talks to anyone who has been residing in Australia, because he assumes that code-switching discourse is a common occurrence amongst bilinguals. Unlike speaker L, speaker I explains that he tries not to mix the languages if he speaks to an older person, or a person who is not close to him. Moreover, speaker H commented that she sometimes uses English expressions when she interacts with her boss. She does this in order to create a certain 'mood', in some certain instances, one of informality and casualness, that is not particularly easy to achieve when adhering to the more formal structures of Japanese discourse.

The third group of questions *(What are your views on the mixing of English and Japanese? Why do you think people mix the two languages?)* are direct questions aimed at eliciting the speakers' opinions about the occurrence of code-switching. Of the six younger speakers, four positively evaluated the practice of code-switching. They commented that it is a natural phenomenon amongst Japanese people who have been residing in an English-speaking country. Two speakers (B and C) pointed out that employing English expressions is useful for expressing certain things, and bilinguals choose one of the language items according to what they are talking about. Speaker C states that mixing English and Japanese is an indication of cultural

assimilation. Speaker D comments that embedding English expressions in a Japanese sentence is acceptable, since a huge number of English words find themself in the Japanese language and common in a Japanese society, but not whole English sentences. Speaker D however expresses a little anxiety for his future life in Japan, due to his habitual use of English expressions.

Two speakers (E and F) negatively evaluated the occurrence of code-switching. Speaker E commented that Japanese people should separate the two languages (English and Japanese). She assumes that people mix the two languages because they have gradually come to forget their first language. She also believes that some people mix the languages on purpose, to 'show-off' their English language proficiency. According to her, in most cases, those who mix the languages the most are the ones who have been residing in Australia for only a relatively short period of time. Similarly, speaker F thinks that the mixing of the two languages is an indication of a lack of competence in the Japanese vocabulary.

Of the older speakers, three speakers (J, K and L) positively evaluated the occurrence of code-switching. For instance, speaker J thinks that mixing the two languages constitutes habitual behaviour amongst bilingual people, and therefore it is what could be termed a 'natural' incident. Speaker K similarly states that it is acceptable in an English-speaking context. It is the bilinguals' unique prerogative based on

their proficiency in both English and Japanese. She points out that there are some advantages in the mixing of languages, such as: firstly, that it is usually efficient to express actual meanings; second, it can be used for a euphemistic purpose; and third, using English expressions in Japanese discourse is useful for expressing something specific regarding situations in the English context (Australia). In the same manner, speaker L believes that mixing the two languages is often an efficient way to convey exact meanings, especially if there are no equivalent words in either Japanese or English. It is also an effective strategy for making conversation more interesting. He, however, comments that the excessive use of English expressions is annoying (e.g. intersentential code-switching).

Speakers G and H consider it to be acceptable under certain circumstances. For example, speaker G comments that it is acceptable, unless a speaker mixes the languages on purpose, in order to show off one's English proficiency. She personally prefers to separate the two languages, even though she believes that the mixing of the two languages is a much more efficient way of conveying meanings when she interacts with bilingual people. While speaker H considers it to be a natural phenomenon amongst people who have been residing in Australia, but it may be rude to Japanese people who are just short-term visitors here. She also comments that mixing languages is an indication of a lack of proficiency in both the English and Japanese languages.

Table 5.12 Positive and Negative Views of Code-switching by the Speakers

	Evaluation of Code-switching	
Speaker	Positive views	Negative views
A	Bilingual's natural behaviour	
B	Bilingual's natural behaviour	
C	Convenient to express certain things Indication of cultural assimilation	
D	Bilingual's 'natural' behaviour	Anxiety for non-acceptance in Japanese society
E		Indication of a lack of proficiency of both E/J Showing off one's English proficiency
F		Indication of a lack of Japanese vocabulary
G	Effective for communication with bilingual people	Can be showing off of one's English proficiency
H	Bilingual's 'natural' behaviour	Can be rude to the non-residing Japanese Indication of a lack of proficiency of both E/J
I		A lack of Japanese identity 'Showy'
J	Habitual behaviour	
K	Bilingual's natural behaviour Bilingual's unique prerogative Effective to express actual meanings Can be useful as euphemism	
L	Bilingual's natural behaviour Makes for more interesting conversation Effective to convey actual meanings	

Unlike speakers G and H, speaker I expresses rather negative views about code-switching. He believes that Japanese people have to speak proper Japanese, and not mix the languages. He however comments that embedding a small portion of English expressions into Japanese sentences is acceptable, but using long English expressions may be 'showy'.

Gardner-Chloros (1991) conducted a similar survey in her study of language selection and switching (French/Alsatian), in Strasbourg. Her 40 subjects were all very much aware that the people around them were mixing the two languages. She found that her subjects, when questioned, would either admit that they codeswitched just like everyone else, or would claim that although the habit was widespread, they themselves refrained from doing so. Their attitudes towards code-switching varied. Their reactions ranged from a consideration of it as being quite natural in a bilingual context; and thus acceptable, to the conviction that it was a bad habit, one which was both irritating and impolite (Gardner-Chloros, 1991, p105).

The speakers in this present study were also well aware of their coworkers, friends, and themselves mixing the two languages. Most speakers described this phenomenon as 'natural' in an English-speaking context. However, their responses to the direct question about code-switching show that their attitudes varied from negative to positive. Moreover, some speakers indicated that they recognised the roles or functions of code-switching which operate within bilinguals' daily interactions.

Gumperz (1982, pp62-3) reports a range of differing attitudes towards code-switching cross-culturally. Some characterise it as a display of impoliteness, or perhaps an obvious consequence of a lack of education, whilst some see it as a sign that the speaker is incapable of controlling the two languages. In Grosjean's study (1982, p146) for example, speakers commented that code-switching was a grammarless mixture of two languages, a jargon or gibberish, which therefore insulted the monolingual's own rule-governed language. Lüdi (1986) also found that in her study, code-switching had a lack of societal acceptance. Furthermore, Romaine (1995, p237) reports that in the case of bilingual children, many professionals, such as speech therapists, perceive the mixing of languages negatively. They see it as being harmful in that it is an impediment to the complete mastering of either language. The advice given therefore is to keep the languages separate – this however is perhaps not in tune with normal bilingual development in other communities.

Such negative views often create stereotypical reactions and stigmatise code-switching. For instance, many bilingual communities use such pejorative terms as 'mixed language'. More specifically, among Spanish and English bilinguals, language code-switching is labeled as 'Tex-Mex' or 'Spanglish' (Jacobson, 1982). In Panjabi, the term 'tuti futi' (broken up) is used to refer to code-switching (Romaine, 1995). Moreover, 'Joual' is employed among French and English bilinguals in

Canada (Chana and Romaine, 1984). In Willis's (1992) investigation into the use of language amongst high school students at the Canadian Academy (CA) - which is an international school - in Japan, he notes that code-switching is one of the features of the stigmatised variety used by the students.

'It should be stressed that the Japanese spoken is not the delicate formal language of polite society. Rather, it is a patois born from street language, liberally mixed with English vocabulary. It is a CA language, a *chanpon-go*, a *CA-go* (a hotchpotch or potpourri is perhaps the best analogy)'(1992, p83).

Amongst the participants in this current study, no such labels were given to code-switching, although some displayed similarly negative views toward code-switching such as have been given above. These were: 'The mixing of the two languages indicates a lack of proficiency in both the English and Japanese languages (speakers E and H) and 'Practising code-switching is an indication of a gradual loss of competence in the Japanese language (speaker F).

An emphasis on the 'purity' of the Japanese language was clearly expressed by some speakers. They stated that Japanese people should speak proper Japanese, therefore, they should completely separate the Japanese and English languages. This type of attitude has also been seen amongst bilinguals in other communities. Treffers-Daller's study (1992), which focused on code-switching between the local varieties of French and Dutch in Brussels, investigated the causes for its disappearance

amongst the younger generation. He concludes that the disappearance of intrasentential code-switching is attributable to the puristic influences of standard Dutch speakers.

Similarly, Poplack's (1988) study demonstrates the contrasting patterns of code-switching use between French-speakers in Ottawa-Hull, and Puerto Ricans in New York. She argues that the non-occurrence of intrasentential code-switching amongst French/English bilinguals in Ottawa-Hull is a reflection of their attitudes towards the use of English. The puristic notions that they hold are attributable to the historical legacy of conflict between the French and the English. She did not find this evident in the New York Puerto Rican situation. Myers-Scotton (1998b, p100) states that in speech communities which hold puristic notions with regard to their own language, it is unlikely that code-switching will occur.

Many Japanese people feel that their identity is consistent with, and linked to, patrilineal descent, language, and notions of supposed racial purity. Increased awareness of Japanese ethnicity has been triggered by contact with, and comparisons between, other cultures (Miller, 1995, p190). A strong connection between the Japanese language and identity seems to exist in Japanese society, and some may feel that a loss of competence in the Japanese language correspondingly equates to a loss of Japanese ethnic identity. In fact, in this study, speaker I (who produced the lowest number of codeswitches) clearly expressed this notion during the sociolinguistic

interview. There is a strong possibility that Japanese people who have resided for a long period of time in an English speaking country will continue to maintain these beliefs. This assumption is supported by Kanazawa and Loveday's (1988) study which demonstrated that first generation immigrants in Brazil continue to show strong ethnocentric tendencies.

Another speaker (L) demonstrated similar, but more moderate expressions of this notion. He felt that the excessive use of English expressions was annoying, even though he held positive views about code-switching. This indicates that the practice of code-switching may be considered to be acceptable up to a point, as long as the speaker makes an effort to retain a Japanese ethnic identity. This can partly account for the frequent use of single word switches amongst the speakers. In fact, some of the speakers commented that they usually try to restrict their code-switching to single words in order to avoid letting their utterances become overtly dominated by English.

Speaker I commented that he usually tries to pronounce English items in a Japanese way when he mixes the two languages. This is a strategy which admits the use of code-switching, yet in the effort to retain a Japanese identity, presents codeswitched discourse as a monolingual utterance. This reflects the familiar Japanese practice of incorporating foreign words (usually English) into the Japanese phonological system.

Others feel that the frequent use of English items, or the employment of lengthy English expressions, may be done on purpose, to 'show-off'. Similarly, Malcolm's study (1997, p58) has revealed that the use, in certain contexts, of Standard Australian English is regarded as 'flashy' or 'posh' amongst Australian Aboriginal speakers. One of Saragih's (1997) subjects similarly commented that her interlocutor's use of Bahasa Indonesia expressions in discourse in the regional language (Simalungun) was an obvious sign that she was 'showing off'.

On the other hand, some speakers' negative views towards code-switching seemed to derive from their awareness of the existence of certain social norms and values with respect to the practice of code-switching. This socially sanctioned, acquired attitude is held to be distinct from one's own personal preference for proper speech. For instance, they believe that the mixing of the languages may offend certain Japanese people, such as older people, strangers, people who are just short-term visitors and people who have been living in Australia for only a short period of time. Most commented that they tried to avoid English expressions which were not commonly used as loan words in Japanese society, during the interaction with the above type of interlocutors. It seems that the speakers pay attention to how they should speak in accordance with social convention, with the desire to obtain acceptance from their interlocutors, just as monolingual speakers choose

different forms of one language in adjusting their style to the situation (e.g. O'Donnell and Todd, 1992).

Some speakers state that they engage in code-switching for certain reasons, even though these same speakers hold negative views of it. They believe that using English expressions is an effective way of communicating with bilingual people. They point out some advantages in the mixing of languages, such as: firstly, it is usually an efficient way to express actual meanings; second, it can be used for a euphemistic purpose; and third, using English expressions in Japanese discourse is useful for expressing something specific regarding situations in the English context (i.e. Australia).

As in this present study, Gardner-Chloros (1991) asked her subjects their opinion as to the reasons for code-switching in her study of language selection and switching (French/Alsatian) in Strasbourg. She classified the subjects' replies in the following way. These are: 1) reasons which were associated with language domains (i.e. certain professional and technical areas), that is the roles that each language performs with the specific society (Alsatian); 2) reasons which relate to the speakers' individual language capabilities. It was noted that quite often code-switching serves as a way of overcoming linguistic inadequacies. In interpersonal and group situations compromise forms of speech were produced so that all speakers could equally participate in the conversation; 3) reasons which were tied to identifying an association with a specific group,

an abstract way of sending a coded signal, as a way of creating a more relaxed mood in what might otherwise have been a very formal situation (such as a job interview) (Gardner-Chloros 1991, p106).

Even though these subjects clearly demonstrated perceptive replies in the interviews, they characterised code-switching as a non-deliberate, unconscious mode of speech. Gardner-Chloros concludes that 'the unconsciousness is clearly not carried over into their reasoned perceptions'.

Bilingual speakers' 'unconsciousness' in terms of code-switching has been reported on by several researchers. For example, in Blom and Gumperz's (1972) study, which focused on code-switching between local and standard Norweigian in Hemnesberget, they found that code-switching was frequently employed by people during the recordings, even though they claimed that the standard dialect was used only in certain situations (i.e. school, church, or some formal meetings). Gal (1988, p246) argues that speakers often do not realise that they code-switch, and if they do, are sometimes reluctant to admit it. Nevertheless, some speakers actually monitor and comment on this practice. Poplack (1988, p218) points out that 'unawareness' of certain alternations between languages is one characteristic of 'skilled' or fluent code-switching amongst Spanish/English bilinguals (Puerto Ricans in New York). Moreover, Gumperz (1982, p62) states that there would be no utility in asking a bilingual to recount incidences of

particular switches, for it would be like asking native English speakers to record and self analyse their use of future tense forms. Gumperz (1982, p61) explains that speakers are usually unaware of which language is being used at any one time, since their main concern is with the communicative effect of what they are saying.

One example of this in the current study is the case of speaker E, despite the fact that she holds strong negative views towards code-switching. She explained that this attitude derives from her mother's puristic notion about the Japanese language. She reported that her mother remains anxious over the perceived loss of speaker E's Japanese identity, since she has been in an English-speaking country for a lengthy period of time (9years). During the course of the recording sessions, speaker E often showed her hesitation by pausing in her codeswitched discourse. Romaine (1989, p142) refers to this as 'flagging' which is an indication of the speaker's awareness of code-switching. Speaker E appeared to control her use of English expressions at the beginning of the discussions. Yet the 'flagging' disappeared when she gradually became more involved and relaxed as in the discussions with her partner as time went by.

Topic 1
23.E: Omotta ijoo ni toreta. Dakara watashi no itteiru koto wa
     koo.. nante iuno.., **ethics** ni kankei surukoto dakara. Watshi
     wa risuukei no soo iu **report** o kakuno wa nareteru kedo. Nani ga
     tadashiitoka soo iu.. **ethics** no koto ni tsuite kaita koto ga
     nakatta kara kekkoo...

23.E: I got a much better mark than I expected. As you know, what I
wrote was something related to, what can I say ... **ethics**. I'm
used to writing **reports** in the science or mathematics field,
but I haven't written anything which is related to.. **ethics**
which is supposed to discuss what is correct or wrong. So, I
was very...

Topic 1
79.E: Yoku wa nannai kedo. Demo sore wa **point** ni.. nante iuno.., **add**
sareruka dooka wakaranain janai?

Translation
79.E: I don't understand. Anyway, we don't know if it can be.. what
can I say.. **added** to our **point**, do we?

Furthermore, during the interviews in this study, some
participants showed that they were unaware of their actual use
of English expressions. For instance, speaker H, who
demonstrated smooth intra and intersentential code-switching,
even though she holds some negative views of its practice,
often had difficulty in explaining the reasons why she engaged
in code-switching during the course of the discussions. This
may be evidence of an 'unconscious' mode of speech.

Swigart (1992) maintains that the contradiction between the use
of code-switching, and negative views held, can be explained in
the following way. His study focused on what he calls the
'urban' variety of Wolof used in the city of Dakar, Africa.
This is the mixing of French and Wolof, in what constitutes a
distinct and separate code. The code-switching that takes place
in this environment represents the unmarked (conventional)
choice. In the informal situation, the urban Wolof code is done
with very little conscious awareness. Swigart (1992, p90)
argues that in most cases, the switching occurred in informal

situations, and it was not carried out deliberately, or as the strategic negotiation of expected or unexpected codes. On the other hand, in formal situations, the nature of the code-switching process amongst the speakers changed: it become more marked, the speakers manipulating it to create desired situations or meanings.

The users of urban Wolof in Swigart's study may differ from the speakers in the present study in terms of the proficiency in the two languages which code-switching involves. However, the code-switching that was employed amongst the speakers in the present study showed similar characteristics to the above. Code-switching was common amongst participants. The subjects were placed in an informal, relaxed situation, with partners who they were familiar. Their code-switching tended to be relatively non-deliberate and with minimum conscious awareness. It was not employed strategically as a means of creating ulterior effects.

As it turned out the strong 'puristic' attitude did influence the occurrence of code-switching. However, negative attitudes towards code-switching do not always correspond to the practice of code-switching. This is primarily due to the fact that code-switching and its associated functions seem to be conventionally operating amongst the bilingual in-group. Moreover, the speakers choose a speech style, that is, they produce either predominantly codeswitched or predominantly monolingual utterances in a particular interaction.

5.5 Pragmatic Factors in Code-switching

Sociolinguistic research has, in general, endeavoured to uncover societies' rules and norms in relation to varieties of language behaviour. It has focused on the ways in which language exists as an aspect of the social norm which sets constraints upon individual action. However, even considering that the individual is restricted by these limitations, he is not completely tied down by social norms. With language, the individual has the ability to transcend these limitations and express an individual social identity (Williams, 1992, p92). In this section the way in which bilingual speakers make choices regarding the usage patterns of code-switching will be discussed.

Style Shifting and Code-Switching

Speakers possess a wide range of speaking styles, which they employ when speaking to various members of different speech communities. Just as the monolingual shifts styles, the bilingual switches languages. Gal (1979, p91) explains that 'codes' are the linguistic varieties in a speaker's repertoire, including, in the case of bilinguals, different languages as well as different styles. Similarly, Romaine (1995, p170) states that style shifting and code-switching are coexistent at the level of discourse. In other words, style shifting accomplishes for the monolingual, what code-switching does for the bilingual.

According to Labov (1972, p208) 'Styles can be ranged along a single dimension, measured by the amount of attention paid to speech'. His study, which looked at different phonological patterns across social classes in New York City, came to the conclusion that when people come together in a formal activity setting, they give greater attention to their speech. In this instance, he recorded a scale which included five styles which gradually increased in formality: A) casual style, B) careful style, C) reading aloud from text, D) reading aloud from word-lists, D') pronunciation of minimal word-pairs. The speakers in Labov's study, in general, showed that as the degree of formality increased, the speakers became more aware of their speech. For instance, it appeared that the motivation of the lower-class group when in a more formal context, was to adapt a manner of speaking which simulated the middle-class group (Labov, 1997).

Some other linguists have a different approach to the study of the style dimension of language from Labov's study. Bell's (1984) study, for instance, is a more interpretive and speaker-based approach which closely looks at interaction and language use. Bell emphasises how speakers manipulate their language in order to create a path for understanding, but still remain within the framework of conventional social values and symbols. He proposes that each speaker creates their conversational contribution to their audience (the audience can be the addressee, auditors, overhearers and eavesdroppers). He then states that stylistic variation is parallel in function to

bilingual code-switching behaviour. That is, 'the formal/ informal continuum is simply expressed in different code sets in different societies: by language choice in bilingual societies, by dialect switching in diglossic situations, and by style shift in monolingual societies' (Bell, 1984, p176).

In this present study, the interaction between each participant was supposed to be 'informal' since the relationship of each pair was based on an established 'friendship', and the setting was familiar to both speakers. Most of them seemed to discuss topics in a relaxed manner and participated enthusiastically although some showed a little awkwardness at the beginning of the recording sessions. Unlike the others, speaker (G) commented that she was self-conscious about her speech during the recording sessions, even though the researcher was absent, and there was no mention that this was being carried out in order to study code-switching behaviour. She explained that she disliked mixing the Japanese and English languages and tried hard not to do it. In fact, the result shows that across the topics, speaker G recorded only half the amount of code-switches when compared to her partner, speaker H - except within the 'neutral' category (speaker H's score within this category was about three times that of speaker G's). In contradiction to this however, speaker G's partner and all of her friends reported that speaker G frequently employs English expressions when conversing with her close friends. This indicates that the level of formality causes the speaker to pay more attention to her own speech and in turn this decreased the

frequency of code-switches. In other words, the speaker tailors
her speech to suit the particular situation, and to obtain
acceptance in particular from her *audience* (in this case the
audience was the researcher or third party who was not present
during the recording sessions but who would be an *overhearer*
over the microphone). These examples are shown in the following
passages:

Topic 1
Passage 1
1.G: Nani o hanaseba iinokashira?
2.H: **I don't know. Why do you work then?**
3.G: **Well**... mochiron soodesu ne, watashi nimo anata nimo nanika
    yuueki na koto ga arukarade...

Translation
1.G: what should we talk about?
2.H: **I don't know. Why do you work then?**
3.G: **Well**...of course...there is something good for you and as well
    as for me....

Passage 9
64.H: Nihon de nihon no jooshi no tame ni hataraita koto wa
    arimasu?
65.G: Naidesu ne.
66.H: **You've never worked for Japanese.**
67.G: **No**, ...pari demo yappari huransujin, watashi no shigoto wa
    huransujin bakkari de konkai ga hajimete nihonjin.
68.H: **What's the difference between the Japanese boss and foreign
    boss?**
69.G: **Totally.**

Translation
64.H: Have you ever worked for a Japanese boss?
65.G: No, I haven't.
66.H: **You're never worked for Japanese.**
67.G: **No**,.... In Paris I had a French (boss). My job always deals
    with the French. This is the first time I've ever worked for
    Japanese.
68.H: **What's the difference between the Japanese boss and foreign
    boss?**
69.G: **Totally.**

Line 3 in passage 1 shows that speaker G began her utterance
with the English word *'well'* in order to answer speaker H's
question in English. However, speaker G paused after producing
'well' and then switched to Japanese. Speaker G may have been

171

tempted to utter a full English sentence, since her partner asked speaker G's opinion in English. Similarly, in passage 9, after her partner switched to English and confirmed speaker G's reply (in line 66), speaker G uttered 'no' in English. Yet again she made a pause, and switched to Japanese. Speaker H continued to produce another English sentence (in line 68) to ask speaker G's point of view, but Speaker G blocked her utterance after producing an English word 'totally'.

Linguistic Styles as Strategies of Politeness

Formal style is associated with 'politeness'. Most speakers in this study believe that the mixing of the languages may offend certain Japanese people, such as older people, their employer, strangers, people who are just short-term visitors, and people who have been living in Australia for only a short period of time. Fraser (1990, p233) states that politeness as an expression derived from language, is determined by its occurrence in communicative contexts, rather than by any innate properties which it may contain. That is, 'polite' is attributable only to speakers, not to language and is routinely assessed as more or less polite relative to community values and norms.

Ide (1991, p64) argues that 'For the Japanese people, linguistic politeness is mainly a matter of conforming to social conventions for a choice of linguistic forms'. Ide (1989, p232) points out Brown and Levinson's face constructs (negative face - the want of every 'component adult member'

that his action be unimpeded by others, *positive face* - the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others) do not consider the acknowledgment of social relationship. She then suggests that the concept of 'discernment' ('wakimae') which signals social relationships has to be added to an aspect of politeness 'volition' (strategic politeness attending to face concerns).

Similarly, Matsumoto (1988, p403) explains that in Japanese culture, people are expected to act 'properly' according to their relative position or rank with regard to other member of group. This is due to the fact that a person's self image (i.e.'face'), as a group member who actively participates in specific relations with others (rather than as an independent individual). Loss of face results in the perception - in terms of the other members of the group - that this individual has somehow, failed to fully understand their place in society, that is the 'proper' manner which they should behave as a member of it.

Yoon (1996, p397) agrees with Ide and Matsumoto's position and emphasises that the respect for age, and status, which derive from the concepts of Confucianism governs social interaction and influences the choice of linguistic forms. In his study of code choice and code-switching amongst Korean/English, his subjects displayed more use of monolingual utterances and small-size switches when they interacted with members of an 'out-group' (this refers to people who are socially distant

from each other due to their difference in status, age, rank, and lack of closeness).

The present study focused only on 'informal' interaction between paired participants. However, the comments, which derived from most of the speakers (as it was explained above), indicated that these speakers are likely to produce Japanese monolingual utterances or use a smaller number of English expressions in those particular instances.

Convergence

Individuals monitor their speech carefully, and have the ability to modify their behaviour. Both Le Page and Giles have developed theories based on this concept. Le Page and Andree Tabouret-Keller (1985) state that the individual creates their own patterns of linguistic behaviour so that one can, when desired, create a sense of distance or separateness between oneself and certain groups. Le Page (1998, p28) explains that speakers monitor their speech according to the contexts they find themselves in. They always (for the most part unconsciously) adopt a style which is felt to be appropriate to their relationship with the interlocutor.

Similarly, Giles' speech accommodation theory argues that when an individual speaker interacts with an interlocutor, they may, in an effort to gain that interlocutor's acceptance and approval, resort to modifying their own speech ('convergence'). He also suggests that individuals may shift their speech style

away from the speech styles of their interlocutors as a tactic of social differentiation ('divergence')(Giles and Byrne, 1982, p105).

The comment taken from one of the speakers (G) in the present study is illustrative of the process of 'convergence'. This is an experience which happens to her often. Speaker G explains that when she interacts with a Japanese person for the first time, and the person talks in Japanese only, she will also continue to talk to the person without mixing the languages. Even if she knows the Japanese person is capable of speaking English, speaker G will interact in the same monolingual manner. Yet if the person does eventually begins to mix English and Japanese, then speaker G will converge with that person's code-switching discourse, even if it is the first time they have ever spoken together. Moreover, speaker G comments that if the speaker tends to talk in English only, she will also accommodate to the person's language choice.

In the broader analysis of the recording session, half of those who attained the highest individual frequency scores were paired across the topics. That is, they possessed similar patterns of code-switching use to their partner. One explanation for this may be found in the theory above. In fact, speaker F, who was of pair 3, commented that he has come to use more English expressions since he has become closer to speaker E. On the contrary, speaker E states that she used to use English expressions much more frequently than she now does. She

has completed high school in Australia (after studying at high school in Japan for one year), and has been in Australia for a total of nine years (while speaker F's length of time is six years). Speaker E has also had only a small amount of contact with Japanese people. Therefore, these factors may contribute to the different range of linguistic repertoire between them. While frequent conversation with speaker F has moderated speaker E's usage of English expressions. Even though these speakers' individual total number of codeswitches differed from each other, their scores for each topic seem to illustrate a similar pattern of code-switching use.

Moreover, the trend of scores which was displayed by speakers G and H for each topic, illustrated similar patterns, even though speaker G did not display her actual use of code-switching as explained above. Speaker H therefore appeared to be unique because she interacted with speaker G in a similar manner to their usual interaction during the course of recording sessions, even though speaker H did not converge with speaker G's codeswitched discourse. However, both speakers G and H produced a higher score within the Japanese-related topic than topic 1 (work). This pair scored the highest individual frequency results within the 'neutral' category, with their similar patterns of code-switching. This provides evidence to suggest that these speakers were accommodating in their pattern of code-switching use.

Unlike the two pairs above, speakers C and D, who made up pair 2, demonstrated very similar patterns of code-switching. For instance, both received not only the highest individual scores of codeswitches during their discussion of topic 1 (study), but also recorded similar scores for the rest of the topics. This may be due to the fact that speakers C and D often spent their spare time together, and therefore the frequent contact with each other has allowed them to adapt to each other ('convergence') especially in terms of code-switching.

The speakers' use of English expressions shows that a pattern of mutual convergence is occurring. O'Donnell and Todd (1992, p70) state that vocabulary modification is probably one of the most conspicuous indicators of a shift in style. It is for this reason that vocabulary is central to the discussion of style (and register). Clyne (1987) has developed the notion of 'triggering' in relation to the patterning of code-switching, including its syntactic characteristics and the convergence between the bilinguals' two codes. Some examples from the current study are shown in the following passages:

Topic1
Passage 5
35.B: De benkyoo doo? Nan **semester** me korede?
36.A: Eeeto ne, ni **semester**, san **semester**, Att, chigau. Ninenme ni narunoka na.

Translation
35.B: So, how's your study going? Which **semester** is this for you?
36.A: Ah.. the second **semester**, the third **semester**, no, this is the second year.

Passage 7
72.A: Moo chotto rai **semester** yattemitee...
73.B: Watashi rai **semester** wa chottoo... Moo sandome no shoojiki de watashi imakara nihon ni kaette hon, siryoo mite junbi shite okoo to omotte...

<u>Translation</u>
72.A: Why don't you try next **semester**?
73.B: I'm not sure about next **semester**. I'm thinking I might go to Japan and check some materials for further study.

Topic 1
Passage 4
73.E: Demo sore **level one** datta no?
74.F: Iya, **level two** de.
75.E: Sore wa **level two** datta no? ja **level two** mo arunjanai.
76.F: Iya, demo hon yondara **guidebook** mitara chigau.
77.E: Ja, soo kiite mitara iijanai. **Level two** ga arundesuka tte itte.
78.F: Chau, chau, chau, **level one** de **part two** ni haitte iru (elective) yanka toreruhazu yanen...

<u>Translation</u>
73.E: Was it in the list of **level one**?
74.F: No, (it) was in **level two**.
75.E: Was it in **level two**, then the **level two** has...
76.F: No, the **guidebook** doesn't say so.
77.E: Then why don't you ask if the subject is available in **level two**.
78.F: No, no, no, that is **level one** and in part two, so it must be taken (as an elective).

As these examples show, speakers A and F accommodated to the codeswitched items which were produced by their partners. For instance, in passage 5, speaker A took the form which was a combination of a Japanese numeral and English noun – *ni* semester ('the second semester') and *san* semester ('the third semester') because her partner (speaker B) used the combination of a Japanese adjective and English noun – *nan* semester ('which' semester). A similar instance occurred in passage 7. Speaker A produced a combination of the Japanese adjective *rai*, and the English noun *semester* ('the next semester'), and speaker B took the same form of the phrase when answering speaker A's question.

In contrast to this, speakers E and F, who were in the same pair (pair 3), employed full English phrases, which consisted

of an English noun and numeral. In passage 4, speaker E produced the English phrase 'level one'. In order to confirm this, and provide the correct information, speaker F used the same English phrase. Other than speakers E and F, all of the younger speakers demonstrated this type of code-switching, that is, a combination of Japanese and English items. They also commented that they tried not to let their utterances become dominated by English.

The sequences of accommodation between the speakers may be understood as being a 'repetition' of English expressions. In Auer's study (1998, p12), which closely investigated the sequence of language negotiation, 'reiteration' or 'repetition' was interpreted as a phenomenon which occurs in the process of the speakers' gradual convergence. Some examples which have been taken from the present study are shown in the following passages:

Topic 2
Passage 5
91.E: Sonna **United Nation** no **fund** ga aru janai. Nan no tame ni aru no.
92.F: Sono **United Nation** ga tsubushite, **United Nation** ga karande iru njanai no?
93.E: Chigau, nato ga tsubushitanda yo. Nato ga tsubushite **United Nation** ga kondo heiwajooyaku mitainano to aida ni haitte nato wa datte betsu ni **Serbian** no hoo **attak** suru dake daata kara.
94.F: A soonano, de **Serbian** ga Kosobo o **attack** suru?
95.E: Soo, soo, soo, de, dakara **Serbian** ga Kosobo ni irukara saishuutaki ni nato ga **Serbian**, Kosobo o **attack** suru koto ni natta kara Kosobo no hito ga nigechatta no.

Translation
91.E: **Funds** are available from the **United Nations**. What do you think (the United Nations) is for?
92.F: That **United Nations** began the destruction. The **United Nations** caused (the war), didn't they?
93.E: No, NATO cased the destruction. NATO began the destruction and the **United Nations** brought about the peace. The only thing **Nato** wanted to do was **attack Serbia**.

94.F: Oh is that right? Then **Serbia attacked** Kosovo?
95.E: That's right. Because **Serbia** was in Kosovo, NATO eventually **attacked Serbia**, Kosovo, and they were evacuated.

Examples 92 and 94 in the above passage show that speaker F repeated the English phrase *'United nation'*, and the English words, *'Serbian'* and *'attack'* which were used by speaker E. This indicates that speaker F accommodated speaker E's preference in linguistic choice. In other words, repetition is one of the ways in which speech can show accommodation.

Other examples are shown in the following passages which were produced by speakers C and D (pair B).

Topic 1
Passage 1
3.D: Konkai wa **major, major** niko ni shite.
4.C: **Repeat** shiteruno ga, datte...
5.D: Att, **repeat** shiteruno aru.

Translation
3.D: This time, **major**, I'll take a double **major**.
4.C: I thought you have to **repeat**, because...
5.D: Yes, I have to **repeat**.

Passage 3
30.C: Sono **Aussie** no yatsu wa nante itteru no?
31.D: Sono **Aussie** tachi?

Translation
30.C: What did the two **Aussies** say about it?
31.D: Those **Aussies**?

Passage 5
58.C: Sore wa **Spanish**?
59.D: **Spanish** dakara sa
60.C: Jaa, **Ok**?
61.D: Ma, **Spanish** wa ore ni totte wa...

Translation
58.C: Are the other units **Spanish**?
59.D: Yes, **Spanish**.
60.C: Then, (you'll be) **Ok**, (right)?
61.D: Well, **Spanish** for me is...

Passage 5
84.C: Oyaji ga soonandesho? Demo nani yatte mo **law** toka yaranakya
ikenaikara ne.
85.D: Maa ne.
86.C: Oredatte **law** yaranakya ikenaindakara. Ore mo kon **semester law**
ga arukara ne. Dooshiyoo kana.

Translation
84.C: Your father's job is in marketing, isn't it? Whatever you
study, you have to know about **law**.
85.D: Perhaps.
86.C: I also have to learn **law**. I have a unit studying **law** this
semester. What should I do?

Similar instances were also seen in the interaction between

speakers I and J. As passage 5 shows, speaker J repeated a

phrase which contained an English word *'holiday'*, right after

speaker I produced that phrase.

Topic 1
Passage 5
47.I: [person's name] mada **holiday**?
48.J: [person's name] mada **holiday**.

Translation
47.I: Is [person's name] still on **holiday**?
48.J: (He is) still on **holiday**.

A different form of 'repetition' was observed in the case of

speakers I and J. In passages 1 and 10, speaker I repeated the

English words *'manager'* and *'packer'*, both of which were used

by speaker J in preceding utterances. Speaker I however

pronounced these words in a Japanese way - *'maneejaa'* in

passage 1, and *'pakkaa'* in passage 10, even though speaker J

uttered both words with a normal English pronunciation. As an

explanation to this, speaker I commented that he usually tries

to pronounce English items in a Japanese way when he mixes the

two languages during the interviews. This is a strategy which admits the use of code-switching, yet in the effort to retain a Japanese identity, presents codeswitched discourse as a monolingual utterance.

Giles and Smith (1979, p64) have demonstrated that the processes of convergence and divergence may occur simultaneously. At one level for instance a speaker might attempt to converge with his or her interlocutor at one way particular level (for example by way of speech rate), yet on another level, they may attempt to diverge or create a sense of dissonance by, for instance, employing speech with a different accent. In the case of speaker I, it can be interpreted that he converges with his partner's linguistic choice, but maintains his intent.

Topic1
Passage 1
14.J: Dakara sono kijun ga, kocchi no hito no kijun ga wakaranainda yone. **Owner, owner** ni kiitara **owner** wa kiraida tte. **Manager** atari de, dokomade, meikaku ni natte naiwake ne, **manager** atarimade itte **stop** suruka, sono keeki tesuto no.
15.I: Ii yo, sonna **manager** made ikanai yo. Sanpuru dasu koto mo aru kedo, daitai [company's name] ja kore tesuto tte iunomo keeki mo arudesho. [company's name] de kanarazu yatterundakara.

Translation
14.J: Actually, I don't know the standard of it. I asked an **owner** his opinion about it (a cake), and he said he doesn't like it. It's not clear whether the **manager** has the authority to be able to **stop** a sample cake from being sold in the shop or not.
15.I: No, it's not (be stopped) by the **manager** we sometimes put a sample in the shop. But there are some test cakes. We definitely do it.

Passage 10
99.J: Watashi ga motto hayaku yannakya dameda tte, 'Moo owatta kara burashi de nuttara chan to **oven rack** ni kakenasai, sashinasai' tte, '**Packer** ni tasukete moratte nani mo Iwanainoka' tte. De **packer** niya tte waratte. Kutte kakatte kurunda ne.
100.I: Darega? **packer** ga?

Translation

99.J: I told her that she has to work faster. I said to her 'Hang
the brush on the **oven rack** after you use it, 'Don't you say
anything to a **packer** who helps you'. So **packer** grinned.
and then she blew up my face.

100.I: Who? The **packer**?

Code-switching as an In-group Marker

Giles and Coupland (1991, p76) explain that when interlocutors

converge their speech, they become liberated from some of the

normative social constraints that may prohibit them from using

particular speech patterns. In another sense, some may feel

obligated to establish their own identity with their

interlocutor before any accommodation of alternative speech

patterns might occur. Tabouret-Keller (1983, P147) on the other

hand states that the sharing of what may be called mixed

discourse can also be used to consolidate one's own preferred

identity - separated from the social norms of one specific

culture. For instance, bilinguals who prefer a hybrid identity

(such as Japanese and western) can use code-switching as a

means of validating a particular preferred social identity.

Some researchers who focused on code-switching have found this

phenomenon amongst bilinguals. For instance, Goyvaerts and

Zambele (1992, p79) state that speakers who codeswitch often

are demonstrating their "mutually multiple identities".

Wardhaugh (1992, p108) shows that a feeling of both pride and

solidarity may come from bilinguals who are capable of mixing

language, and who do so frequently, as a means of consolidating

their shared notion of who they are. Poplack (1980, p599) for

instance states that intrasentential code-switching in particular operates to bond speakers in a more intimate relationship. As code-switching can only be accomplished by those bilingual members who are proficient in both target languages, code-switching acts as a kind of in-group marker. That is, the speakers evaluate code-switching in the same manner to each other, as a result, they share the norms and values of its practice. In fact, most of the speakers in this study pointed out the effectiveness of the practice of code-switching, due to its spontaneity, it is natural.

Code-switching as an 'Unmarked' Choice

Speakers' regular use of code-switching within the context of in-group membership therefore results in code-switching itself as the main medium of in-group conversation. Myers-Scotton (1988, 1993, 1995a) calls this type of code-switching 'unmarked' (which is expected or conventional), and code-switching itself is the unmarked choice rather than either language alone. She reported that some multilingual urban communities, such as in Africa and India, often show code-switching as their unmarked informal medium. Similar instances have been found in some immigrant communities or families in Europe and North America, even though one of their languages still dominates in setting the dimensions of code-switching (Myers-Scotton, 1998d, p232)

This type of code-switching is distinguished from code-switching in formal settings where relationships are being

negotiated. Heller (1988a, p81) refers to this in situations where no clear unmarked conventions of language choice may exist, or where there may be competing conventions (while code-switching itself as unmarked choice exists in situations where there are clear unmarked conventions of language choice). Similarly, Myers-Scotton (1995a, pp114-119) calls this type 'sequential' unmarked code-switching which can be distinguished from code-switching *itself* as the unmarked choice. She explains that 'sequential' unmarked code-switching occurs when there is a distinct shift in the unmarked rights and obligations set which is caused by a parallel change in the conversations situational factors (such as participants and topic). This occurs when speakers who are unfamiliar with each other come together in conversation, during which they endeavour to negotiate the socially appropriate or expected set of rights and obligations which apply to that topic. An instance of this can be seen in the recognition of a shared ethnicity when two speakers who are unfamiliar with each other come together. The rights and obligation set would then change from being shaped by 'unknown' relation to that of 'shared' relations (in terms of ethnicity). Thus Myers-Scotton asserts that code-switching behaviour is influenced by the topic only in the above way, she categorises this as 'sequential' unmarked code-switching.

Code-switching *itself* as an unmarked choice on the other hand can be held as . community norm, or at the same time, it can be the norm for specific speakers alone, or specific interactions. Myers-Scotton (1995a, p119) suggests that there are four

conditions for bilinguals to produce code-switching as the unmarked language choice. First, the speakers must be bilingual peers. Second, the speech interactions which occur must be of the type whereby the interlocutors wish to consolidate come form of inclusive group membership. Third, the speakers must possess a positive attitude towards the target languages. And finally, the speakers must possess a degree of proficiency in terms of being able to speak both languages. According to her the characteristics of this type of switching is that it is the overall pattern which carries the communicative intention, and most often takes the form of intrasentential code-switching (and sometimes within the single word)(Myers-Scotton, 1995a, p117).

In the current study, code-switching seems to have been chosen as a code in itself. In fact, most speakers (A, B, D, H, I, J, K, and L) described the practice of code-switching as "bilinguals' natural behaviour" or "habitual use". Each of the interactions between the speakers in a their pairs during the recording sessions has demonstrated that in general, they communicated fluently - rapidly switching without pause and smoothly switching from one language to another. This indicates that the speakers share established code-switching usage with their partner. Moreover, the type of code-switching which was most frequently produced was intrasentential code switching. It seems that codeswitched discourse amongst the speakers is a psychologically unified mode of speech, that is, there is little or no disconnection between the two languages.

However, during the course of the discussions, the choice of topic did have an overall influence on the frequency of code-switches which were recorded (for the Japanese related context had the lowest occurrence of code-switching). This result contradicts Myers-Scotton's assumption that code-switching is only influenced by topic in instances where the speakers are in the initial stages or process of establishing the conventions for code-switching use (what she calls 'sequential' unmarked code-switching). Certainly, Myers-Scotton's assumption seems to possess a great degree of accuracy or validity when limited to language pairs derived from 'homotropous cultures'. That is cultures which share certain similarities. It is more difficult however to come to the same sort of conclusions when applying these assumptions to 'heterotropous cultures', or cultures which are radically different. The main point here is that even though the concept basically remains the same in both societies (i.e. 'having lunch'), the cultural experience may be so totally different, that applying the Japanese term for lunch '*hirugohan*' seems to be inadequate in converging the actual cultural experience here (this analogy has been explored in slightly more detail in 'The Relationship between the Frequency of Code-switching and Topic' section).

The ability to use two languages, and as well as switch between them involves knowledge of the appropriate speech in relation to specific interactions. Hymes (1972) described this sense of recognition as a part of 'communicative competence'.

Communicative competence may be defined as the speakers' knowledge of what is a norm, and what is expected in a particular context. It involves 'the socially appropriate and interpretable ways of speaking which draw upon an implicit knowledge of what is appropriate and inappropriate in which social context' (Williams, 1992, p115). Verhoeven (1998, p392) calls this type of competence 'sociolinguistic competence' referring to knowledge of stylistic differences (or register variation). Verhoeven suggests that an individual's sociolinguistic competence is honed through the relation of three categories of knowledge. A) *Person knowledge*: this refers to an awareness of the interlocutor's current state of mind, overall temperament and disposition. This also includes a reading of interlocutor's intentions or motivations. B) *Knowledge of social categories* (age, sex, status). C) *Knowledge of how events are organised*: this involves Knowledge of conventionalised dialogues in the appropriate situations – established 'script' – such as in greetings and in telephone dialogues.

Linguistic choice is limited because particular modes of speech, within the confines of particular settings, are ruled out. Yet there is always some room for negotiation within a conversation (Gardner-Chloros, 1991, p39). Researchers like Gal (1983), Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985) and Myers-Scotton (1983, 1995a, 1998d) place an emphasis on the individuality of interactions. For example, Gal (1983, p68) believes that linguistic behaviour does not slavishly adhere to social norms.

Rather, the speaker takes an active role in the construction of language in any given social situation, as well as in the interpretation of their interlocutors' communicative intent. In such cases the individual may tune his/her linguistic behaviour with the aim of resembling a group which they want to be identified. Conversely, their speech may be constructed in such a way as to be blatantly distinguishable from others with whom they do not wish to be identified (Le Page et al., 1985, p181). "The whole process, and each style, are 'natural', parts of their 'acts of identity'" (Le Page, 1998, p28). Myers-Scotton (1995a, p92) argues that interpersonal relationships, rather than the situation, have a greater bearing on code choice. Following from this, code variation may be interpreted as being a way for the speaker to influence the final outcome of interpersonal relations.

One of the examples of this may be found in the comment which came from speaker H during the course of the interview. Speaker H stated that she sometimes used English expressions when she interacted with her Japanese boss. She did this in order to create a certain 'mood', one of informality and casualness, which was not particularly easy to achieve when adhering to the more formal structures of Japanese discourse. For instance, if speaker H intends to confirm the time which her boss is supposed to be back to the office, she uses an English sentence such as 'what time will you be back?'. Speaker H believes that this is a way of eliciting from her boss a response (an indication of the time he will be returning), without giving

him the impression that she is imposing upon him the demand that he be punctual. According to established Japanese custom the interaction between employee and employer is expected to be formal. In such instances therefore Japanese is the expected code, for it is based on respect for status, which has previously been discussed. However, speaker H engaged in code-switching which was associated more with an informal atmosphere in order to achieve her intention. This indicates that a speaker can make a code choice which is motivated by a particular outcome rather than making a code choice accordance to the social norm.

Speaker H also stated that she often used English Expressions (e.g. 'yes', and 'no') when she wanted to emphasise her strong belief in regard to certain issues. She felt that clearly expressing 'yes' or 'no' in the Japanese language might be considered abrupt, therefore the use of such English expressions allowed her to avoid these negative implications. This type of incident was obvious during the discussion of the Japanese-related context.

Topic 2
Passage 3
56.H: Un kuni wa ugoite ikumonoda to seijika ga inakutemo.
57.G: Ya hontoo?
58.H: **Yes, yes, I, I believe that.** Seijika ga inakutemo kuni wa ugoku.

Translation
56.H: Yes, a country can carry on without a leader.
57.G: Is it true?
58.H: **Yes, yes, I believe that.** A country carries on without a leader.

Passage 4
62.H: **No**, ano watashi wa seijika no nihonjin ni kansuru kagiri wa
      seijika no **leadership** wa zenzen nai to omotte imasu.
63.G: Aa ja anata ga ossharuno wa nihon no bawai ne seiji..
64.H: **Yes**, nihon no seijika ni **as far as leadership is concerned**,
      seijika no **leadership** wa nai to omoo.

Translation
62.H: **No**, as far as Japanese politicians are concerned they don't
      have **leadership**.
63.G: Oh, you're only talking of the Japanese case, aren't you?
64.H: **Yes**, in Japanese politicians' case, **as far as leadership is
      concerned**, I don't think they have **leadership**.

Another example is evident in the case of speaker G, who

produced a higher frequency of code-switching in the Japanese-

related context, rather than topic 1 (work). She explained that

she tends to employ English expressions when the discussion

centres on criticism in general. She believes that negative

opinions in Japanese are typically expressed in a humble

manner, because of the concept of 'self-modesty' in Japanese

society. In fact, during their discussion of the Japanese-

related context, speakers G and H (speaker G's partner) focused

on criticism of such things as Japanese politicians and company

policies. Speaker G, therefore, chose to employ English

expressions rather than Japanese expressions in order to create

a more assertive tone, which she is not able to produce in the

Japanese language with its limitations and characteristic

'humble' manner. An example of one of the passages (of speaker

G and H) is as follows:

Topic2
7.G: Soona no, dakara yappari dooshite **leader** ga inaikatte iuto
     yahari aruteido kokusaiteki na **level** de katsuyaku shite
     itadakeruyoona seijika ga inai tte koto. ...
8.H: Demo sore wa watashi wa omookedo sore wa **politician** no
     mondaija nai to omoo.
9.G: Sore wa dare no mondaikashira?

10.H: Sore wa **politician** jishin no mondaija nakutte **politician** ga
erabu **bureaucrats** no nooryokuda to omoo, tte iuno wa tatoeba
politician tte iuno wa tokubetsuna ano nante iuno... **very very
particular job. Politician** tte iuno wa toku ni nihon dewa
otoosan ojiisan, ojiisan ga **politician** ni natte sono mata
musuko ga **politician** de tsunagatte iru janai?

Translation

7.G: That's it. There is no politician who can actually work at the
international **level**, this is the reason why there is no **leader**.
8.H: I don't think that it has anything to do with **politicians**.
9.G: who them?
10.H: I don't think that there is a problem with the **politicians**
themselves, rather, it is the ability of the politicians to
select capable bureaucrats. For example, **politicians** are
special.. what can I say... **very very particular job.
Politician**, especially in Japan, their fathers and (their)
grand fathers, the grand father becomes a **politician**, then his
son becomes **politician**, and then his son becomes a **politician**
too. It seems to me that **politicians** hand their job down
through each generation, keeping it within the family.

As speaker G's comments indicate, she usually engages in code-
switching when the discussion centres on criticism, in any
situation. In other words, speaker G makes a code choice in
order to both express her clear opinion about a topic, and to
avoid abruptness. In fact, speaker G employed a higher
frequency of code-switches during topic 2 (which consists of
Japanese-related context, English-related context, and neutral)
than topic 1 (work) since the discussion between her partner
(speaker H) and herself consisted chiefly of a critical
analysis of Japanese politicians and company policies,
comparing them with such systems in Western societies. Even
though speaker G was very much aware of her speech and tried
not to mix the two languages, her awareness of her language use
seemed to diminish as she became engaged in a code-switching of
this sort.

Speaker H displayed a similar code choice to speaker G during topic 2. Example 78 in a following passage shows that speaker H first produced a sentence which contained an intrasentential code-switch then she started the second sentence in Japanese. However, she switched to English after producing a Japanese phrase, and chose to stay in English the rest of her utterance for that turn. This may be due to the fact that her discussion came to be a criticism of European people. However, speaker H's clear explanation of this code-switching was not obtained therefore it is not certain whether she made a code choice in order to both express her clear opinion about a topic, and to avoid abruptness, or whether she would make this code choice in any other situations.

Topic 2
76.H: Sore wa dakara **power** yone.
77.G: Nooryoku, nooryoku. Yappari nooryoku…
78.H: Watashi wa ne kokumin wa tomokatu **top leader** wa sooshite moraitai wane. Kokumin ni kanshite ieba **I'm very very pessimistic actually... Even even English people, ordinary people, are they global? Can you say that? No, I don't think so French ordinary people, are they global? No, I don't think so.** (laugh)
79.G: **True**. Sore wa zettai ni ieru koto ne…

Translation
76.H: It's **power**.
77.G: That is ability, ability, their ability…
78.H: I hold hope that a top leader does it, but I'm doubtful about the citizen. In terms of the citizen, I'm very pessimistic actually. **Even even English people, ordinary people, are they global? Can you say that? No, I don't think so. French ordinary people, are they global? No, I don't think so.**
79.G: **True**. You can definitely say that.

Furthermore, code-switching might be employed on purpose, to 'show-off' speakers' English language ability. Some speakers comments (speaker G, H, and E) during the interview illustrate that they have encountered this sort of code choice by Japanese

bilinguals. Speaker E, in fact, reported that in most cases, those who mix the languages the most, are the ones who have been residing in Australia for a relatively short period of time.

As the case of speakers G, H, and the speakers' comments show, code-switching can be engaged in as a discourse strategy in which the speakers use it to achieve certain goals. In such case, the speakers seem to be not influenced by situational factors (i.e. topic, interlocutor, and setting), or social norms in making their linguistic choices. That is, the speaker are aware that code-switching can be used as a marked choice (unexpected) as a strategy to gain certain outcomes.

5.6 Interactional Functions of Code-switching

Gal (1979, p12) explains that the consequence of members of a speech community engaging in frequent and significant interactions, is that a code develops which is not readily understandable to outsiders. Speakers and their addressees within a particular speech community therefore share knowledge about the use of and appropriate response to code-switching. Gumperz (1982, p75) points out that 'Since speakers do understand each other and can agree on what is being accomplished in particular settings, there must be some sharing of codes and principles of interpretation'. This suggests that code-switching fulfils certain conventional or shared functions within a speech community. The evidence here suggests that

code-switching was operating in this sense amongst the paired participants throughout the course of this study.

The functions of code-switching have been studied at both the 'in-group' level, and at the individual level. In terms of the former, Blommaert (1992) has shown that code-switching functions as a marker of social identity amongst the academic staff at the university of Dar es Salaam (i.e. boundary creation or establishing mutual role relationships). Goyvaerts and Zembele (1992) have likewise found that code-switching is a way of encoding power and solidarity in Bukava town in Zaire, Africa. Christie (1990) also concludes that English/Patois code-switching in Dominica is a means of elaborating or consolidating a shared identity between the speaker and their addressee.

However, the main focus of this study is on the speakers' individual interactions and intentional meanings. The interactional functions have been analysed and often developed into taxonomies by many researchers (e.g. Gumperz 1982, Auer 1984, Romaine 1995, De Heredia-Deprez 1990, Goyvaerts et al., 1992, Nishimura 1995). Some examples of function which have been noted by these researchers, include: quotation, message qualification, reiteration, addressee specification, joking, emphasis, seeking agreement or parody, discourse marker, and repair. In this study, the researcher has identified a number of functions based on the speakers' comments or interpretations

which code-switching performs, and has categorised them as follows:

1. Quotations

As has been previously shown, quotations are often marked by a language switch (e.g. Gumperz 1982, Poplack 1988, Romaine 1995). Both Gumperz (1982) and Romaine (1995) have observed that quotations are not always made in the original language used. For example, in Gumperz's (1982) study, not all speakers produced quotations in the original language in which they were first said. Romaine (1995, p162) explains that 'the accuracy of the representation of the reported speech with respect to its linguistic form is not important, but a switch itself must be significant'. This suggests that the purpose of switches which mark quotations is to bring about a stylistic effect, rather than to reconstruct the original language used.

Nishimura (1995) has observed quotations which were made for the purpose of stylistic effect amongst second generation Japanese in Canada. She points out that the accuracy of the language originally used is not always preserved. Second generation Japanese place an emphasis on quotations by code-switching, in order to make their speech livelier. For example, one of the speakers in her study produced quotations which were all in English, even though the original language used was Japanese. Nishimura (1995, p177) maintains that this is due to the speaker's intention which was aimed at animating or bringing to life the speech of the quoted characters.

In the present study both direct quotations, and reported speech, were marked by code-switching. Unlike Nishimura's study, this study demonstrated that in all cases, a single English word (a noun, an adjective or an infinitive) was used or embedded into a Japanese phrase or sentence as a quotation. This may be interpreted as showing that even though the speakers intended to make quotations as a stylistic effect, they chose to use only a main English word, so that they could avoid the situation whereby their utterances would become completely dominated by English. Some examples are follows:

Topic1

8.A: 'Soo soo koko ga **important** dawa' tte '**Exam exam**' tte itsumo sen hiiteru none. (She said 'That's it. This is **important**'. She also said '**Exam, exam**' and underlined it.)

11.B: Demo [lecturer's name] no baai wa 'Koko wa **important**' tte, ano hito yukkuri shaberu desho? (But [lecturer's name] speaks slowly and says 'This is **important**', doesn't he?)

25.B: Demone **question** zitai wa nanika, watashi no tomodachi wa itteta kedo 'Sugee **simple** dayo' tte itte. (The **question** itself is.... Actually, friend of mind said 'Pretty **simple**'.)

87.B: Kurasumeeto wa nanka koo yatte **planning** o kangaeruno ga sugoi ii toka itte...(My classmate said that she likes to think **planning** ahead...)

19.D: ..Senseitoko itte 'Nani, nani kono nanaten' tte. 'Iya, watashi ga yondara, ma nanaten, soregurai no **assignment**'. (..I went to see the lecturer, and I said 'What do you mean by giving me this mark?' She said 'I thought the **assignment** was worth seven points').

23.D: 'Zenkai no **assignment** o motte kurukara zenkai no **assignment** de ten kure' tte. 'Soreja zenkaino **assignment** motte kinasai' tte. (..I said 'I'll bring in my old **assignment**, so that you can mark it.' She said 'Well, bring the **assignment** in then').

2. Semantic Authenticity

Code-switching is more likely to occur when the semantic differences between two languages are greater. That is, code-switching can be employed as a means of guarding against

unwanted semantic loss or gain. Researchers like Gysels (1992) and Li (1999) demonstrated that code-switching has a role to play in solving problems of 'untranslatability' between languages. Gysels (1992, p.9) points out that the motivation for employing French elements in Lubumbashi Swahili is based on the speakers' semantic choice. Similarly, Li's (1999) study has demonstrated that even though a dictionary 'equivalent' exists between two languages, there remains a semantic incongruence.

In the current study, some incidences of code-switching were recorded that clearly showed that the speakers were selecting their code as a sort of instrument to facilitate the convergence of meanings or semantic nuances. The following utterances are some examples of this:

Topic1
110.K: **Cash** de yatowareru toka, **business** ga kekkoo mada teichaku shiteiru yoona kiga surundesukedo... (I think **business** which is kind of *cash* in hand* is still popular).

93.L: So iu mono ni chakumoku shite nanika **business** de aitemu o mitsukenai to ikenaindeshoo ne. (Perhaps it is important to look at those things which are likely bring success in **business**).

Both speakers K and L employed an English word, 'business', instead of the using Japanese equivalent. Speaker K explained that she used the word 'business' in order to indicate a wide range of activities in the business field, as it relates to the Australian economy. This was more advantageous, because the Japanese language does not have an all-embracing term which can easily cover all of these separate aspects within the sphere of business. Similarly, speaker L commented that his choice in

using the English word 'business' in example 93, was done for the reason that it covers a wide range of meaning. The Japanese equivalent which he refers to, 'zigyoo', overemphasises, or expresses too strongly what he wanted to convey.

Topic 2
61.L: Sore wa ne, akogare to iuyori moshi soo iwareru to sore wa sugoi **pressure** dato omoimasu yo. Gyaku ni iwareru, kore wa **pressure** desu yo. (There is going to be big **pressure** on [him the Crown Prince], rather than considering it to be something fortunate if [he] is asked [to have a mistress], this will only put **pressure** on [him]).

Speaker L also used the word 'pressure' in example 61 because the Japanese equivalent 'yokuatsu' has both too strong a meaning in this context, and refers mostly to physical, rather than what he meant as mental, pressure.

Topic2
15.G: Demo sore wa yappari shigoto de atte sono **ideology** tte iuka sono kangae o oshitooseruno wa yappari aruteido seijikada to omoo wayo. (The politician's job is to present their **ideology**. I mean some politicians can achieve this better than others).

17.G: Un, sore wa **advisor**. Un, demo tada hitotsu chigaukoto wa wariai ni ano koodooryoku ga arujanai, nihon no seijika tte iuuo wa.. (Yes, there are **advisors**. But there is one difference between them and Japanese politicians..).

The use of the English words 'ideology' and 'adviser' by speaker G, also can be attributed to semantic reasons. She commented that 'ideology' can indicate a set of ideas based on a political or economic system, but the Japanese equivalent 'kuuron', has a quite a vague meaning. Similarly, 'adviser' in this instance indicates a person who gives advice to a government whilst the Japanese equivalent 'komon', and

'*soodanyaku*', have meanings which are associated more with business rather than politics.

Semantic difference is also clearly manifest in the diversity between the Australian and Japanese university systems. Terminologies highlight this diversity. Some examples from data are the following:

Topic1
8.C: A. aredesho? **Lecturer** ga saiaku toka tte itteta yatsu desho?
Nanka.. (Oh, is that one? You told me that you got a terrible
lecturer, didn't you? You said something...)

In example 8, speaker C uses the English word '*lecturer*'. The Japanese equivalent '*sensei*', which is used throughout primary school, Junior high school, high school and university, is completely different from the terms which are commonly employed in the Australian education system. Speaker C also commented that the word '*sensei*' is too intimate in this context as in Japan the term denotes a more personal relationship between the student and his or her teacher. Yet another Japanese equivalent '*kooshi*' sounds, to him, a little too stiff and it is often used to indicate a temporary lecturer. Therefore, the English word '*lecturer*' directly indicates a university '*lecturer*' in Australia.

Topic 1
167.E: Un, sore wa [her supervisor's name] ga yarunda yo. Mukookara
e? Iya, **supervisor** tte iuno wa **supervise** surudake. ([her
supervisor's name] is going to do it. He..., ha? no, the
supervisor only **supervises**).

163.E: Unn, dakara.. Dakara ne shiranaide watashi ga omotteiru koto o
paper ni kaichatte sore o yonda hito ga nihon wa
koodattanoka to omotte zenzen sore ga jissaito chigatte
itara sore wa sugoi watashi wa... (No, if the readers get the
wrong idea about Japan, just because of my **paper**, based on my

own interpretation and not accurate research. I would be
so...).

In example 167, speaker E believes that the meaning of the
Japanese equivalent *'kantoku'* (supervisor) and *'kantoku suru'*
(to supervise) emphasise *'control'* or *'authority'*, which was
not the meaning she wanted to convey in this utterance. She
also explains that she employed an English word *'paper'*,
because it indicates *'the science assignment'*, which the
Japanese equivalent word does not.

Topic1
138.C: Eeetoo, **assignment** mittsu to.. **presentation** hutatsu to... (Ah,
they were three **assignments**, two **presentations**...)

In example 138, speaker C employed the English words
'assignment' and *'presentation'*. The Japanese equivalent
'shukudai' indicates an assignment of a much smaller scale,
therefore he employed an English word *'assignment'*. Similarly,
the use of the English word, *'presentation'*, is a more accurate
way of explaining his study, since the Japanese equivalent
'happyoo', involves a different format from that of a
presentation which is usually given at an Australian
university.

3. Contextual Association

In this function, code-switching often seemed to be used as a
medium for sending contextual meanings which were related to
the speaker's study or work. Since many English expressions are
directly related to the speakers' life in an English-speaking

context (Australia), and the speakers share their experience with their interlocutors, code-switching aided the speakers in creating a more successful communicative interaction. Some examples are the following:

Topic1
38.A: Watashi (institution's name) kara kiteru kara (institution's name) tte ittara **foundation course** mitainano. Ichioo **under graduate** no ichi-nen kan issho nanda kedo yappari gakuhi mo zenzen chigaushi.. (I'm actually from [institution's name], like **foundation course**. This is also **under graduate**, but the tuition fee is different.

The use of the English items 'foundation course' and 'graduate diploma' in example 38 by speaker A was made possible through her partner's knowledge about a specific course which exists here in Australia. She commented that she often used English expressions like these in order to exchange information or talk with her partner (speaker B) about courses, units, and general university system here.

Topic1
21.L: Sore o kakudai shite asoko ni aru **sign board**. Are watahi ga tsukutta ano zigata nandesu... (Yes, I made it bigger. The **sign board** I make with the stencil...).

Since speaker L holds in his mind the episodic memory of the sign board, this experience, which took place in the context of an English-speaking environment, influenced him to use this English word, rather than the Japanese equivalent. Speaker L also knew that he could share his memory with speaker K (speaker L's interlocutor) if he uses the English word, because speaker L has seen the 'sign board'.

202

Topic 1
43.I: [person's name]. nanka ne, **time sheet** o rokuji made
      yatterunoni goji ni kaetteru tte hanashi kitakoto aru?
      Aaiuno wa.. (I've heard something about [person's name]. Have
      you heard that he leaves work at five o'clock but records his
      time sheet at six o'clock?)

Topic 1
38.J: Ukundesu yo. Patto sore ga ne, **fan** o mawashita wake mae ne **fan**
      o mawashite yaita wake. Yappari sositara onajidana tto omotta.
      Chiri ga ue ni paatto, dakara ano **oven** mo onaji dane.
      Yogore ga.. (The dust is scattered, because I turned on
      the **fan**. I had the same experience when I baked (cakes)
      with **fan**, and the dust flew everywhere. That **oven** is the
      same. Lots of dust…).

Both speakers I and J, who work at the same bakery, explained

that they normally used the Japanese equivalents *'taimucaado'*

(time sheet), *'kankisen'* (fan), and *'kama'* (oven) when they

were working at the bakery in Japan. They only began to use the

English equivalent expressions after working in a bakery here

in Australia. It seems that these English expressions are

directly associated with the speakers' working environment.

Code-switching therefore functions as a means of not only

carrying meanings, but is also of reflecting the environmental

context the speakers finds themselves in.

4. Linguistic Efficiency

Certain English expressions appear to be much easier to use

than their Japanese equivalents. Some explanations for this

include firstly, that code-switching can operate as a mechanism

for avoiding the misinterpretation of words which have the same

pronunciations, but contain different meanings; and second, the

grammatical order of the English language can better emphasise

speaker's opinion. Some examples of these are following:

Topic 1
98.C: Orera mo **science** demo aru yo... (..Even us **science** students
often complain..).

Since the Japanese language possesses a number of homophones,
sometimes speakers are required to provide additional
explanations in order to convey actual meanings. In the case of
speaker C, he tried to avoid using the Japanese equivalent
'kagaku', because it has another meaning, chemistry, which has
a different writing form. He felt that using the English word
was more convenient, rather than the Japanese equivalent which
would have to be elaborated upon by the use of extra
information.

Topic 1
14.H: **Personally, personally, I think**, jissai ni shigoto o suru nowa
bureaucrats dato omoo. (**Personally. Personally, I think** that
in fact the **bureaucrats** actually do the job).

20.H: ...**Unless, you have a very active life**, nanika **going out
everyday, today's** [   ], **tomorrow is swimming and tomorrow is
, you know, going out for dinner.** Soremo maishuu maishuu
tsuzukuto yappari...(...**Unless, you have a very active life**, so
something like, **going out everyday, today's? tomorrow, is swi
swimming and tomorrow is, you know, going out for dinner.** But
if you do it continuously through the week...)

In English, the word which receives the most emphasis is placed
first; In Japanese, the opposite holds, with the exception that
the verb always has to be at the end of the clause. In example
14 speaker H therefore started her utterance with the English
phrase (*'Personally, personally, I think..'*) in order to
emphasise her own opinion. Similarly, in example 20 she started
her utterance with the English sentence (*'Unless, you have a
very active life'*). This is due to the fact that the English
subordinating conjunction *'unless'* precedes a dependent clause,

but the Japanese equivalent *'kagiri'* comes after a dependent clause. Speaker H commented that the order of English grammar, in this case, is much effective in emphasising her point in this utterance. The speakers seem to be very aware of different property which exists between the Japanese and English language, and able to manipulate to convey their intentions.

5. Euphemistic Efficiency

In Japanese society particular English loan words play a euphemistic role. For example, Honna (1995, p53) explained that the English word *'loan'* has been widely used instead of the Japanese equivalent *'shakkin'* which holds rather negative connotations. Li (1999, p15) has also shown that loan words have an important role to olay in expressing sex-related taboos (e.g. 'toilet', 'make love'), which, in Japanese society are, often thought to be affectively neutral. Similar to this phenomenon, code-switching appeared to play a euphemistic role in this study. Some examples are as follow:

Topic 2
52.K: Demo ima no wakai, wakai to iuuka wareware subete josei wa
      daihantai surudeshoo ne. Datte sore wa nihon no **symbol**
      nandakara. (Not only young people, but also all women would
      strongly disagree with that idea, because he [the emperor] is
      a **symbol** [of Japan]).

Topic 2
71.E: **Chinese** mo, yoppodo, chuugoku mo abunai to omookedo. (I think
      Chinese are also, China is quite powerful).

Code-switching functions, as has been demonstrated in speakers K and E's utterances, as a way of avoiding undue associations. Speaker K commented that she uses the English word *'symbol'* when referring to the new Emperor of Japan. The Japanese

equivalent '*shoochoo*' evokes an older image which is found in Japanese history regarding past Emperors. In this case the word '*symbol*' pertains to the current Emperor. Similarly, speaker E felt that the use of the Japanese word '*chuugokujin*' vilifies Chinese people since the term is associated with the image of excluding them from Japanese society.

Topic 1
38.K: Are wa mukunde iru to iuyori mo **Australian style** no hokorashii huniki no karadatsuki ni nararete. (No, you looked quite strong, more like **Australian style**).

The aim of speaker K's use of the English phrase '*Australian style*' in this utterance was to describe her interlocutor's (speaker L) physical appearance as she remembers him several years ago. This English phrase was being used as a way of avoiding direct expressions about physical characteristics which may carry negative connotations especially because her interlocutor was of the opposite sex.

Topic 1
110.K: **Cash** de yatowareru toka, **business** ga kekkoo mada teichaku shiteiru yoona ki ga surundesu kedo......(I think **business** which is kind of "**cash** in hand" is still popular).

In many cases Japanese people are unwilling to use terms which directly refer to money. The use of the English word '*cash*' by speaker K in this utterance results from this tendency and can be accounted for in this way, for she believes that the Japanese equivalent '*genkin*' is too direct. The English word '*cash*' can be perceived as being a more indirect or neutral expression which avoids the negative implications which are associated with its Japanese counterpart.

Topic 2
73.A: Ippai iru yone. **Lazy** kibun de iru yone kiraku de ii yo.
      watashi koko sukidana tte omoo. (There are many. I like to
      feel **lazy**. I feel relaxed. I like it here).

In example 73 speaker A agreed with her interlocutor's (speaker
B) opinion with regard to people in Australia. As the Japanese
equivalent 'namakemono' or 'darashinai' has a much stronger,
and more negative meaning than 'lazy', speaker A came to employ
the English word. Speaker A commented that she made the choice
as a way of reducing such connotation.

Pandharipande's (1998) study of Marathi/English code-switching
illustrates that Marathi borrows a certain image which is
thought to be associated with the English language what she
calls 'social function' (for instance, modernity, prestige).
She then points out that the most crucial feature of code-
switching is that it is motivated by this social function. The
positive evaluation of the English language amongst the
speakers has been shown in the section of 'Attitudes towards
Languages', whereby the speakers in general seem to hold a
positive idea – such as 'modernity' and 'sophisticated' – of
the English language. This suggests that a certain perception
of code-switching functions as euphemistic effectiveness.

5. Pragmatic Consideration
In this study the choice of English items amongst some speakers
appears to have derived from what is thought to be the
language's inherent casualness. In other words, the speaker

employed certain English expressions in order to avoid undue formality or to create a friendly or perhaps more intimate mood. Some examples are following:

Topic 1
59.G: Watashi no baai wa **lucky** datta no. Ichiban hajime ga sugoku totemo ii jooshi de subarashii jooshi de totemo **lucky** datta no. (In my case I was **lucky**. The first boss was really nice, a wonderful boss, so I was so **lucky**).
24.H: **Lucky** yone, hontooni. ([They would be] **lucky**, really).

Topic 2
79.G: **True**. Sore wa zettai ni ierukoto ne... (**True**. You can definitely say that).

Both speakers G and H commented that the Japanese equivalent '*kooun*' ('lucky') sounds rather formal and stiff when compared to the English equivalent. Speaker G also employed the English word '*true*' for the same reason. The English items here function as reducing formality, thereby softening their utterances and making them sound much friendlier.

Topic 2
11.A: Soo soo soo, **thank you**. yon keta no yatsu de ni keta ni kaeteruyatsu dakara imadani nisen-nen ni kitara zerozero ni natte maeno data ni modotte shimaukara sono data ga zenbu kieteshimau tte iu ..(That's right. **Thank you**. It is normally supposed to be for figures, but it was changed into two figures, so when the year 2000 comes up all of the data is destroyed...)

In this case speaker A thanked her partner (speaker B) because she was given the information from speaker A, so that she could continue to discuss a specific topic with speaker B. Speaker A felt that using the Japanese equivalent 'arigatoo' sounded too serious and overly polite in this context.

Topic 1
60.C: *Jaa,* **OK**? (Then, [you'll be] **OK**, [right]?)

Similarly, speaker C used the English item *'OK'* in order to avoid his utterance becoming too formal. Speaker C asked about his partner's (speaker D) result in his studies. He thought that the use of the Japanese equivalent *'daijoobu'*, in this context, was not appropriate. Code-switching thus has a function which serves to express the speakers' friendliness.

Topic 1
142.B: *Yokattandesho?* (On the whole you got quite a good result, didn't you?)
143.A: **Ninety percent.**

'Ninety percent' is the mark speaker A gained in one of her assignments. Speaker A explained that she used the English phrase *'ninety percent'* in order to avoid being seen *as* showing off. In this case, code-switching has been employed as a way of circumventing what could be an uncomfortable situation, where the individual is perceived to be boastful or immodest.

6. Familiarity

Some English expressions which have been demonstrated by the speakers in this study are closely related to aspects of their everyday life. Since the speakers repeatedly come across certain English expressions, these tend to become became much more familiar than the Japanese equivalents. This sense is shared by both the speakers and their interlocutors, therefore code-switching comes to play an important role in these speakers' communication. Some examples are as follows:

209

Topic 1
76.C: De, **major** doo suru no? (Then, what about a **major**?)

The English word '*major*' to Speaker C and his partner (speaker

D), is directly related to university life here, since neither

speaker has ever studied at a university in Japan. Speaker C in

fact commented that the Japanese equivalent '*senkoo*' is not

familiar to him, because the word is used only when related to

studying at university. Therefore, the English word '*major*' is

a much more practical and familiar word to him.

Topic 2
47.D: Kocchidattara sa **contract** ga nannen de yametari toka nantoka
ga arukedo. (But here, there are many cases in which [people]
quit [their job] after completing their **contract** or something
like that).
48.C: Nihon de **contract** naikara ne. Hyookajitai ga i.ikuikara ne.
(**Contract** doesn't exist in Japan. It's evaluated as low).

Even though both speakers (D and C) knew the Japanese

equivalent '*keiyaku*', they used the English word '*contract*'.

They commented that they had not come into contact with this

word '*keiyaku*' when they were in Japan. Therefore, the English

word '*contact*' is much more familiar to them. This was perhaps

due to their young age.

Topic 2
124.A: **Work experience** o hitsuyoo to suru desho? Kocchi no hito
minna itteta none. Daigakuo sotsugyoo shitahito tte **work
experience** jan? Detabakkari de ano **requirement** ni kaite
atta none, detabakari de wakai **experience** o motte iru hito
boshuu tte kaite atta no. (**Work experience** is required,
isn't it? Every one here says that. A person who has just
finished has no **work experience**, has he? In the
advertisement, the **requirement** was that the person should be
young, have just completed a university degree, and have work
experience).

Both 'work experience' and 'requirement' are often seen in everyday life. Getting a job is very important to speaker A, she often looks through advertisements in the newspaper. The English words, which she usually comes across, seem to be much easier for her to use than Japanese equivalents, 'shigoto no keiken' and 'shikaku'.

Topic 2
19.G: Nante iunokashira, kono iza huta o aketara yahari ginkoo no soshiki datoka iumono ga iwayuru **globalisation** towa mattaku kskehanarete itato uudesho? (I mean we realised that the banking or organisation in Japan is totally different from the **globalise** banking system, isn't it?)

30.H: ...ano kigyoo ni shitemo zenbu **combine** sarete amerikato nihon no kigyoo to zenbu issho ni natte nanika doitsu no ginkoo ga BT o kattari toka zenbu ano **merger** ga tsuite irukara zenbu kaisha zentai no keizai ga keizai tte iuno ga ittaika shiteiru to omoo none. (...Even many enterprises were **combined** and the German bank bought BT. It seems to me the whole economic system has been integrated due to **merger**).

34.H: **Public servant** igai hutsuuno ano. (Except the **public servant**).

These English expressions are often seen and heard in the newspaper and on television. Both speakers G and H believe that when they discuss specific things, these terms, which are often used in everyday life, are much easier to use than the Japanese equivalents. There is no doubt that the use of certain 'key words', such as 'globalisation' and 'merger', is linked the media in general and is particularly common in discussing current affairs.

7. Affective Association

The expression of feeling in English was demonstrated by only one speaker (speaker B). Her relatively short duration of time (ie. two years) in Australia may have stimulated speaker B's

feelings. Speaker B in fact commented that she uses certain English items specifically in the context of life in Australia, as distinct from her former life experience in Japan. She believes that these English expressions convey more authentic meanings. The Japanese equivalent also expresses meaning, but only in terms of her life in Japan. Code-switching in this case functions as a means of expressing the speaker's feelings which are specifically related to her/his experience in an English-speaking country.

Topic 2
20.B: ..Kocchi ni kite mite hoka no ajia no kuni no kotachi ga sugoi benkyoo shite iruno ga sugoi **impressive** datta. Ano **impressive** datta none. (..Since I came here, I've noticed that Asian students study very hard, it is so **impressive** to me, really **impressive**.

Topic 1
81.B: Watashi konkai wa **disappointed** datta karane. So **disappointed**. Andake ganbatte watashi sugoku ganbatta to omoonda kedo daigaku ni zutto tomatteta mon. (I was **disappointed, so disappointed** about this semester, even though I did my best. I really studied hard I think. I actually stayed over several times at the university).

Topic 2
125.B: ... Koko deno seikatsu wa **satisfied** nanda kedo yappari benkyoo de mada mi ni tsuitenai ippai wakannai koto ga mada ippai aru mon yunitto owatta tokoro de wakannai mon. (...I'm **satisfied** with life here, but I still don't understand many things in our course of study).

These interpretations for the codeswitched items are based on the speakers' own understanding of why they used certain English expressions. In most cases, the speakers showed some difficulty in giving reasons for their use in the beginning of the interview. However, after they were given the passages which contained the codeswitched items by the researcher (in some cases, the recorded conversation was played), most of the speakers were able to interpret their use of English items.

Poplack (1988) concludes that different communities perform different types of code-switching in her study of Ottawa-Hull and Puerto Rican communities. The present study has found some different functions from other communities which were previously studied. These functions appear to partly determine code-switching amongst the speakers. One of the most significant reasons why certain codeswitched items are being employed is to avoid being overly formal, and to escape the complexities of established Japanese politeness forms. Japanese bilinguals who find themselves in an English speaking environment can appropriate certain English words which can then replace the more elaborate politeness strategies inherent in the Japanese language. In this sense, the speakers seem to be very aware of the different properties which exist between the Japanese and English languages, and are able to manipulate these in order to convey intentional meanings.

5.7 Structural Factors in Code-switching

Discussions in the previous sections have demonstrated that although the speakers make their own code choice, certain social constraints frame permissible patterns of code-switching. However, these constraints are also largely attributable to structural factors. Therefore, in order to fully account for code-switching behaviour, it is necessary to study the linguistic perspective, along with the social and pragmatic.

The purpose of this section therefore is to examine what linguistic features characterise switched items, and the environments in which they are embedded. As the results from the recorded data have shown, the type of code-switching most frequently produced by the speakers was intrasentential. This refers to code-switching which occurs within the same sentence, from the single word to clausal level (more than a single word, including one finite verb). Since intrasentential code-switching involves the interaction between syntax and the lexicon, the nature its structure, in relation to linguistic constraints on intrasentential code-switching, has been studied by many researchers (eg. Pfaff 1979, Joshi 1985, Poplack 1980, Azuma 1996, Myers-Scotton (1992, 1993, 1995b, 1995c, 1997, 1998b, 1998c, 1998d).

Amongst these researchers, Myers-Scotton (1995b, 1995c) demonstrates the nature and organisation of language production, which is based on her systematic model (what she calls the Matrix Language Frame Model). The Matrix Language Frame Model suggests that when a speaker decides to engage in code-switching, the very first thing which is decided upon is the matrix language. The selection of the matrix language is based on a number of factors including sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic considerations, as well as semantic-pragmatic ones. That is, speakers engaging in code-switching perceive the matrix language to be "the language we are speaking" (for them code-switching has a psychological reality as discourse in a single language). "A basis for this perception is that the

matrix language, relative to the embedded language(s) in the code-switching discourse, coincides with the unmarked choice (Myers-Scotton, 1998b, p96)". In other words, the matrix language is often the speaker's first acquired language, since code-switching is typically an in-group mode of discourse. Moreover, she explains that the matrix language in general, is the source of relatively more morphemes. A way of analysing this is to take, as a minimum sample, two sentences (either from a single speaker or from an adjacency pair produced by two speakers) and find the language which contains the most morphemes. This is taken then as the base or matrix language.

In this present study, the Japanese language was clearly dominant over the English, in quantitative terms as well as sociolinguistically, because the subjects are all native speakers of Japanese. Therefore, employing the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) model enables the researcher to investigate the nature and the organisation of production of intrasentential code-switching which derived from the speakers' naturally occurring conversation. Hereafter, the matrix language (i.e. Japanese) and the embedded language (i.e. English) will be called the ML and the EL respectively.

The Complement Phrase as the Unit of Analysis

Within the MLF model, a Complement Phrase (it is synonymous with a clause with a complementizer) is considered to be a relevant unit of analysis (Myers-Scotton, 1998d, p220). Complementizers for example include *that*, and conjunctions such

as *if* and *whether*. It is a constituent headed by an element in complementizer position, although the element is often null (empty or zero). The Complement Phrase encompasses the IP - Inflection Phrase - which is equivalent to a sentence.

Content vs. System Morpheme Distinction

The MLF model suggests that content morphemes and system morphemes do not show similar patterns of occurrence in code-switching. Content morphemes include nouns, adjectives, time adverbials, most verbs, and prepositions. (That is, nouns and descriptive adjectives receive thematic roles, and verbs, predicate adjectives and some prepositions assign thematic roles). System morphemes are: articles which restrict the possible reference of nouns either to a smaller set (the boys vs. Boys) or to an individual (the boy), tense and aspect which restrict the possible reference of predicates (ie. verbs and adjectives), and degree adverbs which restrict the reference of events and adjectives (eg. very). System morphemes neither assign nor receive thematic roles (eg. Inflections and most function words). Myers-Scotton (1995b, 1995c, 1998b, 1998c, 1998d) claims that the possibility for the occurrence of items depends on whether they are content or system morphemes.

The Validity of the Matrix Language Hypothesis

The MLF model assumes that essentially only EL content morphemes, not system morphemes, may occur in mixed constituents (the matrix language + the embedded language). The model also assumes that two principles - the morpheme order

216

and the system morpheme – restrict the role of the embedded language in mixed constituents in intrasentential code-switching. The morpheme order principle is that mixed constituents contain content morphemes from both the ML and the EL, but have a grammatical frame from the ML. The system morpheme principle is that in mixed constituents, all system morphemes that have grammatical relations external to their head constituent will come from the ML.

In this section, some utterances from the recorded data which include intrasentential code-switching will be examined with regard to both the morpheme order and the system morpheme principles.

In the examples below, the placement of two English content morphemes follows the Japanese language requirement. `No" is the genitive case marker, and is normally the inverse of the English construction, since in Japanese, the modifier always precedes the modified. This therefore shows that the EL content morphemes are inserted into a frame prepared by the ML (i.e. Japanese).

109.B: Sono **semester** *no* **average** ikuraka toka sugoi ki   ni   shite
       that   of   how much and very mind DAT do
       itten   demo sugoku ki   ni shite ....
       one point even very   mind   do
       "They also worry about the **semester average**, so (they) worry
       about even one point..."

39.E: Dakara moshikashitara **exchange** *no* **program** de ikeru
       so   possibly   of   on go-POTEN
       kamoshirenai shi ...
       might   CONJ
       "I might go (there) on an **exchange program**, so..."

```
29.L: ...sooshitatoki  ni  tamatama    soko  de  tsukatte ita
         at that time  DAT accidentally there ABL employ  be-PAST
      Chinese no accountant, ...
               of
      "...at that time (I) had a Chinese accountant, ....."
```

According to Tsujimura (1996, p193), in the Japanese language, numeral quantifiers are often separated from the modified nouns. This does not occur in the English language. The incongruence which is evident in the word order between the Japanese and English language seems to be solved thorough the morpheme order principle.

```
3.D: Konkai    wa  major, major o  niko   ni  shi te..
     This time TOP           ACC double DAT make and
     "This time, major, (I'm taking) a double major.."
```

Japanese is a consistent subject-object-verb (SOV) language thus the verb always comes at the end. In example 20, the English adjective *impressive* appears before the Japanese copula *"da"* which takes all verbal inflections. This also shows the morpheme order is that of Japanese.

```
20.B: ..ajia no kuni    no kotachi   ga  sugoi benkyoo shiteiru no
      ..Asia GEN country GEN students TOP very  study   do-PROG NOMI
      ga  sugoi impressive datta.
      NOM very             COP-PAST
      "..the fact, which Asian students study very hard, was so
      impressive (to me)."
```

In example 91, the system morpheme marking plurality (i.e. the suffix -*s*) does not appear with the English compound noun '*United Nation*' and the noun '*fund*', because there is no counterpart in the Japanese language. In example 31, on the

other hand, a Japanese plural marker *"tachi"* follows right after the English noun *'Aussie'*. This can support the system morpheme principle, which calls for all relevant system morphemes to come from the ML in mixed constituents. However, the plural noun *"tachi"* is always attached only to personal pronouns or to human (proper) nouns. Because of this it does not appear in example 91.

91.E: **United Nation** no **fund** ga aru janai.   Nan no tame ni aru no.
                    GEN NOM COP-INTERRO-NEG what GEN for DAT COP FP
     "Funds are available from the **United Nations**. What do you
     think (the United Nations)is for?"

31.D: Sono **Aussie** tachi?
      That   PL
      "Those **Aussies**?"

Moreover, Myers-Scotton (1998b) suggests that English verbs which appear within the Japanese grammatical system do so without any inflection when they take a *"do*-verb construction". This construction consists of an EL verb stem with no inflections and an ML *"do"* verb inflected with ML system morphemes (e.g. tense and aspect). The Japanese *"do"* verb (*suru*) is marked with the ability of altering tense and aspect, as well it can also be marked with the negative potential inflection.

In the example below, for instance the English verb *describe* occurs with the Japanese auxiliary *"suru"* (*do*) which in this case is carrying the potential negative inflection. Since *"do"* can be inflected for tense as well, an EL content verb like

describe, will appear without any inflections. This will be further discussed in one of the following sections.

161.E: ...De watashi ga ne zenzen nihon ni aru mono o koo
      and I   TOP FP at all Japan DAT be NOMI ACC like
   describe dekinaku   tte jibun de ne katte   ni...
           do-POTEN-NEG if myself ABL FP own's way DAT
   "...(If) I can't **describe**, or if I misunderstand something
   about Japan then ..."

Compromise Strategies

a) "Bare form" with "Do" verb

In the example above (91), the English compound noun *United Nation* and the noun *Aussie* did not occur with definite articles (in addition to the demonstrative *sono* [that]) as well as the suffixes *-s*. This is because Japanese has no article system and no counterpart to the suffix *-s* (which has previously been discussed). Myers-Scotton calls these EL content morphemes "bare forms". She states that EL content morpheme can occur as "bare forms" in a mixed constituent frame prepared by the ML, but the EL form is missing the required ML system morphemes (Myers-Scotton, 1995c, p994).

In this study, English lexemes often took a "bare form" in the mixed constituents. For example, the English verbs did not occur with their inflections, yet they did occur as nonfinite forms with an inflected "*do*" verb from Japanese. Myers-Scotton (1998b, p104), states these "*do*" constructions actually frequently appear in many language pairs, and in such among Japanese and English pairs. Some examples are as follows:

35.D: **Paperwork** to zenbu awasereba **pass** shiteru kedo hoidemosa.
         with all   together   do-PROG but still...
   "Altogether with **paperwork**, I could **pass**, but still..."

```
181.E: Dakara sugoi yuuhukuna hito    nanoni      jibun   no seikatsu
       so    very  wealthy   person even though oneself GEN life
       ni wa restrict shiteru    wake    janai?
       DAT TOP          do- PROG  reason  INTERR NEG
       "Although the people are wealthy, they are restricting (the
       amount of rubbish allowed to be discharged), aren't
       (they)?"

37.D: Pass shita.  Demo..
          do-past but
      "I passed, but..."
```

These examples show that the English verbs *pass* and *restrict*

appear as "bare forms". These EL morphemes are therefore

embedded into a frame prepared by the ML auxiliary *"suru"* *(do)*,

with the auxiliary taking all verbal inflections. Under those

conditions, the English verb infinitive becomes a functional

noun as such becomes integrated with the Japanese *"suru"* *(do)*

construction.

In examples 79 and 31, both the English verbs *'add'*, *'combine'*

and *'isolate'* occur as bare forms with an inflected *"do"* verb

(sareru). *"Reru"* is the passive voice, it is attached to the

negative stem of the verb. One would have expected to have the

Japanese verb for *'add'* and *'combine'* to carry the passive

voice inflection, but on account of the code-switching, these

English verbs were transformed into Japanese verbs, thus it is

the *"suru"* *(do)* verb forming which carries the passive voice

inflection.

```
79.E: Demo sore wa point ni,   nante iu  no.. add sareru kadooka
      anyway it TOP        DAT what  say FP        do-PASS if
      wakarainanjanai?
      know-NEGATIVE
      "Anyway, [we] don't know if it can be, what can [I] say.. added
      to [our] point, [do we]?"
```

221

```
31.H: ano, kigyoo     ni  shitemo zenbu combine sarete ...
      well enterprise DAT even    all           do-PASS
      "Even many enterprises were combined..."
```

```
 4.K: Sorekara arayuru tokoro kara isolate sarete, nante iuno
      and      all     place  from         do-PASS what  say
      kashira ...
      FP
      "And Perth is isolated from many places, and what can (I)
      say..."
```

Moreover, the English past participle appears without its

suffix (-ed) within the "do" construction, as in example 23.

'Confused' was transformed from its original form, 'be

confused' to be brought into conformity with the Japanese

grammar. In fact, many nouns (acting nouns) can be rendered

into verbs by adding "suru" (do) to them. "Do" takes all the

inflections, including, as in this example, causative,

desiderative, and past, to accomplish the appropriate meanings.

Thus 'confuse' is embedded into a frame prepared by the ML, as

a bare form.

```
23.B: Watashira no  koto confuse sasetain    da.
      I-PL       GEN NOMI         do-CAUS-DESI COP
      "(He) wants to make us confused".
```

The following are additional examples taken from the study

which illustrate how the English past participles appears as a

bare form with the addition of the "do" construction.

```
 9.A: Are desho, ano bitto ga,  nandakke are? Ikinari iwareru  to
      that is    the bit   NOM  what      ah  suddenly ask-PASS when
      confuse shite shimau.
              do    have
      "That is, ah... bit... what? ah (I) was confused because (you)
      asked suddenly".
```

```
24.K: Nihon no  endaka      ni chikazukeru yooni adjust shita   jidai
      Japan GEN rising yen DAT close-POTEN CONJ          do-past time
      ga  arimashita yone.
      NOM be-past    FP
      "There was a time when (it) was adjusted to the strong
      Japanese yen".
```

b) Past Participles as a Single Unit

According to Myers-Scotton (1995c, 1998b), certain EL inflected

forms occur in mixed constituents. For instance, an English

past participle (e.g. worried) can appear as a "completed

content morpheme" of the same order as an EL noun or adjective.

In the current study, the English past participles, 'ashamed'

and 'disappointed' occurred in mixed constituents. In both

examples 58 and 81, the past participles are treated as

adjectival nouns in a frame prepared by the Japanese language.

In Japanese, the adjectival nouns form a predicate (as nouns

generally do), by adding the copula "da" or "desu" (Akiyama and

Akiyama, 1991, p152).

```
58.B: Dakara shiranai koto ga  oosugiru koto mo      ashamed ⊔. ne.
      So    know-NEG NOMI NOM too many NOMI as well         COP FP
      "So, (I)feel ashamed when (I) don't know many things."
```

```
81.B: Watashi konkai    wa disappointed datta     kara ne, ...
      I        this time TOP             COP-past conj FP
      "I was disappointed about this (semester)..."
```

Example 12 shows that the irregular form of the past participle

'stuck' appears with a "do" verb. In the examples above, all of

the past participles are nonfinitive verbs with their own

inflectional suffixes, while the past participle in example 12

does not possess the inflectional suffix -ed. Because of this,

'*stuck*' is treated as a noun to produce a verb phrase (by adding "*do*") and embedded into the frame prepared by the Japanese grammar system. Yet the speaker's recognition of the past participle '*stuck*', which is from '*be stuck*', retains the irregular form of the past participle.

12.A: Nanka **stuck** shiteru yoo ni shaberu kara..
      something do   like   speak   so
      "When [he] speaks, he is always **stuck,** so ..."

c) Embedded Language Islands

In the model of the constituents of the complement phrase, Myers-Scotton (1995b, 1995c, 1997, 1998b, 1998c, 1998d) categorises matrix-language islands, and embedded-language islands, along with mixed constituents (matrix language + embedded language constituents). This study concentrates only on embedded language islands and mixed constituents. The major characteristics of the matrix island (ML island) is that it keeps its own grammatical frame. However, ML islands consist of only morphemes from the ML. The embedded language islands (EL islands) are consistent with EL grammar, and all morphemes derive from the EL.

"Congruency" is defined by Myers-Scotton (1995b, p247) as a match between the EL content morpheme and the ML content morpheme. In other words, an EL content morpheme must match its ML counterpart in terms of its subcategorisation features. However, if its counterpart the ML *system* morpheme, then there is no match at all. These features specifically refer to theta roles (their assignment in the case of verbs and prepositions

and their reception in the case of nouns, descriptive adjective and pronouns).

According to Myers-Scotton (1995b, 1995c, 1998b, 1988d), an EL island is produced, when there is a problem with congruence across the code-switching language pair with regard to a semantic/pragmatic mismatch, or incongruence with regard to predicate-argument structure.

In this present study, several EL islands were produced. For instance, example 119, the EL island 'at least two years' appears as the predicate of this sentence, since "wa" is the topic marker. It may be interpreted that an idiomatic expression like 'at least', can be combined with other independent English lexemes (such as 'two years'), to be then treated as a single unit in the complement phrase. It is still however, under the control of the Japanese grammatical frame regarding its placement. That is, the placement of an EL island follows ML requirements.

119.B: Are dakedo, **at least two years** wa ano, jiyuu ni shiteru
       Well but   TOP well free   DAT do-PROG
       kara.
       so
       "So (they have a lot of) free time, **at least two years.**"

In a different case, an EL island occurred due to an incongruence in the grammatical structures. The lack of congruence between the English and the Japanese language regarding the prepositional phrase in the example below shows

that Japanese prepares the grammatical frame. In English, 'view point' requires in most cases "from" which precedes it to make the surface form of the prepositional phrase. Since the Japanese counterpart of the prepositions in English is the postpositions, "de" (from) appears after the EL island 'view point'.

165.E: Ii   omoiire o   mottenaitte iuka nihon no   toshikeikaku
       positive opinion ACC have-NEG   say Japan GEN city planning
       wa tadashii to   omotteinai kara sooiu   **view point** de
       TOP right   CONJ think-NEG so such things   ABL
       zenbu   semete iku wake   janai?
       Everything approach go reason INTERRO-NEG
       "I'm going to approach (to my topic) coming from this **view
       point** which derives from a critical opinion about the city
       planning of Japan, right?"

The theory that the production of EL islands derived from problems regarding congruence (in terms of a semantic/ pragmatic mismatch) was also supported in this study. Example 81, which has been previously discussed with regard to the past particles (disappointed), shows the EL island 'so disappointed'. It appears after the mixed constituent which contains the English past participle 'disappointed'. It is repeated in the EL island, with the addition of the adjective 'so', which was produced in order to emphasise her feelings. An interpretation of this is that the speaker's semantic/pragmatic reason, the intention to emphasise her feelings, does not fit the Japanese counterpart 'totemo' (so). It was for this reason that the speaker produced the EL island.

81.B: Watashi konkai   wa **disappointed** datta   kara ne, *so*
      I   this time TOP   COP-past conj FP
      disappointed.
      "I was **disappointed** about this (semester), **so disappointed**."

50.H: **As far as leadership is concerned**, nihon   no hitotachi wa
                                            Japanese GEN person-PL TOP
      zenzen kitai shiteinai.
      at all expect do-NEG
      "**As far as leadership is concerned**, Japanese people don't
      expect that from politicians at all."

In example 50, the EL island 'as far as leadership is concerned' is the dependent clause. It consists entirely of EL morphemes. Although the number of morphemes from the EL and the ML is similar in this utterance, the Japanese language is recognised as the ML. This is because the dependent clause does not express a complete thought and cannot stand by itself as a sentence. The production of an EL island is a strategy employed to deal with insufficient congruence, since it fits the requirements of both the ML and EL (Myers-Scotton, 1995c, p1011). For instance, 'as far as' - the Japanese equivalent (conjunction 'kagiri') always comes at the end of the dependent clause of the sentence which does not occur in English. In the case of example 50, the incongruence which is evident in the word order between the Japanese and English languages lead to the production of the EL island.

Moreover, the speaker's intention may also influence the occurrence of EL islands. Myers-Scotton (1995c, p991) assumes that at certain level ("conceptual") in language production, speakers' consideration of which surface lexemes would best convey the semantic as well as pragmatic and sociopragmatic features of their intentions, involves the production of EL

227

island. In fact, the speaker commented that she felt the Japanese word order was insufficient for emphasising her intentions in this content.

Collection of Compromise Strategies

a) "Bare form" with the Stative verb "naru"

In this study one will encounter different types of strategies which were used in an attempt to overcome problems with congruence. For example, in the case below, the Engli_h verb *attack* appears as a "bare form" with the stative verb "naru" (to become) because it takes the 'past' inflection. Although the verb 'attack' is followed by "do" (suru), the mixed constituent itself is treated as a noun phrase due to the nominalizer "koto". A combination of the postposition "ni" and the stative verb "naru", usually suggests the completion of the event, and "naru" can take certain verbal inflections. Thus 'attack' occurs as a bare form with noninflected "suru" (do) because of "naru" (to become).

95.E:..saishuutake ni nato ga **Serbian**... Kosobo o **attack** suru koto
 ..eventually DAT NATO TOP   Kosovo ACC   do   NOMI
 ni natta   kara ..
 DAT become-PAST so ....
 "...NATO eventually **attacked Serbia**... Kosovo, so....."

Similarly, in example 30, the English past participle 'globalised' appears as a bare form in combination with the postposition "ni" and the stative verb "naru" (to become) which takes verbal inflections.

30.H: Ano, seijika   jitai ga kawaranaku temo kokumin tte iuka ano,
      well politician itself NOM change-NEG CONJ citizen CONJ   well
      global, zenbu **global** ni natteiru   desho?
             all   DAT become-PROG COP
      "Although politicians have not changed, nations have
      globalised, everything has **globalised.**"

b) Adjectival Noun as Unit of Embedded

English adjectives in mixed constituents appear to be under the

control of the Japanese grammatical frame. Japanese adjectives

can be divided into two major groups: first, true adjectives

which are like verbs in some respects; second, adjectival nouns

(quasi adjectives) which are formed similar to nouns. Most

adjectival nouns are followed by the particle -na. These appear

before the noun they modify (Tanimori, 1998, p248). In the

examples below, -na is added to the English adjectives

`intelligent`, `international` and `inconvenient`, since they

are placed before Japanese nouns. This shows that the English

adjectives are treated in the same manner as the Japanese

adjectival nouns, and thus they are followed by the particle -

na, in order to modify the Japanese nouns.

36.K: Nakanaka **intelligent**na kata   ga omie ni narareta na to
      Very   person NOM come DAT HON-past FP CONJ
      omo   tte..
      think CONJ
      "I thought that a very **intelligent** person came (to me) ..."

64.B: Ma   ima   wa kaisha wa **international**na jinzai o
      well recent time TOP company TOP   talent ACC
      hoshigatte iru kedomo
      want   PROG but-CONJ
      "Although it is considered that in recent times, many
      companies seem to need (employees) who have **international**
      thinking in reality..."

74.B: Watashi mo sukida   kedo **inconvenient**na kototo ga oosugiru.
      I   too like-COP but   thing NOM too many
      "I like here too, but there are too many **inconvenient** things."

c) Different types of EL island

According to Myers-Scotton (1995b, 1997, 1998d, 1998b), EL islands are grammatically well-formed constituents entirely in the EL. However, different types of EL islands occurred in this study which were not grammatically well formed. The example below demonstrates that an EL island appears with the "do" verb (*suru*). As has been discussed above, English past participles occur in mixed constituents since they are treated as single units in code-switching. According to this, '*organise*' can carry an inflection. However, it appears without its suffix -*ed* in the "*do*" construction. This is the same reason for '*confuse*' and '*adjust*' which were also given in the previous examples (i.e. the past participle was brought from its original form in '*be organised*' into conformity with the Japanese grammar, since many nouns can be rendered into verbs by adding "*suru*" [*do*] to them). In this sense, noninflected '*organise*' meets the system morpheme principle - all the system morphemes must come from the ML. Myers-Scotton's hypothesis (1992, p27), which states that "the more formulaic in structure a constituent is, the more likely it is to appear as an EL island". Thus the English adjective '*well*' can occur with '*organised*' as the EL island, but '*organise*' appears as a bare form in the "*do*" construction.

75.B: Soredattara chanto **well organise** shite konkai kaette
       in that case perfectly   do-CONJ this time back
       nihon de shiryoo atsumete...
       Japan ABL material get-CONJ
       "I'm planning to go to Japan to get materials so that I can be
       well organised ..."

The section has attempted to discover the characteristics of the embedded language (i.e. English) and the grammatical environment of the matrix language (i.e. Japanese) with regard to intrasentential code-switching. The analysis of the data which derived from the speakers' naturally occurring conversation has shown that in most of the cases, a single English content morpheme is selected, and embedded into the Japanese grammatical structure. That is, the English content morpheme is inserted in place consisting of the Japanese morpheme order and the Japanese system morphemes.

Japanese is a language in which words are formed primarily by means of agglutination, and words can contain several morphemes, but the words are easily divided into their component parts (normally a root and affixes). In such languages, each affix is clearly identifiable and typically represents a single grammatical category or meaning (O'grady, Dobrovolsky and Katamba, 1998, p381).

Since all system morphemes are from Japanese, and Japanese governs the grammatical feature which is based on consistent subject-object-verb, there are certain ways by which the English content morpheme is accommodated to the Japanese grammatical frame. These are some of the findings of the features which characterise the English morphemes: first, both the English content verb and the past participle occur as "bare forms" with the Japanese auxiliary "*suru*" (*do*) which will take

all necessary inflections. Second, the English verb also appears as a "bare form" with the Japanese stative verb "*naru*" (*to become*). Third, the English adjective is inserted with the Japanese particle *-na* as an adjectival noun. Fourth, the English past participle can occur with their English inflections as they are treated as single unit.

Several English phrases and clauses have also been incorporated due to linguistic reasons or speakers' intentions. The former one is that English idiomatic expressions trigger the production of the English phrase. Yet, it is still under the control of the Japanese grammatical frame regarding its placement. The later one is that the semantic/pragmatic mismatch between the two languages led to speakers' decisions which produce a well-formed English phrase or clause.

A variety of mixing patterns can be found, which depends on the participants' respective competence of different varieties along with on sociolinguistic factors (Gardner-Chloros, 1997, p362). Myers-Scotton (1998c, p103) argues that it is clearly easier to embed a single English lexeme in a frame of the ML than it is to produce an entire constituent up to the level of complement phrase. This indicates that structural analysis regarding to intrasentential code-switching should also take speakers' proficiency in languages into fully account for code-switching behaviour.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

This study has examined the code-switching behaviour of native speakers of Japanese in an English-speaking context. The purpose of this study was to find; first, whether certain components (i.e. topic and gender) influence the frequency of code-switching; second, in what ways the occurrence of code-switching relates to the speakers' attitudes towards both Japanese, English, and code-switching, or the speakers' communicative intent/strategies; and finally, the linguistic features which characterise switched items and the environments in which they are embedded.

One of the conclusions which may be drawn from this research is that the different topics did have an impact upon the code-switching behaviour of the participants. Most telling were the results obtained from the discussions related to the Japanese cultural context. Here, it is obvious that there was a clear reduction in the frequency of code-switching compared to the other topics. It seems appropriate to suggest that the association between culture and language should play some part in explaining this occurrence. For instance, when talking about a topic related to the Japanese context, the speakers possess a repertoire of native terms which capture the fullest and most accurate meanings of those concepts. Inversely, when analysing

the frequency of code-switches for the English related topics, it is obvious that the frequency of code-switches is substantially higher. In this case, native Japanese terms are not able to fully convey the real meaning of these concepts. In other words, we can see that topics generally tend to be associated with a particular cultural domain and hence, a specific language repertoire.

As all of the participants in this study have been living in Australia for at least two years, each has taken on a specific and active role in the community - whether as a student in a university, or as an employee. As such, they have been immersed in the culture and have been exposed to the terms and concepts which are inherently associated with these roles. The habitual exposure to such language is an important aspect in the forming of a particular code-switching behaviour.

In addition to this, there are different patterns in code-switching use between the younger age group and the older age group. The results show that all speakers who are in the younger age group produced the highest frequency of code switching per turn for the discussion of either study (topic one) or the English related context (within topic two). Moreover, their discussion, in general, was focused on their study at university, or the prospect of looking for future employment. In contrast to this, the older age group displayed the highest frequency of code-switching in their discussion of what has been categorised as 'neutral' (that is, including both

the English speaking and Japanese cultural context, or not related to either) rather than work (topic one) and the English related context in topic two. That is, the younger speakers tended to engage in code-switching when they were discussing a topic which directly related to the English-speaking context alone, whereas the older speakers tended to produce more codeswitches during their discussions related to both the Japanese cultural, and English-speaking context, (or not related to either). This indicates that the people who have been living in an English-speaking environment for a lengthy period of time have a greater ability to employ English expressions outside of the more restricted context of their everyday situation, and apply them to a much broader field. A suggested reason for this may be that the participants in the older age group, who have been residing in Australia for a much longer period of time than their younger counterparts, have a greater command of the English language. Similarly, they may also have a more expansive knowledge of social issues both at the community level, and in terms of international affairs. However, such observations are in reality only speculative, one of the limitations of this research being it did not incorporate a detailed measurement of the participants' English language capabilities.

In terms of code-switching in relation to the gender of the interlocutor, it is difficult to establish a clear relationship between the two. Only two speakers C, and D, (both of the same entirely male pair) received a relatively higher average number

of codeswitches throughout all of the topics. On the other hand, of the two mixed pairs, the speakers of one pair both obtained a similar score to each other (they recorded a quite low frequency of code-switching). Of the twelve speakers, the three speakers who most frequently engaged in code-switching were the speakers who had same-sex partners. Their partners however did not generally display the same tendency. One interpretation for this is that each individual holds a different speech style. Thus it turns out there is no clear relationship between the frequency of code-switching, and the gender of the interlocutor. In other words, it made no difference to the frequency of code-switching, whether the participants were of the same or different sex.

In this study, the most common switches were intrasentential code-switching, especially single word. In fact, of the twelve speakers, only one participant engaged in intersentential code-switching. Although the speakers employed phrase switches, especially during their discussion of topic 1 (study or work), many of them seemed to be used as a single unit. These English phrase switches are used to express certain things, such as the name of a unit, system, section, or job.

Moreover, a few phrases appeared to be a combination of an English word and a Japanese numeral, these include: *juuni* point ('twelve point[s]'), and *ni* semester ('the second semester'). This was most common amongst the younger age group, some of whom commented that this was one way of guarding against the

dominance of English in their speech. This is a fairly convenient switch in that the English item remains constant whilst the Japanese numeral can easily be subject to change. This differs from the situation where phrases are employed as a single unit because these words are not interchangeable in the same way. This can partly account for the frequent use of single word switches across topics amongst the speakers.

General attitudes towards both the Japanese and English languages were examined within the first section of questionnaire two. Although most of speakers positively evaluated Japanese, a more positive evaluation for English rather than Japanese amongst the speakers was presented in the scores elicited by this questionnaire. In general then, it was clear that English came to hold a preferred status.

This overall tendency however did not clearly reflect the frequency of code-switching amongst the speakers as it occurred in this study. In other words, a markedly positive attitude towards English did not necessarily translate into a higher frequency of code-switches. For example, speaker H, who employed various types of codeswitches and recorded a high average number of switches, evaluated English only slightly higher than Japanese (just as most of the other speakers did). Moreover, speaker D received the third highest average number of codeswitches per turn, but his evaluation of English was the lowest out of all the twelve speakers.

The second section of questionnaire two, which was aimed at eliciting responses for 'instrumental' and 'integrative' attitude towards English, for each item, by each speakers, shows that there is a tight clustering of mean scores, and thus a balanced response between integrative and instrumental attitudes. This illustrates that the participants possess a favourable attitude in terms of both the instrumental and the integrative aspects. In other words, the speakers hold both pragmatic or utilitarian motives, and attachment to, or identification with, a certain speech community. On the whole, the frequency of code-switches was not then representative of the speakers' positive attitudes towards the two languages, nor the favourable attitudes towards the two attitudinal aspects with regards to English.

In the analysis of attitudes towards code-switching, it turned out that a negative attitude takes either one of two forms. The first is derived from their awareness of the existence of certain social norms and values with respect to the practice of code-switching. These include for instance what might be termed a 'purist' notion, which is an emphasis on the 'purity' of the Japanese language. Another might be 'politeness' with some of the subjects stating that it is rude to codeswitch in some situations, especially in discussions with older people and their employer. The second is derived from one's own preference for proper speech. The concern with code-switching is that its practice may be an indication of a lack of competence in the Japanese language.

The speakers, in commenting generally on the perceived Japanese social attitudes towards code-switching, revealed that in formal situations, they try to produce predominantly monolingual utterances. That is, they choose predominantly code-switched utterances in informal in-group contexts, and predominantly monolingual utterances in the formal situation. It indicates that the speakers pay attention to how they should speak in accordance with social convention, with the desire to obtain acceptance from their interlocutors, just as monolingual speakers choose different forms of one language in adjusting their style to the situation.

Certainly, linguistic choice is constrained by social norms and values (including 'politeness' concern) or influenced by situational factors (i.e. topic, interlocutor, and setting). However, in the case of speakers G and H, as well as information derived from the speakers' comments, showed that code-switching can be engaged in as a discourse strategy in which the speakers use it to achieve certain goals. In such cases, the speakers' code-switching behaviour does not seem to be influenced by these factors. That is, the speakers are aware that code-switching can be used as a marked choice (unexpected), as a strategy to gain certain outcomes.

As it turned out, the holding of a negative attitude, clearly in at least one case (the 'purist' notion), did influence the occurrence of code-switching in this study. Of the twelve

speakers, only six speakers held a positive evaluation of code-switching, whilst three speakers held negative views of code-switching only. Additionally, three speakers possessed both negative and positive evaluations. Nevertheless, negative attitudes towards code-switching do not always correspond to a reduction in the frequency of code-switching. Because the speakers are aware of the role of code-switching which operates within the participants' daily interactions, because they have established 'permissible' patterns of code-switching use in in-group situation, and because amongst these subjects discussions were of an informal nature (thus, little attention was paid to their own speech), the negative attitudes towards the mixing of languages which may be held is overridden.

In fact, the researcher has interpreted several functions of code-switching based on the speakers' own understanding of why they used certain English expressions. These are: quotations, semantic authenticity, contextual association, linguistic efficiency, euphemistic efficiency, pragmatic consideration, familiarity, and affective association. Most of these functions are different from other speech communities. It indicates that different speech communities perform different types of code-switching. The functions in this speech community show that the speakers seem to be very much aware of the different properties which exist between the Japanese and English language, and they appear to partly determine code-switching amongst the speakers.

In addition to this, the structural analysis with regards to intrasentential code-switching which derived from the speakers' naturally occurring conversation has confirmed the principles suggested by Myers-Scotton in her Matrix Language Frame model. The study has shown that: firstly, in most cases, a single English content morpheme is selected, and embedded into the Japanese grammatical structure ('The morpheme order principle'), and second, all system morphemes are from Japanese, and Japanese governs the grammatical feature which is based on consistent subject-object-verb ('The system morpheme principle').

Moreover, the study has found some features which characterise the English morphemes in order to accommodate the Japanese grammatical frame. These are including: taking 'bare forms' with the Japanese auxiliary 'suru' (do), or with the Japanese stative verb 'naru' (to become). The Japanese particle 'na' also takes a part in the English morpheme to accommodate the Japanese grammatical frame.

It was also found that the process of producing intrasentential code-switching is not only determined by the linguistic constraints, but also through the speakers' intentions. A few speakers produced well-formed English phrases or clauses in intrasentential code-switching for semantic/pragmatic reasons. This indicates that the speakers make a decision to create their own code-switching patterns during their individual interactions and try to convey intentional meanings.

To summarise, this study has shown that all participants taking part in this study engaged in code-switching during the course of the recording sessions. As it turns out, code-switching amongst the participants is a conventional language choice in informal in-group interactions, since the relationship of each pair was of an established friendship, and the setting was designed to be an informal situation. Each of the interactions between the speakers in their pairs, during the recording sessions, has demonstrated that in general, they communicated fluently - rapidly switching without pause from one language to another. This indicates that the speakers share established code-switching usage with their partners. Moreover, the speakers' intrasentential code-switching, which was the most frequently produced, indicates that codeswitched discourse amongst the speakers is a psychologically unified mode of speech, that is, there is little or no disconnection between the two languages.

The subjects were particularly aware of the advantages and convenience of incorporating English into the Japanese language. One of the most significant reasons why certain codeswitched items are being employed is to avoid being overly formal, and to escape the complexities of established Japanese politeness forms. Japanese bilinguals who have long been operating in an English speaking environment, may become familiar with certain English terms which can then be substituted for the more elaborate and conventional politeness

strategies inherent in the Japanese language. Thus, code-switching amongst the speakers should not be perceived as being an indication of a lack of balanced proficiency between the two languages, but rather, as a sign of communicative competence. For bilinguals, code-switching is an important resource which can be used to achieve certain communicative goals. Code-switching therefore should be thought of as expansion on the monolinguals' linguistic repertoire.

The research has attempted to give a fuller account of the code-switching behaviour as presented by twelve native speakers of Japanese in an English-speaking context. In order to this, two approaches have been employed (i.e. social/pragmatic and linguistic), as well as the incorporation of the speakers' attitudes towards both Japanese, English and code-switching. However, the research has been limited in that it has not systematically taken into account the varying degrees of English language proficiency which exists amongst speakers. This has been a limiting factor in the endeavour to present a full account of code-switching, since proficiency must come before the speakers' intentions/strategies, and the production of intrasentential code-switching. Therefore, future research should address such proficiency issues in a systematic way.

References

Akiyama, N., & Akiyama, C. (1991). *Japanese Grammar*. Barron's Educational Series.

Appel, R., & Muysken, P. (1987). *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.

Auer, P. (1984). On the meaning of conversational code-switching. In J. C. Auer & A. di Luzio (ed.), *Interpretative Sociolinguistics: Migrants-Children-Migrant Children*, 87-112. Tübingen, Germany: Narr.

Auer, P. (1988). A conversation analytic approach to code-switching and transfer. In M. Heller (ed.), *Code-Switching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 187-213. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Auer, P. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (ed.), *One speaker, Two languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*, 115-135. Cambridge University Press.

Auer, P. (1998). Introduction: Bilingual conversation revisited. In P. Auer (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*, 1-24. London/New York: Routledge.

Azuma, S. (1987). Conversational code-switching in Japanese/ English: A study on Japanese Americans. *JACET Bulletin*, 18, 1-19.

Azuma, S. (1996). Speech production units among bilinguals. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 25(3), 397-416.

Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bautista, M. L. S. (1991). Code-switching studies in the Philippines. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 88, 19-32*.

Bell, A. (1984). Language style as audience design. *Language in Society*, 13, 145-204.

Bentahila, A., & Davies, E. E. (1983). The syntax of Arabic-French code-switching. *Lingua*, 59, 301-330.

Bentahila, A., & Davies, E. E. (1992). Code-switching and language dominance. In R. J. Harris (ed.), *Cognitive Processing in Bilinguals*. 443-458. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Bentahila, A., & Davies, E. E. (1998). Codeswitching: An unequal partnership?. In R. Jacobson (ed.), *Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 106/Code-Switching Worldwide*, 25-49. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Blom, J. P., & Gumperz, J. J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structures: Code-switching in Norway. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (ed.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, 409-434. University of Pennsylvania.

Blommaert, J. (1992). Codeswitching and the exclusivity of social identities: Some data from Campus Kiswahili. In C. M. Eastman (ed.), *Codeswitching*, 57-70. Cleveland/Philadelphia/ Adelaide: Multilingual Matters 89.

Boeschoten, H. (1998). Codeswitching, codemixing, and code alternation: What a difference. In R. Jacobson (ed.) *Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 106/Code-Switching Worldwide*, 15-24. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bokamba, E. (1987). Are there syntactic constraints on code-mixing? In K. Denning (ed.), *Variation in Language*, 35-51. Stanford University Press.

Bokamba, E. (1988). Code-mixing, language variation and linguistic theory: Evidence from Bantu languages. *Lingua, 76,* 21-62.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1990). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1999). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (ed.), *The Discourse Reader*, 321-335. London/New York: Boutledge.

Chana, U., & Romaine, S. (1984). Evaluative reactions to Panjabi/English code-switching. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 6,* 447-473.

Christie, P. (1990). Language as experience of identity in Dominica. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 85,* 61-69.

Clyne, M. G. (1967). *Transference and Triggering.* The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Clyne, M. G. (1982). *Multilingual Australia.* Melbourne: River Seine Publications.

Clyne, M. G. (1987). Constraints on code switching: How universal are they? *Linguistics, 25,* 739-764.

Clyne, M. G. (1998). Multilingualism. In F. Coulmas (ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, 301-314. Blackwell.

Cooper, R., & J. Fishman. (1974). The study of language attitudes. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language,* 3, 5-19

De Heredia-Deprez, C. (1990). Comment est-on bilingue en famille? Elements de methodologie [How is one bilingual in the family? Elements of methodology]. *Linguistique,* 26(2), 95-105.

Eastman, C. M. (1992). Codeswitching as an urban language-contact phenomenon. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development,* 13 (1 & 2), 1-17.

Edwards, J. (1983). Language attitudes in multilingual settings: A general assessment. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development,* 4(2 & 3), 225-236.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1964). An analysis of the interaction of language, topic and listener. *American Anthropologist,* 66, 86-102.

Faltis, C. J. (1989). Code-switching and bilingual schooling: an examination of Jacobson's new concurrent approach. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development,* 10(2), 117-127.

Fantini, A. E. (1985). *Language Acquisition of a Bilingual Child: A sociolinguistic Perspective.* Multilingual Matters 17.

Fasold, R. (1984). *The Sociolinguistics of Society.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Ferguson, C. A. (1959). Diglossia. *Word,* 15, 325-40.

Fishman, J. A. (1972). The relationship between Micro- and macro- sociolinguistics in the study of who speaks what language to whom and when. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (ed.), *Sociolinguistics,* 15-32. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Franceschini, R. (1998). Code-switching and the notion of code in linguistics: Proposals for a dual focus model. In P. Auer (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity,* 51-72. London/New York: Routledge.

Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 14, 219-236.

Fremy, D., & Fremy, M. (1993). *Quid.* Robert Laffont.

Gal, S. (1979). *Language Shift. Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria.* New York: Academic Press.

Gal, S. (1983). Common on Breitborde: Levels of analysis in sociolinguistic explanation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language,* 39, 63-72.

Gal, S. (1988). The political economy of code choice. In M. Heller (ed.), *Code-switching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 245-264. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gale, Mary-Anne. (1993). *Code-switching, Manymak or Yaka Manymak?: A Discussion Paper on Language Use, Language Change and Language Loss*. Occasional Papers in applied Linguistics, No 2. Centre for Studies of Language in Education Northern Territory University Darwin, Northern Territory, Australia.

Gardner-Chloros, P. (1991). *Language Selection and Switching in Strasbourg*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gardner-Chloros, P. (1997). Code-switching: Language selection in three Strasbourg department stores. In N. Coupland & A. Jaworski (ed.), *Sociolinguistics: A Reader and Coursebook*, 361-375. Macmillan Press.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *The Attitude/Motivation Test Battery*. Technical Report. Ontario: University of Western Ontario.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13, 266-272.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Gearon, M. (1998). To switch or not switch: Examining the code-switching practices of teachers of French as a foreign language. *Monash University Linguistics Papers*, 1(2), December, 49-57.

Gibbons, J. (1983). Attitudes towards languages and code-mixing in Hong Kong. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 4(2), 129-147.

Gibbons, J. (1987). *Code-mixing and Code Choice: a Hong Kong Case Study*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Giles, H., & Byrne, J. L. (1982). An intergroup approach to second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 3, 17-40.

Giles, H., & Coupland, N. (1991). *Language: Contexts and Consequences*. Open University Press.

Giles, H., Hewstone, M. & Bail, P. (1983). Language attitudes in multilingual settings: Prologue with priorities. *Journal of Multilingualism and Multicultural Development*, 4(2&3), 81-100.

Giles, H., & Smith, P. M. (1979). Accommodation theory: Optimal levels of convergence. In H. Giles & R. St Clair (ed.), *Language and Social Psychology*, 45-65. Oxford: Blackwell

Goyvaerts, D. L., & Zambele, T. (1992). Codeswitching in Bukavu. In C. M. Eastman (ed.), Codeswitching. *Multilingual Matters 89, 71-81.* Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with Two Languages. An Introduction to Bilingualism.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gysels, M. (1992). French in urban Lubumbashi Swahili: Codeswitching, borrowing, or both? In C. M. Eastman (ed.), *Codeswitching,* 41-55. Cleveland/Philadelphia/Adelaide: Multilingual Matters 89.

Hasselmo, N. (1970). Code-switching and modes of speaking. In G. G. Gilbert (ed.), *Texas Studies in Bilingualism,* 179-210. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Haust, D., & Dittmar, N. (1998). Taxonomic or functional models in the description of codeswitching? Evidence from Mandinka and Wolof in African contact situations. In R. Jacobson (ed.), *Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 106/Code-Switching Worldwide,* 79-90. Mouton de Gruyter.

Heller, M (1988a). Strategic ambiguity: Code-switching in the management of conflict. In M. Heller (ed.), *Code-switching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives,* 77-96. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Heller, M. (1988b). Where do we go from here? In M. Heller (ed.), *Code-switching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives,* 266-272. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Heller, M. (1995). Code-switching and the politics of language. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (ed.), *One speaker, Two languages: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching,* 158-174. Cambridge University Press.

Hidalgo, M. (1986). Language contact, language loyalty, and language prejudice on the Mexican border. *Language in Society,* 15, 193-220.

Honna, N. (1995). English in Japanese society: Language within language. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development,* 16 (1 & 2), 45-62.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (ed.), *Sociolinguistics,* 269-293. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: two neglected aspects of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua,* 8(23), 223-248.

Ide, S. (1991). How and why do women speak more polite in Japanese. In S. Ide & N. H. McGloin (ed.), *Aspect of Japanese Women's Language*, 63-79. Kuroshio Publishers.

Iwabuchi, E. (1993). *Gairaigo: Kotoba Dokuhon*. Kawaideshoboshinsha.

Jacobson, R. (1982). The social implications of intra-sentential code-switching. In J. Amastae & L. Elías-Olivares (ed.), *Spanish in The United States: Sociolinguistics Aspects*, 182-208. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jacobson, R. (1990). Introduction. In R. Jacobson (ed.), *Codeswitching as a Worldwide Phenomenon*, 1-13. New York: Peter Lang.

Jacobson, R. (1998). Conveying a broader message through bilingual discourse: An attempt at contrastive codeswitching research. In R, Jacobson (ed.), *Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 106/Code-Switching Worldwide*, 51-76. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jorgensen, J. N. (1998). Children's acquisition of code-switching for power wielding. In P. Auer (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*, 1-24. London/New York: Routledge.

Joshi, A. K. (1985). Processing of sentences with intrasentential code switching. In D. R. Dowty, L. Karttunen & A. M, Zwicky (ed.), *Natural Language Parsing: Psychological, Computational, and Theoretical Perspectives*, 190-205. Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B. (1978). Code-Mixing as communicative strategy in India, In J. E. Alatis (ed.), *International Dimensions of Bilingual Education*, 107-124. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Kanazawa, H., & Loveday, L. (1988). The Japanese immigrant community in Brazil: Language contact and shift. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 9(5), 423-435.

Kasuya, H. (1997). *Sociolinguistic Aspect of Language Choice in English/Japanese Bilingual Children*. Umi.

Koscielecki, M. M. (1994). *English as an International language: A sociolinguistic Analysis of the Japanese Experience*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Edith Cowan University.

Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Labov, W. (1997). The social stratification of (r) in New York city department stores. In N. Coupland & A. Jaworski (ed.), *Sociolinguistcs: A Reader and Coursebook*, 168-178. Macmillan Press.

Lambert, W. E., Hodgson, R. C., Gardner, R. C., & Fillenbaum, S. (1960). Evaluation reactions to spoken language. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 60, 44-51.

Lanza, E. (1992). Can bilingual two-year-olds code-switch? *Journal of Child Language*, 19, 633-658.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. H. (1991). *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research.* London: Longman.

Lasimbang, R., Miller, C., & Otigil, F. (1992). Language competence and use among coastal Kadazan children: A survey report. In Fase, Jaspaert & Kroon (ed.), *Maiantenance and Loss of Minority Languages*, 333-355. Philadelphia: John Benjamin.

Le Page, R. B., & Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of Identity: Creole-based Approaches to Ethnicity and Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Le Page, R. B. (1998). The evolution of a sociolinguistic theory of language. In F. Coulmas (ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, 15-32. Blackwell.

Li, D. C. S. (1999). Semantically motivated code-alternation: Resistance to transfer and reluctance to translate. In A. Alastair (ed.), *Perspectives: Working papers*, 11(1), 1-52. Department of English City University of Hong Kong.

Li Wei. (1995). Variations in patterns of language choice and code-switching by three groups of Chinese/English speakers in Newcastle upon Tyne. *Multilingua*, 14(3), 297-323.

Loveday, L. (1986). *Explorations in Japanese Sociolinguistics.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Lüdi, G. (1986). Forms and functions of bilingual speech in pluricultural migrant communities in Switzerland, In J. A. Fishman, A. Tabouret-Keller, M. Clyne, B. Krishnamurti, & M. Abdulaziz. (ed.), *The Fergusonian Impact*, 2 vols, 217-137. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, ii.

Maher, J. C. (1991). Ainu-go no fukkatsu. In J. C. Maher & K. Yashiro (ed.), *Nihon ni Okeru Bairingarizumu [Bilingualism in Japan]*, 149-175. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.

Maher, J, C. (1995a). The right stuff: Towards an environmental linguistics. In J. C. Maher & G. Macdonald (ed.), *Diversity in Japanese Culture and Language*, 95-118. London and New York: Kegan Paul International.

Maher, J. C. (1995b). The Kakyo: Chinese in Japan. In J. C. Maher & K. Yashiro (ed.), *Multilingual Japan*, 125-138. Multilingual Matters.

Mahar, J. C., & Kawanishi, Y. (1995). Maintaining culture and language: Koreans in Osaka. In J. C. Maher., & G. Macdonald (ed.), *Diversity in Japanese Culture and Language, 160-177.* London and New York: Kegan Paul International.

Maher, J. C., & Yashiro, K. (1995). Multilingual Japan: An introduction. In J. C. Maher & K. Yashiro (ed.), *Multilingual Japan, 1- 17.* Multilingual Matters.

Maher, J. C., & Yuasa, I. (1991). In the case of Erika: Bairingarizumu to Guruupu Kyookai. *Gekkangengo,* 20(8), 31-37. Taishukan.

Makino, S., & Tsutsui, M. (1992). *A Dictionary of Basic Japanese Grammar.* The Japan Times.

Malcolm, I. G. (1997). The pragmatics of bidialectal communication. In L. F. Bouton (ed.), *Pragmatics and Language Learning,* 8, 55-78. Urbana-Champaign: Division of English as an International Language, Intensive English Institute, University of Illinois.

Marasigan, E. (1983). *Code-switching and Code-mixing in Multilingual Societies.* Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Maruya, S. (1993). *Katakana to Romaji de. Gairaigo: Kotoba Dokuhon.* Kawaideshoboshinsha.

Maschler, Y. (1998). On the transition from code-switching to a mixed code. In P. Auer (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity,* 125-149. London/New York: Routledge.

Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness Phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 12(23), 403-426.

McClure, E. (1981). Formal and functional aspects of the codeswithed discourse of bilingual children. In R. P. Duran (ed.), *Latino Language and Communicative Behavior,* 69-93. Norwood, N. J.: Ablex.

McClure, E., & McClure, M. (1988). Macro- and micro-sociolinguistic dimensions of code-switching in Vingard. In M. Heller (ed.), *Code-switching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives,* 25-51. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

McConvell, P. (1985). Domains and codeswitching among bilingual Aboriginies. In M. Clyne (ed.), *Australia, Meeting Place of Languages* (=Pacific Linguistics, Ser. C, No. 92), 95-125. Canberra: Australian National University.

McConvell, P. (1986). Aboriginal language programs and language maintenance in the Kimberley. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics,* Ser. S, No. 3, 108-122.

McConvell, P. (1988). MIX-IM-UP: Aboriginal code-switching, old and new. In M. Heller (ed.), *Code-switching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 97-150. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

McConvell, P. (1991). Cultural domain separation: Two-way street or blind alley? Stephen Harris and the neo-Worfians on Aboriginal education. *Australian Aboriginal Studies*, No. 1, 13-24.

McGregor, G., & Li Wei. (1991). Chinese or English? : Language choice amongst Chinese students in Newcastle upon Tyne. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 12(6), 493-510.

Merritt, M., Cleghorn, A., Abagei, J. O., & Bunyi, G. (1992). Socialising multilingualism: Determinants of codeswitching in Kenyan primary classrooms. In C. M. Eastman (ed.), *Codeswitching*, 103-121. Cleveland/Philadelphia/Adelaide: Multilingual Matters 89.

Miller, L. (1995). Crossing ethnolinguistic boundaries: A preliminary look at the Gaijin Tarento in Japan. In J. Lent (ed.), *Asian Popular Culture*, 189-201. Boulder, Co: Westview Press.

Milroy, L., Li Wei, & Moffatt, S. (1991). Discourse patterns and fieldwork strategies in urban settings: Some methodological problems for researchers in bilingual communities. *Journal of Multilingual Development*, 12(4), 287-300.

Milroy, L., & Li Wei. (1995). A social network approach to code-switching: The example of a bilingual community in Britain. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (ed.), *One speaker, Two languages: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*, 136-157. Cambridge University Press.

Mishoe, M. C. (1995). *Dialect Codeswitching among Lower Class Socioeconomic Speakers in the Southern United States: A Sociolinguistic Study*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of South Carolina.

Motowani, P. (1991). *A Dictionary of Loanwords Usage: Katakana-English*. Maruzen.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1992). Comparing codeswitching and borrowing. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 13 (1 & 2), 19-40.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). Common and uncommon ground: Social and structural factors in codeswitching. *Language in Society*, 22, 475-503.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1995a). *Social Motivations for Codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1995b). A lexically based model of code-switching. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (ed.), *One speaker, Two languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*, 233-256. Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1997). Rational actor models and social discourse analysis. In E. R. Pedro (ed.), *Discourse Analysis*. Proceedings of the 1st international conference on discourse analysis. Lisbon: Edições Colibri and Associação Portuguesa de Linguistica.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1998a). A theoretical introduction to the Markedness Model. In C. Myers-Scotton (ed.), *Codes and Consequences: Choosing Linguistic Varieties*, 18-38. New York: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1998b). Structural uniformities vs. community differences in codeswitching. In R. Jacobson (ed.), *Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 106/Code-Switching Worldwide*, 91-108. Mouton de Gruyter.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1998c). A way of dusty death: the Matrix Language turnover hypothesis. In L. A. Grenoble & L. J. Whaley (ed.), *Endangered Languages: Language Loss and Community Response*, 289-316. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1998d). Code-switching. In F. Coulmas (ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, 217-236. Oxford: Blackwell.

Myers-Scotton, C., & Jake, J. (1995c). Matching lemmas in a bilingual language competence and production model: Evidence from intrasentential code switching. *Linguistics, 33*, 981-1024

Naval, U. C. (1989). The seed concepts constraint in code switching. *World Englishes, 8*(3), 347-363.

Nishimura, M. (1995). A functional analysis of Japanese/English code-switching. *Journal of Pragmatics, 23*, 157-181.

Nishimura, M. (1997). *Japanese/English Code-Switching Syntax and Pragmatics*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

O'Donnell, W. R., & Todd, L. (1992). *Variety in Contemporary English*. London: Routledge.

O'grady, W., Dobrovolsky, M., & Katamba, F. (1998). *Contemporary Linguistics: An Introduction*. London and New York: Longman.

Omdal, H. (1995). Attitudes towards spoken and written Norwegian. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 115*, 85-106.

Pandharipande, R. V. (1998). Is genetic connection relevant in code-switching? Evidence from South Asian languages. In R. Jacobson (ed.) *Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 106/Code-Switching Worldwide*, 201-220. Mouton de Gruyter.

Pandit, I. (1990). Grammaticality in codeswitching. In R. Jacobson (ed.), *Codeswitching as a Worldwide Phenomenon*, 33-69. New York: Peter Lang.

Pascasio, E. M. (1984). Philippine bilingualism and code Switching. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics. Special Monographic Issue, DEC 83 and June 84*, 122-134.

Pfaff, C. W. (1979). Constraints on language mixing: Intrasentential code-switching and borrowing in Spanish/ English. *Language*, 55, 291-318.

Poplack, S. (1980). 'Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español': Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistic*, 18, 581-616.

Poplack, S. (1988). Contrasting patterns of codeswitching in two communities. In M, Heller (ed.), *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 215-245. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Poplack, S., Sankoff, D., & Miller, C. (1988). The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation. *Linguistics*, 26, 47-104.

Poplack, S., Wheeler, S., & Westwood, A. (1990). Distinguishing language contact phenomena: Evidence from Finnish-English bilinguals. In R. Jacobson (ed.), *Codeswitching as a Worldwide Phenomenon*, 185-218. New York: Peter Lang.

Quackenbush, H. (1995). Mastering loan words. *Nihongojanaru*, 5, 17-22.

Rayfield, J. R. (1970). *The Languages of Bilingual Community*. The Hague: Mouton.

Rindler Schjerve, R. (1998). Codeswitching as an indicator for language shift? Evidence from Sardinian-Italian bilingualism. In R. Jacobson (ed.), *Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 106/Code-Switching Worldwide*, 221-247. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Romaine, S. (1984). *The Language of Children and Adolescents. The Acquisition of Communicative Competence*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Romaine, S. (1989). The role of children in linguistic change. In L. E. Brevik & E. H. Jahr (ed.), *The Causes of Linguistic Change: Do we know them yet?* Mouton De Gruyter.

Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ryan, E. B., Giles, H., & Sebastian, R. (1982). An integrative perspective for the study of attitudes towards language variation. In E. B. Ryan & H. Giles. (ed.), *Attitudes Toward Language Variation*, 1-19. London: Edward Arnold.

Sankoff, G. (1972). Language use in multilingual societies: Some alternative approaches. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (ed.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings, 35-51.* Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.

Sankoff, D., & Poplack, S. (1981). A formal grammar for code-switching. *Papers in Linguistics*, 14, 3-46.

Saragih, S. G. (1997). *Code-switching Amongst Simalungun-Indonesian Bilinguals*. Unpublished MA thesis.

Saunders, G. (1982). *Bilingual Children: Guidance for the Family*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters 3.

Scotton, C. M. (1976). Strategies of neutrality: language choice in uncertain situations. *Language*, 52, 919-941.

Scotton, C. M. (1983). Comment: Markedness and code choice. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 39, 119-128.

Scotton, C. M. (1988). Code-switching as indexical of social negotiation. In M. Heller, (ed.), *Codeswitching Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 151-186. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter

Scotton, C. M., & Ury, W. (1977). Bilingual strategies: the social function of codeswitching. *International Journal of the Society of Language*, 13, 5-20.

Serra, C. O. (1998). Discourse connectives in bilingual conversation: The case of an emerging Italian-French mixed code. In P. Auer (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*, 101-122. London/New York: Routledge.

Shibata, T. (1993). *Gairaigo wa nihongo o midasuka. Gairaigo: Kotoba Dokuhon*. Kawaideshoboshinsha.

Shibatani, M. (1990). *The Language of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Shin, L. (1991). Sansan no baai: Zainichi-chuugokujin-shitei no nigen-go heiyoo. *Gekkangengo*, 20(8), 88-42. Taishuukan.

Southworth, F. C. (1980). Indian Bilingualism: Some educational and linguistic implications. *Proceedings of the New York Academy of Science*, 345, 121-146

Sridhar, S. N., & Sridhar, K. (1980). The syntax and psycholinguistics of bilingual code-mixing. *Canadian Journal of Psychology, 34, 407-416.*

Suzuki, T. (1993). Gairaigo o megutte. *Gairaigo: Kotoba Dokuhon.* Kawaideshoboshinsha.

Swigart, L. (1992). Two codes or one? The insiders' view and the description of codeswitching in Dakar. In C. M. Eastman (ed.), *Codeswitching,* 83-102. Clevedon/Philadelphia/Adelaide: Multilingual Matters 89.

Tabouret-Keller, A. (1983). Switching from a Psychological point of view. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 39, 139-149.*

Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). Diglossie. *Encyclopedie de L' Alsace, 9.* Strasbourg: Publitotal.

Tanimori, M. (1998). *Handbooks of Japanese Grammar.* Chales E. Tuttle Publishing.

Treffers-Daller, J. (1992). French-Dutch codeswitching in Brussels: Social factors explaining its disappearance. In C. M. Eastman (ed.), *Codeswitching,* 143-156. Clevedon/ Philadelphia/Adelaide, Multilingual Matters 89.

Treffers-Daller, J. (1998). Variability in code-switching styles: Turkish-German code-switching patterns. In R. Jacobson (ed.), *Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 106/Code-Switching Worldwide,* 177-197. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Tsujimura, N. (1996). *An Introduction to Japanese Linguistics.* Blackwell.

Ui, H. (1985). *Nichiei Ryogo ni Okeru Gairaigo, Shakuyoogo.* Hozukishoseki.

Verhoeven, L. (1998). Sociolinguistics and education. In F. Coulmas (ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics,* 389-404. Blackwell.

Wardhaugh, R. (1992). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Williams, F. (1974). The identification of linguistic attitudes. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 3, 21-32.*

Williams, G. (1992). *Sociolinguistics: A Sociological Critique.* London: Routledge.

Willis, D. (1992). Transnational culture and the role of language: an international school and its community. *The Journal of General Education, 41, 73-95.*

Woolford, E. (1983). Bilingual code-switching and syntactic theory. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 14, 520-536.

Yamamoto, M. (1985). Nihon no Bairingaru-tachi: Ankeeto choosa ni yoru Eigo-Nihongo bairingaru no soogokankyoo koosatsu. In F. C. Peng, K. Akiyama & M. Hamada (ed.), *Shakai no Naka no Gengo: Kigo, Ningen, Kankyo no Koogo Sayo.* 161-186. Hiroshima: Bunka Hyoron Shuppan.

Yamamoto, M. (1991). *Bairingaru: Sono Jitsujoo to Mondai Ten.* Tokyo: Taishukan.

Yamamoto, M. (1995). Bilingualism in international families. In J. C. Maher & K. Yashiro (ed.), *Multilingual Japan*, 63-86. Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Yashiro, K. (1995a). The Right to Speak: Language Maintenance in Japan. In J. C. Maher & G. Macdonald (ed.), *Diversity in Japanese Culture and Language, 227-248.* Kegan Paul International: London/New York.

Yashiro, K. (1995b). Japan's Returnees. In J. C. Maher & K, Yashiro (ed)., *Multilingual Japan*, 139-164. Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Yoon, K. K. (1996). A case study of fluent Korean-English bilingual speakers: Group membership and code choices. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(3), 395-407.

Appendix 1 Questionnaire Form

Name:

1. Please circle which age you are in : (20-25, 26-30, 31-35, 36-40, 41-45, 46-50, 51-55, 55-60, 60-)
2. Gender: (Male, Female)
3. Please circle and fill out appropriate section: (a. Student   b. Working,   c. Home maker   d. other)

   a. Student
   - Type of course/degree

   - Which year of study?

   b. Working
   - What is your occupation?

   - What duty does your job entail?

4. How long have you been in Australia?

5. Have you been to any other English-speaking countries? If so, for how long, and at which age?

6. At which age did you start learning English? And at what type of institution did you begin your studies of the English language? (e.g. primary school, high school, language school)

7. Have you taken any English examinations (e.g. TOEIC, STEP)?

8. During the course of your day, under which circumstances, and to whom, do you speak English?

9. How would you rate your ability in English? Please check (√) one.

English	Natives	Near-Native	Good	Fair	Poor
9.1. Speaking					
9.2. Understanding					
9.3. Reading					
9.4. Writing					

258

```
Appendix 1 Questionnaire Form
```

Circle the best description for each statement about English and Japanese.
Key: SA = strongly agree
     A = somewhat agree
     A/D = agree and not agree
     D = somewhat not agree
     SD = strongly disagree

1.1. I like hearing English spoken .... (SA A A/D D SD)
1.2. I prefer to watch the TV News in English rather than in Japanese....(SA A A/D D SD)
1.3. English is essential in order to take part fully in life......................... (SA A A/D D SD)
1.4. I like talking in English.. (SA A A/D D SD)
1.5. There are more useful languages to learn than English.....................(SA A A/D D SD)
1.6. English is a language worth leaning... (SA A A/D D SD)
1.7. English is useful for talking about studies/work .... (SA A A/D D SD)
1.8. English is useful for expressing my feelings .... (SA A A/D D SD)
1.9. English is useful for corresponding with my best friend .... (SA A A/D D SD)
1.10. English has no place in the modern world .... (SA A A/D D SD)
1.11. We need to perfect English .... (SA A A/D D SD)
1.12. I prefer to be spoken to in English.. (SA A A/D D SD)
1.13. If I have children, I would like them to be English speaking........... (SA A A/D D SD)
1.14. I would like to marry an English speaker...(SA A A/D D SD)
1.15. English language is no longer important...................................... (SA A A/D D SD)
1.1. I like hearing Japanese spoken.. (SA A A/D D SD)
1.2. I prefer to watch the TV News in Japanese rather than in English... (SA A A/D D SD)
1.3. Japanese is essential in order to take part fully in life......................(SA A A/D D SD)
1.4. I like talking in Japanese..(SA A A/D D SD)
1.5. There are more useful languages to learn than Japanese...................(SA A A/D D SD)
1.6. Japanese is a language worth learning...(SA A A/D D SD)
1.7. Japanese is useful for talking about studies/work ....(SA A A/D D SD)
1.8. Japanese is useful for expressing my feelings ....(SA A A/D D SD)
1.9. Japanese is useful for corresponding with my best friend.................(SA A A/D D SD)
1.10. Japanese has no place in the modern world....................................(SA A A/D D SD)
1.11. We need to perfect Japanese ....(SA A A/D D SD)
1.12. I prefer to be spoken to in Japanese..(SA A A/D D SD)
1.13. If I have children, I would like them to speak Japanese only........... (SA A A/D D SD)
1.14. I would like to marry a Japanese speaker...(SA A A/D D SD)
1.15. Japanese language is no longer important...(SA A A/D D SD)

Appendix 1 Questionnaire Form

How **important** or **unimportant** do you think the English language is for people to do the following? There are no right or wrong answers.

	'Important'	'Not so important'	'Relatively unimportant'	'Unimportant'

FOR PEOPLE TO:

1. To make friends

2. To earn plenty of money

3. Read

4. Write

5. Get a job

6. Become smarter

7. Go shopping

8. Be accepted in the community

9. Talk to people out of university/working

10. To do business overseas

Appendix 2 Transcription

PAIR 1 (speaker A & B)

TOPIC 1: STUDY
Passage 1
6.A: Obachan toka yoku yatteta mon. Aa.... obachan.
7.B: Kurasumeito desho?
8.A: "Soo soo koko ga **important** dawa" tte "**exam, exam**" tte itsumo sen
hiiteru none.

Translation
6.A: The lady often did it. And she .....
7.B: She is our class mate, isn't she?
8.A: She said "That's it. This is **important**". She also said "**exam,
exam**" and underlined it.

Passage 2
11.B: Demo [lecturer's name] no baai wa "Koko wa **important**" tte,
ano hito yukkuri shaberu desho? Ano hito no eigo madamashi
[lecturer's name] ni kurabetara [lecturer's name] tte nani
itteru ka wakarai mon.
12.A: Nanka **stuck** shiteruyoo ni shaberu kara, kocchi shabbeta to
omottara kochhi shabette demo kuesuchon sugoku muzukashii
no tsukuru naa.
13.B: Are sa, **answer** jitai wa sugoku shinpuru dato omoo noyo.
14.A: Soonano?
15.B: **Answer** wa "Kore nandeshoo" tte ieba iinoni "Nantoka nantoka"
tte iuunda yone. Ueno sa gobun no yon gurai wa zenbu imi
no nai **general information** ga kaite atte saigo ni **question**
toka tte dakara kono mae no gobun no yon wa nankanee mitai
na...
16.A: Datte ushiro no hoono sa juuichi peegi kara juuyon peegi no sa
17.B: Aredatte **manual** ni atta yone. Dakara tte kanji yone. Wakarahen
tte kanji.

Translation
11.B: But [lecturer's name] speaks slowly and says "This is
important", doesn't he? I can understand his English better
than [lecturer's name]. I often don't understand what he's
talking about.
12.A: When he speaks, he always gets **stuck** and switches to other
things. Besides, he makes very difficult questions.
13.B: The **answer** for these questions are quite simple though.
14.A: Is it?
15.B: He doesn't give us an **answer** straight away. Most of his
explanation is meaningless and rather **general information**.
The **question** appears right at the end. I don't see any point of
that long explanation.
16.A: Yeah, they are from page eleven to fourteen.
17.B: They are in the **manual**, aren't they? They don't help me to
understand.

Passage 3
21.B: Ano **manual** imi nai yone.
22.A: Iminai yone.
23.B: Arette **complicated** ni shitaindayo. Watashira no koto **confuse**
sasetai nda. Mukatsukuu. **Assignment** datte roku peegi ka nana

peegi gurai atte sa imi nai yone.
24.A: Imi nai yone.
25.B: Demo ne, **question** zitai wa nanika, watashi no tomodachi wa
itteta kedo "Sugee **simple** dayo" tte itte. Puroguramu zitai wa
moshi shinpuru ni kakeba 'A kore wa yaranakya ikenai' to iuno ga
seito ni wakaru no, seito ni. Dakara 'Wakkatta' tte itte sore
o suttepu hunde yatte iku kedo nani o shitara iika saisho ni
wakaranai kara, ano **question** no imi ga...

Translation
21.B: That **manual** is hopeless.
22.A: Hopeless.
23.B: That makes everything **complicated**. It wants to make us
confused. Terrible! We had an **assignment** which six or seven
pages. Nonsense!
24.A: Nonsense!
25.B: The **question** itself is.... Actually, friend of mine said
"Pretty **simple**". If program was written in a simple way, the
students would understand exactly what they have to do, step
by step. Because we don't understand the **question**, it's
difficult to know which part we have to do first.

Passage 4
31.B: Sonde sa, nanka **open book** ni kawatta kara, nanka **questionnaries**
ga kawatta? Mae wa konna ni muzukashiku nakatta to omoo kedo.
Demo **open book** demo iminai yone. Watashi ne **open book** kiraida
yo. **Open book** tte itte mo jikan naishi sa, yokei tsukarechatta.

Translation
31.B: The **questionnaires** might be changed because it has been
changed to an **open book**. I don't think **open book** was difficult
like this. I don't like the **open book** system. Nonsense. I
always run out of time and get tired because of the **open book**
system.

Passage 5
35.B: De benkyoo doo? Nan **semester** me korede?
36.A: Eeeto ne. Ni **semester**, san **semester**, Att, chigau. Ninenme ni
naru nokana.
37.B: Ja kore foo **semester**? Foo **semester** dattara wakaru yone.
38.A: Watashi (institution's name) kara kiteru kara. (institution's
name) tte ittara **foundation course** mitai nano. Ichioo **under
graduate** no ichi nennkan issho nandakedo yappari gakuhi mo
zenzen chigaushi.
39.B: Takai no?
40.A: Yasui no.
41.B: Att honto.
42.A: (The institution's name) no hooga yasui no. Demo asoko **diploma**.
43.B: Aa asoko **foundation** dakara desho? Iine watashi mo soouuno
yatte okeba yokatta.
44.A: Isshoda to omoo yo. Arekisandaa desho?
45.B: Un **college**. Demo are wa sono **foundation** no .. sooda ne.
46.A: **Diploma** ga torerundesho?
47.B: **Diploma** ga torerundakedo watashi diploma wa totte nai no
watashi. Ichi **semester** shika yatte nakutte, de sono ichi
semester toranakutemo yokatta ndakedo, demo are yatte sugoku
yokatta yo. Arega atte, are ga nakattara kokode **stuck** shiteta
yo. Kotoshi no semester de zenbu otoshitetato omoo. Dattesa
ano soouu chishiki ga nakattara doouuhuu ni yatte ittara
iika wakaranakattara, demo watashi ne soko de **diplom** totte
kotoshi no ichinenkan yareba yokatta to omotte soshitara motto

wakatteta to omou. Demo sono **semester** dake demo sugoi **helpful** de yokatta.

Translation

35.B: So, how's your study going? Which **semester** is this for you?

36.A: Ah.. the second **semester**, the third **semester**, no, this is the second year.

37.B: Then, is this the fourth **semester**? (You) must understand everything, because this is fourth **semester** (for you).

38.A: I'm actually from Edith Claremont, like **foundation course**. This is also **under graduate**, but the tuition fee is different.

39.B: Is it expensive?

40.A: It's cheaper.

41.B: 'Oh, really.

42.A: The course at (institution's name) is cheaper, but **diploma....**

43.B: Ah, because it's **foundation** that's why it's cheaper. That's good. I should have done the course.

44.A: I think its similar to (institution's name). You have studied at (institution's name), haven't you?

45.B: Yeah, the **college**, but that is **foundation**.

46.A: You can get a **diploma** if you complete it, can't you?

47.B: I could get a **diploma**, but I didn't. I just took one **semester**, and actually, I didn't have to take it. Taking the semester was good for me. Otherwise I would have become **stuck** on the study I am doing now. I would have failed all my subjects this **semester** if I didn't have this knowledge I wouldn't know haw to deal with it. I regret that I did not take the **diploma**, if I did, I would have understood even more. Any way, taking that **semester** was really **helpful** for the studying I am doing now.

Passage 6

57.B: Chotto han'i ga hiroi yone. Toku ni [lecturer's name] ga **complicated**. Mata [lecturer's name] no hanashi shiteru yo. Kirainanda yone. Watashi [lecturer's name] no koto ga.

58.A: Honto.

59.B: Yappari ato otagai hataraiteru jan, sore kitsui ne. Dattte **control** dekinaikara sa. Watashi wa muri itte **exam** no toki, nantoka jikan tsukutte yasumasete moratteru kedo.

Translation

57.B: That (unit) covers too much ground [lecturer's name] makes it **complicated**. We are talking about him again. I don't like him.

58.A: That's right.

59.B: Besides we work. It's hard, because we can't **control** it, although I ask them if I can have a day off when I have an **exam**.

Passage 7

72.A: Moo chotto rai **semester** yatte mitee...

73.B: Watashi rai **semester** wa chottoo... Moo sandome no shoojiki de watashi imakara nihon ni kaette hon, siryoo mite junbi shite okoo to ...

74.A: Erai.

75.B: C++ mata toru kara arette **advanced** dakara [another lecturer's name] jan, [lecturer's name] ja nakatta mitai. Mata [lecturer's name] dayo. [Another lecturer's name] zenzen **helpful** janaishi ano hito hon yonde irudakejan. **Lecture note** yonderudakede sa, nani mo oshiete kurenai kara mata [lecturer's name] to onaji de jibun hitori de yaranakya naranai jan. Soredattara chanto **well organized** shite konkai

kaette nihon de shiryoo atsumete ato daata sutorakuchaa mo
yaranakya naranai shi. Yappari konpuuta **science** de 'data
structure' yarazu ni owacchau, **course** owacchau to mottainai to
omookara ne.

Translation
72.A: Why don't you try next **semester**?
73.B: I'm not sure about next **semester**. I'm thinking I might go to
Japan and check some materials for further study.
74.A: Good for you!
75.B: I'm going to take C++. That's **advanced** and [lecturer's name]
will be with us not [another lecturer's name]. Again we are
talking about him. [lecturer's name] is not **helpful** at all.
He just reads books or **lecture note**, and teaches nothing.
We'll just have to study ourselves, like before.
I'm planning to go to Japan to get materials so that I can be
well organized. I'll actually take 'Data structure'. I think
it is pointless to study computer **science** in the **course**,
without studying 'Data structure'.

Passage 8
81.B: Watashi konkai wa **disappointed** datta karane. **So disappointed**.
Andake ganbatte watashi sugoku ganbatta to omoonda kedo
daigaku ni zutto tomatteta monne.

Translation
81.B: I was **disappointed, so disappointed** about this (semester),
even though I did my best. I really studied hard I think.
I actually stayed over several times at the university.

Passage 9
87.B: Kurasumeeto wa nanka, koo yatte **planning** o kangaeruno ga sugoi
ii toka itte, **pranning** o kangaeruno ga suki de sore o zutto
shite itte jikkoo shita ato no tasseikan mitai nano ga sugoi
suki datoka itteta kedo, sugoku yoku wakarun dakedo mazu
planning o hajimeru made ni hajimerarenain dayone.
Yaranakya ikenain dayone. Demotte itte sorede....

Translation
87.B: ....my classmate said that she likes to think **planning** ahead,
it's such a nice feeling after this **planning** has been
accomplished. I understand the feeling, but it's a bit hard to
begin this **planning**, even I know that I have to.

Passage 10
95.B: Watashi ga hatarai te iru jikan ni karera wa eiga o mini
ittetari toka **relaxation** nanda yone. Demo watashi mo hataraku
koto wa iyaja nai kara sugoi rirakkusu shite yatterushi
sukina yooni yarasete moratteru dakara hakkiri itte sore mo
rirakkusu to ieba rirakkusu to ierundakedo ne.
Ma toku ni **assignment** toka **exam** no toki wa taihendakedo konkai
ippai yasunda ne dakedomo sorede kokomade yatte dekinakatta
kara sugoi **disappointed**. Sugoi tsuraku nai? Yattemo
wakaranainotte.
96.A: Un tsurai.
97.B: Sore ni kurasumeete toka ni setsumei shite morau to wakaru
jan? De nande wakaruno tte kikitai yone.
98.A: Soodayone. Hotondo no hito ga wakatteru yone. Watashi minna ni
kita none saigo no tokino konpuutaa rabo ni nichiyoobi toka ni,
onna no hito ni, minna iru none. Kiite mitara minna wakatte iru
none.

99.B: Demo doko de oshiete moratteru no. Demo ano hitotachi onaji
semester no tomodachitoka ni minna kiiteru karane. Onaji
semester no tomodachi toka ni kiite mattaku isshodato
nettwaakingu nanka. Zenkai to ninzuu ga chigau kurai de
assignment no naiyoo. Tsurai ne. Nihon no daigaku no benkyoo
to chigau yone.

Translation
95.B: They enjoy going to see a film for **relaxation** while I work. I
don't mind working because I feel relaxed during my work, so
perhaps working is a way of making relax, instead of going to
see films. But it's hard if I have to finish my **assignment**,
and especially before my **exams**. During the last semester, I
often took a day off for my study. I tried doing my best,
but I could not get a good result. I'm so **disappointed**. Even
if you work hard, often you still don't understand them, don't
you feel sad?
96.A: Of course, yes.
97.B: If a classmate explains to me something that I don't
understand, then I can understand. But I'm wondering why they
understand, and I don't.
98.A: That's right. Most of our classmates are able to understand. I
actually asked the students if they understood every thing we
did in the computer lab on the very last day. I found that all
of them understood.
99.B: I wonder how they do it. They seem to get information about
the unit of this **semester** from their friends who have taken
the same **semester**, I've heard that the content of the
assignment is the same as the last one, like "networking". One
thing that is different is the size of class, but the rest is
the same. Anyway it's hard. Studying at university here is
different from studying at a Japanese university, isn't it?

Passage 11
107.B: ...Moo yoginaku otoshite sore de **average** mo nai yoona monda
monme. Demo taitei **average** moo hotondo no seito nanka **average**
ki ni shiteru no.
108.A: Att, soo nano?
109.B: Un minna **average**, moo dakara **assignment** kaette kita
shunkan ni moo **average**. Sono **semester** no **average** ikuraka toka
sugoi ki ni shite itten demo sugoku ki ni shite watashi no
average wa ikuradakara toka itteru kara moo sonna no
dashitaku nai yo to omotte. **Exam** no kekka wa shiritai ne.
Hayaku shiritai ne.

Translation
107.B: .....marking is very strict, so it's hard to even get an
average. Most students are really concerned about the
average, always **average**.
108.A: Is that right?
109.B: Yeah, everyone concerned about **average**. when they get their
assignment back, they think about **average** straight away. They
also worry about the **semester average**, so every one point is
very important to them. I don't want to know **average**, but I
want to know my **exam** result. Don't you want to know?

Passage 12
119.B: ....Sonoten yondai wa sannenkan kurai wa toriaezu asoberu
kara sankaisei de shuushoku katsudoo shiteru kara, are dakedo
at lease two years wa ano jiyuu ni shiteru kara minna baito
shitari toka kaigai ryokoo toka ittari shiteru kara.

120.A: Aaa honto.
121.B: Daigaku no benkyoo ga owatte shigoto ni hairu to seikatsu ga
mattaku kawaru kara sono daigakujidai de rirakkusu sore ni
kurabete kocchi no benkyoo wa areda yone.
122.A: Haado da yone.
123.B: **Hard** da yone. Shigoto ni haitta hoo ga to iuka benkyoo
shiteiru noto mattaku chigatte.

Translation
119.B: .....the four year post graduate students usually start
looking for a job in their third year. So they have a lot of
free time, **at least two years**. Most students work in a part
time job or go abroad during that period.
120.A: Really?
121.B: Their life style totally changes once they start work, it
becomes really hard, so I think this is a precious time for
the university students in their life. In contrast, studying
at university here is what can I say?
122.A: It's hard.
123.B: It's **hard**...

Passage 13
124.A: **Work experience** o hitsuyoo to suru desho? Kocchi no hito
minna itteta none. Daigakuo sotsugyoo shitahito tte **work
experience** nai jan? Detabakkaride ano **requirement** ni kaite atta
no, 'detabakari de wakai **experience** o motte iru hito boshuu'
tte kaite atta no.
125.B: Eee, shinjirareni wane. Dakara watashi nihon de hataraitakara
sore ni kocchi ni kite mo ichioo nihon de hataraita tte iu
shooko sae areba sore wa **work experience** ni narukara
minna watashi no tomodachitoka sa "Anata wa **work
experience** ga arukara iiyone" tte "Korekara wa" tte iu no.
Demo sa nihon de ikko no kaisha de nagaku tsutometara sorede
nanbo tte kanjida yone. Dakara ippai ippai **work experience**
ga arukara dakara tte **advantage** ni naruwakeja nai yone.
Maa naiyori wa iikedo ne. Sono kaishajitai doouu kaisha ni
haitta ka sono jiten ni mo yoru kedo. Demo doonaru nokana
korekara. Watashi moo nihon dewa sumenai yoona ki ga suru.
Yabaina, mata onaji kaisha ni hairu tte iunomo iyadashi kato
itte nanika mi ni tsuita? Watashi nanika mi ni tsuitato wa
omowanai. Dakedo eigo datte maeyori zenzen ii to omoo shi, de
iroirona keiken mo dekite sugoi yokatta. Koko deno seikatsu
wa **satisfied** nanda kedo yappari benkyoo de mada mi ni tsuite
nai ippai wakaranai koto ga mada ippai aru mon. Yunitto owatta
tokoro de wakannai mon, wakattetara kyuujuu paasento datte
hyaku paasento toreru ja nai. Sooja nainda mon. Ii yone,
networking nanka ga are yattara sa minna networking kumetari
dekitari toka shitara sugoi yone. Annan ja wakannai mon.
126.A: Demo are wa **half**, e? **half** gurai ja nai no. Tsugi no **semester**
ni arukara.

Translation
124.A: **Work experience** is required, isn't it? Every one here says
that. A person who has just finished has no **work experience**,
has he? In one advertisement, the **requirement** was that the
person should be young, have just completed a university
degree, and have (work) **experience**.
125.B: That's unbelievable. I have often been told by my friends
that I'm lucky because I have **work experience** in Japan, and
it's going to be useful in the future. But only long term
work in a specific country can really be considered as useful

work **experience**, don't you think? It's not going to be an **advantage** in getting a job just because you have a lot of **work experience**. Of course it's better them nothing. It also depends on which company you have worked at. I'm wondering what will happen to me in the future. I don't think I can enjoy life in Japan anymore. I might be in trouble. I don't want to go back to the company I worked before, but ... Do you think you have learnt something ? I don't feel like I have learnt anything. But I think my English has improved and I have experienced many things. I'm **satisfied** with life here, but I still don't understand many things in our course of study. If I did understand it, I could have got 90% or even 100%. If "networking" makes it possible then, it's going to be great, isn't it. But I have difficulty in understanding it.

126.A: But it is **half, half**. The unit is on again next **semester**, so...

Passage 14

130.B: ...E? demo **stream** arenanjani no, (her interlocutor's name) chan programing nanja nai no? Soreni...watashi ikko dakena no **elective** toru no, are **elective** janai?

131.A: Soo soo soo, demo watashi kooiuno ni sorosoro toriagenakya ikenaindakedo mada anmari tottenai. Itsumo hotondo ga **elective** de...

132.B: Aaa totteruno nanko **elective** toreruno?

133.A: E? kekkoo sannenkan no uchini gorokko torerun janai kana.

134.B: **Elective** ga? Soonanda, demo watashi wa omookedo ne, networking yattoitahoo ga iito omoo yo. Mini tsukeba nanka wakareba sugoi omoshiroito omoo.

135.A: Soo soo soo, are wa shokugyoo ga aru. Shoku ga aru to omoo wa.

Translation

130.B: Your **stream** is that, your..., programming, isn't it? and ..., I'm going to take just one **elective**. It's called **elective**, isn't it?

131.A: Yes, that's right. Actually, I have to take something else sooner or later, because I've almost only taken **elective** units, and not enough of the others.

132.B: Oh, you have taken elective! How many **electives** can you take?

133.A: Ee? I think you can take five or six during the three years.

134.B: **Elective**? can we? I see, but I think you should take "net working". If you can manage to understand it, then it will be very interesting.

135.A: I think so. I think you can get a job if you understand it.

Passage 15

136.B: Watashi wa networking no **assignment** ga warukatta kara sa, bikkuri shicchata yo.

137.A: Minna onajiyoo ni are jan, yoku comento ga nakattari yoku tensuu no sa, kooyu koto ga nanten te iuno o mitemitara, watashi no **advantage** toka soo iuno kaitenaikoto ga atta none.

138.B: Ten ga nakattarisuruno sugoi ten no haibun ga **unfair** dayone. Aredake chikara irete nakami wa atterunoni sorede purezenteeshon ikuratoka 'E? nannano purezenteeshon iruno? wakareba iijanai no' toka omottesa. Dakara sensei ni yotte soiu tokoro no point osaenai to ikenai yone benkyoo surunoni.

139.A: Soo, ano, watashi CIM no benkyoo no konpuutaa no **specification** ga atte watashi no **assignment** ga usuppera de

dashita none. Soshitara chigau tomodachi wa konnafuu ni atsui
none. 'Iya sonna ni yattenaiyo' tte omotte asetta asetta. Sono
tomodachi wa '**specificaiton**' mo irunda tte iu none.
140.B: Att, demo sore wa **assignment** no hooniwa kaite arundesho?
141.A: Ichioo nantonaku watashi no **specification** no haaku no
tsukaikata ga warukattato omoo no. Ichioo kaiteirukotowa
kaiteiru no '**specify**' microprocessor toka cache toka soo
iunode keisan tte iuno omoshiroi kakikata shitetakara
watashi no kaita hooga iinokana to omottandakedo, kekkyoku
watashi ga tottano wa **assignment** ichi no nanajuu-go
paasento.
142.B: Yokattandesho?
143.A: **Ninety percent.**
144.B: Dakara wakannai yone. Nanio **lecturerr** ga motometeirunoka
dakara yappari tomodachi kankei tte hitsuyooda yone. Datte
neitibu wa tomodachi maeno **semester** de kore tottanda yo,
tokaitte tomodachi **assignment** no shiryoo morattari toka kono
sensei wa **exam** de konna kanjide dasutoka, sooiu joohoo ga get
dekirukedo watashi wa sooiuno ga nainjanai? Wakannai
wakejanai.
145.A: Uuun, soo soo.
146.B: Toku ni betsu ni nihonjinja nakutemo iikedo sa, **Aussie** toka
sonna takusan tomodachi inai jan, ma irukana?
147.A: Ee, watashi anmari inaiyo gakkoo ni. Nakanaka tomodachi ga
tsukurenai mon gakkoo de.
148.B: Ato sugoi naka no ii tomodachi ga mae no **semester** de
yattetatoka souiu joohoo get dekiru kedo neitibu no kotachi
mo soo iu takusan joohoomoo ga aruto omoo daigakunonaka ni
aru yone.
149.A: Un.
150.B: Watachitachi wa mattaku nai yone. Dakara kooiu tokoro ni
lecturer ga point o oitte ten o tsukeru toka sooiu joohoo ga
naikara yokei ten ga torenai yone.
151.A: Yappari kocchi ni kitara tomodachi ippai tsukutte saa.
152.B: Demo daigakuno benkyoo tte **individual** dakara sa. Nakanaka
tomodachi tsukuruno tte muzukashii yone.
153.A: Demo iru jan.

Translation
136.B: I was shocked by the result I got for my **assignment** in "net
working".
137.A: This happens often, there are no comments (on the
assignment). When I looked at it, I realized that there were
no marks for the section on "**advantage**".
138.B: That's very **unfair**, isn't it? For example, I worked very hard
in the content of the assignment, but I could not get a good
mark for my presentation. It is important to find out what
kind of things a lecturer likes to emphasise, isn't it?
139.A: That's true. I had an **assignment** on computer **specification**
of CIM. Since I didn't know how much I had to on
"**specification**". I thought it was not really necessary. When
I saw the thick assignment of my friend, I was so upset.
140.B: But you did it in your **assignment**, didn't you?
141.A: Yes, perhaps my understanding of "**specification**" was not good
enough. It was written in a strange way "**specify**"
microprocessor or cache. I thought I did well, but I only got
75% for **assignment** one.
142.B: On the whole you got quite a good result, didn't you?
143.A: **Ninety per cent.**

144.B: We often don't know what **lecturers** expect from us, so we need
good friends. Natives have friends who tell them which unit
they took the last **semester**, and give them information about
the **assignment** and the **exam**. Natives can obtain that type of
information. But we can't, can we? We can't get that sort of
information.
145.A: Yeah, that's right.
146.B: It's especially because we don't have enough friends, both
Japanese and **Aussie.** I wonder if I have some friends.
147.A: Ee? I don't have many university friends. It's difficult to
make friends at university.
148.B: Besides, if you have close friends who have taken the same
units during the last **semester**, then you can get useful
information from them. I think natives have developed that
kind of networking within the university.
149.A: That's right.
150.B: We don't have it at all. We also don't have information about
what kind of things a **lecturer** wants. That's why we have so
much difficulty in getting better marks, don't we?
151.A: We should make many friends here...
152.B: But studying at university is an **individual** thing, so it's
rather difficult to make friends.
153.A: You've already got friends.

TOPIC 2: The year 2000

Passage 1
7.A: Kowaine.Datte hora nyuusu tokanimo iroiro deteda jan.JNN nyuusu
nimo kaite attayooni nisen-nen ni kitara conpuutaa ga
kowarechau tte nankano tsukurika nanka de.
8.B: Are doo iu sisutemu ni natteiruka shitteru?
9.A: Aredesho, ano, bitto ga nandakke, are? Ikinari iwareru to
confuse shite shimau.
10.B: Soo, ano **date** ga kankei shiteite..
11.A: Soo soo soo, **thank you.** yon-keta no yatsu de ni-keta ni
kaeteru yatsudakara imadani nisen-nen ni kitara zero zero ni
natte maeno **date** ni modotte shimaukara sono **data** ga zenbu
kieteshimautte iu software dakedato iuhuu ni hoka no hito mo
iundakedo, hoka no hito wa haadouea mo kakatte kurukara.
Haadouea ni kakatte kuru to zenbu tomacchautte iu jan.
12.B: Konpuutaa dakeja nainda yone. Konpuutaa wa jeneraru
shitamonode denkaseihin de **date** ga haitte iruno wa zenbu
embedded system tte naka ni kumikomarete naizco ni natte sore
ga erebeetaa toka jidoo no manshon no jidootobira moshi **date**
toka kumikomaretari toka spurinkuraa toka sooiuno mo jikan
toka hinichi ni yotte imano jikan ni tsukeru yooni to iuhuu
ni **embedded system** no naka ni kumikomarete irumono wa subete
soodakara kuukoo tokasa are mo soodato ano... **traffic light,**
shingoo mo soodashi naka ni kumikomarete irukara.
13.A: Ano denki no yatsu mo soonandesho? Ano denkigaisha no yatsu,
dakara denkigaisha jitai ga tomatte shimaukara nanmo
dekinaishi.
14.B: Soo toriaezu naka ni moo sono **date system, ambedded system** ga
naka ni haitte irumono wa subete soonanda yone. Dakara hontoo
ni conpuutaa dakeja nakutte ningen ga kangaerareru han'i de
koko wa kore haitte iru kara naosanakya naranaitte iunde
hitotsuzutsu imamade nannenka de naoshite kite mochiron
daigakutoka **government** toka sooiu tokoro no **organisation** no
conpuutaa toka mo **fix up** sareterun dakedo demo doko ni
irerarete iruka kizuite inai kasho toka mo arushi, ato

chuushookigyoo toka, so iu mono ni okane o kakeru **budget**
ga nai kurai no lebel no chuusyookigyoo toka no kaisha toka
mo nanmo shinakattari surukara mada chuugata no kigyoo wa
chan to yatte iru to omoo kedo....

Translation

7.A: Scarely. I've heard it being talked about on the news (the
millenium bug). JNN says that the computer is going to be
destroyed in the year 2000, due to the system...

8.B: Do you know about the system?

9.A: That is, ah... bit... what? ah, I got **confused** because you
asked suddenly.

10.B: It relates to the **date**...

11.A: That's right. **Thank you.** The **date** is normally supposed to be
four figures, but it was changed into two figures, so when the
year 2000 comes up all of the **data** is destroyed. Some say it
will only affect software, but others say it will also affect
the hardware. It means that most of the system is going to be
disturbed.

12.B: It's not only the computer, but also some apppliances which
involve the date and contain an **embedded system.** For example,
elavators or the automatic doors of a flat, or anything on
which you can set the **date** or time in an **embedded system** so
that it will work at a certain time or date, like at the air
port and ah.. **traffic light.** They also contain (an embedded
system).

13.A: It includes the electric company, is that right? The electric
company itself can stop and then we are going to be in
trouble...

14.B: That's right. Anything containing a **data system** or **embedded
system** is going to be effected. Actually, several things have
been **fixed up,** one by one, including the computors in the
government and **organisation.** But still, many things haven't
been fixed up, because we don't know about all the items which
are contained in the system. And also, small scale companies
have only a small **budget** for doing such things. Middle scale
companies can afford to do it, I think....

Passage 2

20.B: ....Kocchi ni kitemite hokano ajia no kuni no kotachi ga sugoi
benkyoo shiteiruno ga sugoi **impressive** datta. Ano, **impressive**
datta none. Nihon igai no ajia no kunitte nanka hokano kunitte
kanjide..... Watashi ga atta imamade no **Indonesian** no ko toka
sonohoka no ajia no kotachi nanka saki no shoorai no koto
toka kuni no koto toka seijikeizai no koto toka nihonjin nanka
yori mo sugoku yoku shitte irushi, toku ni ajia no ko
dakeja nakutte **western culture** demo shoogakkoo no ko datte
kuni no koto shitte iru jan, demo nihonjin nante minna
shiranai noga, toku ni onnanoko toka shiranai noga toozen
mitai na kanji de amari kinishitenai tte iuka 'sore nani?'
toka shiranaikotoga oosugiru. Sorette yokunaitte omou. Minna
wakatte irundamon kunino kototoka kuniga ima doo natte
irunoka. Tada jibun ni doo kakatte kiteru toka, tatoeba
shoohizei ga go-paasento, nana paasento, ju-ppaasento ni
natta toka, soo iu hanashi, soo iu jibun ni kakatte kurukara
sore ni biggu na mondai dakara terebi demo nyuusu demo
yatterushi, sore wa **global** de shitte irundakedo, sono hoka no
koto wa seiji toka ga doo natte irutoka...

21.A: Aaa... anmari ki ni shitenai.

22.B: Mattaku doodemo ii tte kanji janai? Nihon dewa. Demo sorette
hontoo wa yoku nainda yone.

23.A: Sooda yone.
24.B: Watashi no shitte iru tomodachi no ajia no kotachi wa zenbu
shitteru yo. Kuni de ima seiji ga dooiu huu ni ugoite iru toka
finance no kototoka. Ima nihon no jinkoo ga nanninka shitteru?
Shitteru hito ga nannin iru to omoo? Shiranaidesho?
25.A: Watashi shiranai ne.
26.B: Shiranaidesho, ima choodo **one hundred thirty four million** toka
nihon no soojinkoo ga.

Translation
20.B: ...Since I came here, I've noticed that Asian students study
very hard, it is so **impressive** to me, really **impressive.**
Before I came here I didn't know much about Asian people, or
give any attention to Asian countries. The **Indonesian** and
other Asian students I've seen so far seem really concerned
about their future, and the politics and economics of their
country, much more than Japanese people are. Even school
children in **Western culture**s know quite a bit their country.
I've noticed that Japanese people, especially young girls,
don't know anything, and they don't realize how ignorant they
are. I feel so bad. Other people know about what's going on in
their country. Japanese are interested only in those things
which directly affect their daily life, like comsumption tax,
because it is usually a controversal and **global** issue on TV,
or in the newspaper. But people don't know much about anything
else, like politics....
21.A: Yeah, we don't care much.
22.B: Not at all, in Japan, do we? That's really sad.
23.A: I agree with you.
24.B: My Asian friends know about everything, like politics in their
country, and **finance.** Japanese people don't even know about
thing like population numbers. Do you know what the population
is? What do you think, how many Japanese people know what the
population of their country is. Do you know the Japanese
population?
25.A: I don't know.
26.B: You don't know. **One hundred and thirty four million**, that's
the total Japanese population now.

Passage 3
42.B: **Corruption** dakedo hokano ajia no kuni datte motto minna
corruption de tai mo soudashi, un de mo generaru ni itte
watashi ga kanjita nowa hoka no kuni no kotachi wa nihnonjin
yori mo seijikeizai no koto o generaru ni yoku shitte iru to
omotta, de kandoo shita.
43.A: Watashi no Indonesian no tomodachi wa yoku shitte irunone, to
iunowa Indonesia ga sugoi kitanaikara. Moo seiji jitai ga
okashii karatte yoku shitte iru none. Sono hito wa **Indonesian
Chinese** dakara shiroi none, **skin** ga. Dakara hontoo ni soko ni
itara mazu korosaresoo ni nattari toka, sore dakara sono
jootai o nantoka shitai tte ima tsuyoindakedo demo....
44.B: Nanmo dekinaikara ne. Moo..
45.A: Soredakara kanashinde irundakedo, nihon tte senshinkoku ni
haiite irukara ichioo ajia no nakademo. Dakara amerika toka
demo, ano hora keizai toka dootoo ni hariatte iru kara.
   ` Sokomade leberu ga antei dekite naikara sorede minna ga huan
shiteiru noga yoku wakaru none. Ajia no hitotachi no naka de.
46.B: Sore ni karera mo tai mo sooda yo. **Corrupt** damon.
47.A: Seijikeizai tte yokunai are wa zettai naihoo ga iito omoo.
48.B: Demo **government** ga nakereba kuni wa ugoite ikanai yo.

Translation

42.B: **Corruption** is not only occuring here in the (Indonesian government), but also **corruption** in other Asian countries, like Thai land. Generally speaking, young people from other countries know quite a lot about politics and economics, more than Japanese people. I was impressed by this fact.

43.A: My Indonesian friend thinks that the Indonesian government is untrustworthy, and the poliitics in Indonesia is corrupt. Since this person is **Indonesian Chinese**, and has got light **skin**, (she) could be killed if she were over there. She has a strong will to change that condition though....

44.B: She can do nothing about it...

45.A: That's why she feels so sad. Japan is an advanced country among other Asian countries, so Japan can compete economically with America. In contrast, most Asian countries are not economically stable, and for this reason the people hold a lot of anxiety, I think.

46.B: Including Thai land, It's government is **corrupt**.

47.A: I think if politics and economics didn't exist, everything would be much better.

48.B: But countries can not continue if there is no **government.**

Passage 4

58.B: Nihon eno kiboo. Unnn, kiboo tte iuka, motto minna ga kiki o kanjite hokano kuni nimo me o mukeru bekidato omoo. De sore mo tokutei no hito janakutte, wakai hitotach minna, kocchi ni kite watashi wa sore ni kizuitakara watashi mo so iu huu ni naritai to omoo. Dakara shiranai koto ga oosugiru koto mo **ashamed** dane.

59.A: Nisen nen ni natte keizai ga yokunatte shigoto no waku mo hirogatte hoshii naa to omoo.

60.B: Ima **unemployment rate** ga sugoikara taihenda ne.

61.A: Sooda yone.

62.B: Toku ni kocchino **degree** wa, **degree** yaku ni tatanaikara ne. Nihon dewa.

63.A: Hontooni? Ara, eigo de deterukara totte kureru hito ga iruka to omotta.

64.B: ....tada kaigai de daigaku dete manaberu koto wa nihon de mananderu coosu to onajija nai? Sore wa eigo de yatteru ka yattenai ka dakede. Sore wa eigo de yatteru to **useful** dato kaisha mo omotte kurete, sono eigojitai niwa **advantage** ga arukeredo namae no nai daigaku o detemo tada kaigai ni itte itadake nanoyone tte. Ma, ima wa kaisha wa **international** na jinzai o hoshigatte iru kedomo. Sore wa tashika ni aru kedomo, toru nowa yappari toru nowa....demo kekkoo kocchi de daigaku deta karakoso shuushoku ga muzukashii tte iu baajon ippai aru.

65.A: Soo nanda. Kocchi dewa nai notte iu nowa wakarunda. Oobaasii no hito wa toku ni mattaku naitte.

66.B: PR ja nai to dameda monne.

67.A: PR no hito demo nakanaka muzukashii kara. Watashi no tomodachi singapooru made itta mon.

68.B: Oosutoraria no hito tte ippanteki ni **lazy** dakara kono kuni owatteru yone. Higashi no hoo wa wakannaikedo sa. Paasu wa toriaezu **third world** dayo.

69.A: Owatteru.

Translation

58.B: The hopes for Japan? Well, this is not really a sort of hope, but I think anybody, not only specific people, have to be concerned about the crisis which is happening in the world,

and look at other countries, not just Japan. Since coming here, I've noticed that this is very important, so I'm going to try to do it myself. You feel **ashamed** when (I) don't know many things.

59.A: I hope the Japanese economy gets better and there is an increase in the number of jobs.

60.B: The **unemployment rate** now is terrible.

61.A: It is.

62.B: **Degree,** a **degree** from here is not going to be useful in Japan.

63.A: Is it true? Oh, I thought that it's going tu be useful because I'm getting (a degree from an Engligh-speaking country).

64.B: ....we can study a similar thing at a Japanese university, can't we? The one thing that is different is that we are being taught in English some companies may think that this is **useful** and an **advertage** because of the proficiency we have the English language. But most companies don't see the value in studying abroad, unless you can get a degree from a famous university. Although it is considered that in recent times, many companies are aware of the need to have employees who have **international** thinking or sense, in reality, they employ.... Besides, I've heard that studying abroad makes it even more difficult to get a job.

65.A: I know, I know it's difficult to get a job here as well, especially an overseas person.

66.B: It's difficult unless you are a PR (permanent resident)

67.A: It's difficult ever for a person who is a PR. A friend of mine went to Singapore to get a job.

68.B: Generally speaking, Australian people seem to be **lazy.** I don't know about the eastern states, but Perth is like the **Third World.**

69.A: That's right.

Passage 5

73.A: Ippai iru yone. **Lazy** kibun de iru yone. Kiraku de ii yo. Watashi koko suki dana tte omoo.

74.B: Watashi mo suki. Watashi mo suki dakedo **inconvenient** na koto toka oosugiru. Datte nihon mitai ni hokenseido ga naishi ippai minna kommateiru koto ga aru. Nihon towa chigau sisutemu de, kaisha no **social security** toka zenzen yokunai tte hontoo ni sunde yoku wakaru. Haisha nanka sa ikkai ikunoni sen doru ikkai naosu noni zenbude.

75.A: Choo takai!!

Translation

73.A: There are many. I like to feel **lazy.** I feel relaxed. I like it here.

74.B: I like it here too, but there are some things which are **inconvenient.** For example, there is no insurance system like the Japanese one and also, people have trouble (because of the social security system), which is different from the Japanese one. I feel that **social security** here is not good enough. If you go to see a dentist, it would cost you $1000, and then if you have the complete treatment it would be a total...

75.A: Awfully expensive!!

Passage 6

78.B: Demo benkyoo suru noni watashitach shinuhodo gakuhi harawanakya ikenai nowa erai.

79.A: Sugeee takai.

80.B: Nanka **unfair** da yone.

Translation
78.B: It's so tough to pay the very expensive tuition fee.
79.A: Extremely expensive.
80.B: That's **unfair**, isn't it?

Passage 7
95.A: Ee! **Course** owatte moo sugu ni kaetta jiten de yarukamo
shirenai.
96.B: Shuushokukatsudoo tte kocchi ni iru aida kara yaru hoo ga
iiyo.
97.A: Hontoo?
98.B: Amerika no daigaku ni itteru tomodachi tokamo ichinen mae toka
ichinen-han mae toka coosu ga ato ichinen-han de owaru kara
imakara yattokanaito ka tte.
99.A: Ya nandemo iika to omotte, tatoeba hora...**part time** ..
100.B: Aa, **part time job** toka tte koto? Ah, soredattara sugu...

Translation
95.A: Ha? I might start job hunting straight after finishing the
course in Japan.
96.B: You'd be better of starting during your stay here.
97.A: Really?
98.B: A friend of mine who's studying at an American university
thinks that she has to start looking for a job about one year
or eighteen months before her course finishes.
99.A: Well, I'm not fussy, I can even take a job like ...**part time**..
100.B: Ah, **part time job**? Then you can get it easily.

Passage 8
111.A: Kocchi de **program** de sotsugyoo shitato shite mo amari sonna
ni kakeru wakeja naikara, nihon de eigo o tsukatte **program**
kaku wakeja naidesho? Soredattara watashi wa **engineering**
tottoita hoo ga yokattana to omtte.
112.B: Hoka no coosu tte koto? **Computer science** no tte koto?
Soretomo **computer engineering** tte koto?
113.A: Soo soo soo, konpuutaa no **engineering** dattara hora, betsu ni
program janai kara betsu ni koozoo sae wakatte ireba nihon
demo kumitatetari mitari surukoto ga dekirudesho?

Translation
111.A: Even when I finish (computer) **program**ming, I don't think I
can create much, and it's not necessary to write **program**s in
the English language in Japan. I guess I should have taken
engineering.
112.B: Do you mean a different course? **computer science**, or **computer
engineering**?
113.A: That's right. If I took computer **engineering** not **program**ming
and understood structure, then I could build a computer, or
fix it.....

PAIR 2 (speaker C & D)

TOPIC 1: STUDY
Passage 1
3.D: Konkai wa **major, major** niko ni shite.
4.C: **Repeat** shiteru noga, datte...
5.D: Att, **repeat** shiteruno aru.

6.C: Sore wa daijoobuna no?

7.D: Yabai.

8.C: Ah, are desho? **Lecturer** ga saiaku toka tte itteta yastsu desho? Nanka..

9.D: Saiaku to iu ka, ikko otoshita noga arundakedo, travel agency management to iunode, sore zenkai wa ma, zenkaiwa sa, [person's name] to iu onnano ko ga ite, sono ko ga saa...

10.C: Are desho? [person's name] to sannin de.

11.D: [person's name] to sannin de yattandakedo [person's name] ga, to iu ka moo, **assignment** ga ma ni awanakatta none hotondo, **presentation** to issho ni. Hoide, ma ni awanakatta monyake, dooshoo to iu koto ni natte [person's name] ga moo honto, kaze o hiitotta, moo mattaku, [person's name] ga kaze de dekinai tte koto ni shiyoo to prezen o tsugi no shuu ni shite moraoo to. Demo sore ga saishuu no shuuyatta, juu-san shuu ka, juu-yon shuu yatta. Sore de sensei ni ittanyakedo, iya moo konshuu ga saigodakara moo dekirudake no koto wa shinasai tte.

12.C: Hutari ni yare tte?

13.D: Hutari de yarinasai tte. Demo oretach peepaa shika motte nakatta kara booyomi, minna no maede. Demo ichioo sore **pass** kureta no. Demo **exam** de dameyatta monde.

14.C: Jaa, [person's name] wa kawaisoo ni...

15.D: [person's name] wa dai ikkaime no kojin **assignment** ga sugoi yokatta nanaju ppa gurai, nanajuu-go gurai kana? Demo orera wa gojuu gurai shika torenakatta, gojuu-yon pa gurai. Damonde ore wa yonjuu pa choi gurai de otoshite shimatte, futaritomo **exam** mo yoo yarikata ga wakarande sore wa ochita. Ma, ato no mittsu wa ukattandakedo, sore wa muri.

16.C: Konkai ochitara doo narundaroo?

17.D: Konkai ochitara doo narunkana tte kyoohushin wa arukedo. Konkai no wa sensei ga kawatta no, sono kyooka. Mae no sensei wa obasan no sensei dagara donna koto shite mo **pass** wa sasete kuretano ne. Imano sensei tte waraeru no. Waraeruno wa dai ikaime no **assignment** o gojuu ppa choi shika toretenakkata yan. Dakara gojuu ppa choi shika torete nakattakara kon **semester** ten toran to yabai to omotta kara. Ore no mae no **assignment** to issho yatta. Sorede, mae no ohoridashite kite [person's name], [person's name] no **assignment** tte aru yan. [person's name] no (assignment) ga zenkai nanajuu ppa torete iru kara, so ko kara aidea o nukidashite onaji bunsho niwa shite inai kedo aruteido nukidashite **agency** ni kankei shite ita koto o bonbonbon to ireta no. Soshitara doo kangaete mo nanajuu-go paasento gurai totta **assignment** tosa, ore no zenkai no gojuu paasento no **assignment** jan. Hoide, sore o mikkusu shite umai koto **structure** mo ireta n. Dakara, moo orera to shite wa sa [person's name] mo [person's name] mo ore mo warukute credit, credit wa kurudaroo to.

18.C: Rokujuu ppa?

19.D: Rokujuu ppa. Dakara, sore wa nijuu-go ten chuu, mae wa juu-san ten yatta ne, zenkai wa. Konkai wa nijuu-go tenchuu nanaten. [person's name] wa juu-i tten yattan. **Fail** ya, atama kita sa. Sensei toko itte 'nani, nani kono nana ten tte'. 'Iya watashi ga yondara, ma nanaten, soregurai no **assignment**'. 'Chotto matte te zenkai no tensuu to chigaisugiru tte'. Ore ga ittano wa zenkai no **assignment** de, ma hoka no sensei ga koko wa dekite inai, koko wa dekite nai tokoro...

Translation

3.D: This time, **major**, I'll take a double **major**.

4.C: I thought you have to **repeat**, because...

5.D: Yes, I have to **repeat**.
6.C: Is it Ok?
7.D: Not really,
8.C: Oh, is that one? You told me that you got a terrible **lecturer**, didn't you? You said something......
9.D: Yes, She was terrible. I actually failed a unit called travel agency management. This last semester, there was a girl, her name was [her name], she......
10.C: Is that the one? You did it with [another person's name], three people...
11.D: I did it with [that person's name], that means three people. But [the girl's name] could not finish her **assignment** which was associated with our **presentation**, she had a cold at that time actually, so we decided to put off our presentation until the following week. That week, we were supposed to give the presentation, it was the last week (of the semester), week thirteen or fourteen, I think. We asked the lecturer to postpone it, but she said that we have to do it because it was the last week (of the semester).
12.C: Did she mean you had to do it only with him?
13.D: She said I had to do it only with him. All we could do was able to do well in the **exam,** so...anyway, she gave me a **pass**.
14.C: What about [the girl's name] then?
15.D: She got quite good mark in her first **assignment**. I think she got 70% or 75%. We only got about 50% or 54% in our assignment, and I got 40% as a total result. I think I failed that unit because we didn't know how to deal with the **exam**. I passed the other three units, but I don't think I passed that unit.
16.C: What would happen to you if you really failed that unit?
17.D: I'm pretty worried about it. We used to have an old lecturer who always let students **pass,** but we had a different lecturer, this **semester**, and it made the unit much more difficult. I had a funny story when the old lecturer with us. I got about 50% in my first **assignment**. Since I thought I was going to fail unless I got enough marks for (my assignment), I took this idea about agency out of the girl's **assignment** in which she got more than 70%. Then I combined this idea with my old **assignment** because the topic was the same as last (semester). Of course I didn't copy her writing. I thought, also my friends thought, that I could get at least a credit (for that assignment), because I mixed elements from both the girl's **assignment** which got about 75%, and my old **assignment**, which got 50%. Besides I made a nice **structure** (for the assignment), but....
18.C: 60%?
19.D: Yeah 60%. I got 13 out of 25 for the last (semester), but this time I only got 7 out of 25. [a person's name] got 11. We **failed**. I got so upset. I went to see the lecturer and asked her. 'what do you mean by giving me this mark? She said 'I thought the **assignment** was worth seven points'. I said 'wait, that is very different from the mark in my old **assignment**'. I explained to her that I had improved some parts which had been pointed out by my old lecturer, so...

Passage 2
23.D: Ma sore wa arunyanai. **Spelling** misu toka ga aru, soo iu nomo kondo komiattanyaroo kedo toriaezu nanatenyata. De ore itta no 'ore repeater nandakedo, zenkai ore wa **failed**. **Failed** no tokimo **assignment** wa juu-san ten totta' to. Ore wa sono zenkai, [person's name] no o mita toka itte nai yo, sono,

276

'zenkai no sensei no koko ga dekiteinai, koko ga dekite inai,
kooiu tokoro ga machigatte iru tte iu no zenbu naoshite
motte kita, riasaimentoda' to. 'Sore ni taishite nana ten
chuuno wa dooshite konna sensei ni yotte chigaun ya' to.
Soshitara sensei ga 'Jaa, watashi ga dekirukoto wa, sore wa
ato ni ten gurai agereru' to. Soshitara kyuuten ya, **fail** ya.
Konkai otoshitara yabaino ni kyuu ten te iu kara 'Jaa, ore
zenkai no **assignment** o motte kurukara', onaji **assignment** daro,
'zenkaino **assignment** o motte kurukara, zenkai no (assignment) de
tenkure' tte. 'Soreja, zenkai no **assignment** motte kinasai'
tte. Zenkai no **assignment** nante detarame nanda. Ano, 'tourism
development o kakinasai' tte kaitearu noni ore wa, are?
nandakke?... Management development o kaita. Dakara zenzen
chigau koto o yatta. Dakara, nanoni **topic** ga chigatteta.

24.C: Zureteta?
25.D: Sore nanoni, zureteruno ni, 'Anata zureteimasu yo' tte itta noni
pass shita none. Konkai wa raitingu supotto shiteru noni
soredemo sono ten. De, ore mawari ni misete yatta yo. Juu-san
ten datta yo. Sono sensei wa daitai sabetsuteki. Datte tsugi
no **group assignment** de oosutoraliajin no hito hutari to oreto
[person's name] yonin de kunda none. Tashika ni transparent
sheet shika tsukawande, minna wa, nante iu no, pointo boodo,
pawaa pointo? Ano, sukuriin ni dasu yatsu aru janai,
konpuutaa...

Translation

23.D: It could have been something to do with that I guess,
something like **spelling** mistakes could have been taken into
consideration. Anyway, I got seven.I said to the lecturer 'I'm
a repeater.I **failed** the last (semester). I got thirteen points
in my last **assignment,** even thought I **failed**'. I didn't tell
her that this time I used the girl's **assignment**. But I said to
the lecturer, 'I definitely improved all the parts pointed out
to me by my old lecturer, so I don't understand why I got only
seven points, it is so different from the mark I got last
assignment'. Then the lecturer said 'All right, I'll give you
another two points. That's all I can do for you'.
That meant I got nine points and still **failed**. I was going to
really be in trouble this time, if I were to get only nine
points. So I said to the lecturer 'I'll bring in my old
assignment, so that you can mark it. Anyway, that was the same
assignment. She said 'Well, bring the **assignment** in then'.
Actually, my old **assignment** was out of the question. I wrote
about something else, ah,...what was it? ... 'management
development', instead of writing about 'Tourism development'.
That's right, I wrote about the wrong **topic.**

24.C: Wrong (topic)?
25.D: Yes, it said 'You wrote something different (from the topic)',
but I **passed** even though my paper this time targeted the
right spot, I got that mark. Eventually, though I got thirteen
points (in my old assignment). I showed it to all my friends,
and said I got thirteen. I think the lecturer discriminates
against some students. I did the **group assignment** with two
Australians and [Japanese person's name]. We used only
transparent sheets for it, though others used a point
board..., power point? It's thing which appears on the screen,
...computer...

Passage 3
29.D: Naiyoo no mato o eteru. Ma, orera no **research** no koto ni
tsuitenanda kedo sa. Nazenara, sono **assignment** tte iuno ga

agency ni itte orera wa, mistery shopping tte itte, ikinari
soko ni itte ryokooken o kauyoona furi o suru no. De, soko no
hitotachi ga **insurance** no koto o hanashitaka toka, sono
hitotachi no taido wa doo datta toka, dore dake mata sareta
toka, soiu koto o orera ga happyoo suru no. Orera ga itta
assignment no koto. Dakara, orera no **research** kekka shika
hanasanai noni, sorede yo **presentation** juu-ten chuu santen.
Sabetsuto shika iiyoo ga nai. Huzaketeru.

30.C: Sono **Aussie** no yatsu wa nante itteru no.
31.D: Sono **Aussie** tachi? Wakaran.
32.C: Nande sore wa?
33.D: Ma, sore wa **exam** no mae ni wakatta koto ԁԁkakara orerato wa
jikan ga nakatta kara soo iu, awanakatta kedo ne.
34.C: Kekka moo sorosoro dekiterudesho. Konshuu atari derudesho.
35.D: **Exam** no kekka wa moo sorosoro dekiru yone. Demo ma, **overall**,
purinto no nani... peepaawooku to zenbu awasereba **pass** shiteru
kedo hoidemo sa.
36.C: **Pass** shiteru?
37.D: **Pass** wa shita. Demo...
38.C: Ja, **exam** wa dekita tte koto?
39.D: **Exam** wa ore kekkyoku benkyoo shite inai kedo, dekita kedo,
sensei no ten no tsukekata ga kibishii kara.

Translation
29.D: The content was OK. It was based on the **research** we did. That
assignment was called mystery shopping. That's when we
pretend to be customers and go to (the travel) **agency** and buy
travel tickets. We have to comment on the sales-person's
attitude, whether they mentioned **insurance**, and how long they
made us wait. Anyway, we only got three out of ten, for that
assignment, even though the **presentation** was based on our
research. This was definitely discrimination, terrible.
30.C: What did the two **Aussies** say about it?
31.D: Those **Aussis**? I don't know.
32.C: Why?
33.D: We found out about it just before our **exam**, so we didn't have
enough time to talk about it.
33.C: The result must be on the notice board by now, about this
week.
35.D: Yes, the results of the **exam** must be available by now. Well
overall, something like print,... altogether with paperwork, I
could **pass**, but ....
36.C: Did you **pass**?
37.D: I guess I passed, but ...
38.C: Do you mean you did your **exam** very well?
39.D: I didn't study much for my **exam**, but I did well. I don't know,
the lecturer is quite a strict marker, so...

Passage 4
46.C: Doo yattate sa, nanka ajiajin toka hanashite nanka **pause**
shitari nanka chinmoku ga zutto tsuzuitari shitara zenzen dameda
tte koto arujanai? Soo iu yatsura to kurabete sa, jibunra no
hoo ga dekitana tto omottara soo iu noto kurabete mitara ii
janai.
47.D: Demo yatsura wa pawaa pointo tsukatte itakara ne.
48.C: Ah, soona no?
49.D: Jissai pawaa pointo wa orera wa pawaa pointo tsukatte nakatta
kara ne. Demo tensuu wa iito omowanakatta kedo **fail** ni suru
koto nainjanai.
50.C: Tsukae tte iwareta no?
51.D: Sonna koto iwarete nai yo. Sonna koto iwarete nai, sonna...

52.C: Demo, saikin no **business** no toka no purezen wa zenbu
       arejanai..
53.D: Soo pawaa pointo.
54.C: Pawaa pointo tsukaunjanai?

Translation
46.C: It can't be a good (presentation) if Asian students like us
       make a long **pause,** or a long silence, can it? If you think you
       did well (but you could not get a good mark) then why don't
       you compare your mark with those other Asian students?
47.D: But most of them used power point.
48.C: Oh, is that so?
49.D: Actually, power point was used by most of the people in the
       class, but we didn't use power point. I didn't expect us to
       get a good mark, but (she) didn't have to make us **fail**.
50.C: Were you told to use it?
51.D: No, we weren't, we weren't told anything like that.
52.C: But, most **business** presentations these day use....
53.D: That's right, power point.
54.C: Power point, isn't it?

Passage 5
57.D: Mata konkai yattsu totta kedo hutatsu wa **tourism** no yatsu
       yaro...
58.C: Sore wa **Spanish?**
59.D: **Spanish** dakara sa
60.C: Jaa **Ok?**
61.D: Ma, **Spanish** wa ore ni totte wa
62.C: Anmari benkyoo shinakutemo...
63.D: Anmari benkyoo shinakutemo ikeru. Kurasu hotondo detenaishi.
64.C: Iinjanai.
65.D: Maa maa, ukatterudesho. Sonna ni muzukashiku nai. Mada
       intorodakushon yashi.
66.C: Sore demo, ma korekaramo tottekundesho?
67.D: Ha?
68.C: Ima **Spanish**, intorodakushon de sorekara mata...
69.D: Iya, moo **Spanish** toranai kamoshirenai.
70.C: Nande?
71.D: Unn to...iuka **tourism** no **major** yameyooka to omotte. Iketenai
       kara. Annamon totta tte shoorai nanmo yaku ni tatanaishi.
72.C: Ya, shoku ga? Nihon ni kaette doo suru no?
73.D: Kekkyoku **tourism** nante kocchi de
       hatarakanakereba nanni mo yaku ni tatanai. Anmari pointo nai
       no. Kekkyoku **domestic** na kotobakari dakara. Dakara **international**
       no koto anmari naikara **agency law** toka tte **law** narattate...
74.C: Ja, korekara mata jikan kakaru janai.
75.D: Ya, **minor** ni mawaseba ii.
76.C: De, **major** doo suru no?
77.D: Dakara, ima sugoku mayotteru no. Maaketingu ni shiyoo ka
       konpyuutaa..
78.C: konpyuta wa yappari dame?
79.D: Ore datteee..
80.C: konpyuutaa wa ii tte. IT wa... nihon tekunorojii wa iiyo. Are
       wa shigoto ga yoku mitsukaru yo. Ore no tomodachi nankademo.
81.D: Ore wa garaja nai jan. Dakara, maaketingu ni ikoo kana tte
       omottari surundakedo ne.
82.C: Mata hito to hanasuno ga tokui dakara toka, soo iuno ga
       areba...
83.D: Idea toka soo iuno ga areba, demo maaketingu tte muzukashii
       no shitterunda yone.

84.C: Oyaji ga soonandesho? Demo, nani yatte mo **law** toka yaranakya
ikenaikara ne.
85.D: Maa ne.
86.C: Oreda tte **law** yaranakya ikenaindakara. Ore mo kon **semester**
arukara ne. Doo shiyoo kana.
87.D: [interlocutor's name] **exam** wa daijoobu nano?
88.C: Ore wa.. **repeat** wa nai kedo mittsude tte iu ka, **exam** wa
daijoobu tatta. Dakara **exam** wa ikko ochite iru kana tte, yabai
kana tte omotte sore o kakunin shi ni itta no. Sidonii kara
kaette kite isshuukan, isshuukan tatte sugu itte sore ga
ichiban huandatta kara ne. Sore de moo ok yo. Dakara credit
totta toka, HD totta toka wa soo iuno wa wakaranai kedo.
Ukattaka ukaranakattaka oshiete kureru kara.
'Ukatta yo' tte itte kureta kara, sorekara goruhu janjan yo.
89.D: Iinaa.
90.C: Dakedo, demo sono hitotsu igai wa ato daijoobu de distinction
ka HD wa toreteru yo. Hitotsu wa tabun...
91.D: Benkyoo shiteru naa.
92.C: Te iuka, **semester** ga sugoi taihendatta. Te iuno wa maishuu
report o mittsu kaiteta kara. Sono **report** o kaku noni aruteido
benkyoo shinai to damejanai. **Information** toka ato reedingu mo
arushi. Soo iu yaru noni sukoshizutsu yatte kita kara saigo
no hoo wa sonna ni muchakucha yaranakutemo aruteido moo nooto
toka dekite tano ne. Sore o yomu dake de yokatta kara.
93.D: Ore, datte benkyoo shinai kara ne.
94.C: Dakara saigo ni zuuto yaranakya ikenaino ga soo iuno ga
tsurai. Ore mo **exam** kiraida kara ne. **Exam** de roku-juu
ppa toka, nanajuu ppa toka toranai to ikenai tte naruto....
95.D: Iyanandakedo soo natte shimaunda yone. Hitsuzenteki ni.
96.C: Dakara, **assignment** toka... **assignment** toka daitai niko
arujanai. Hotondo distinction tte iuka nanajuu paasento ijoo
tottereba **exam** ga ikura warukutemo tooru tte.
97.D: Sore wa torenai.
98.C: Torenai. Tottakotonai to iuka. Dakara **assignment** notoka topic
aruja nai. Are o hayame ni, totteru yatsu, mae ni benkyoo
shiteru yatsu kara nyuushu site oite sorede shirabete okuwake
yo. Minna ga yatteru toki ni yaru to hon ga naitoki ga arukara
ne. Toku ni **business** toka yatteru yatsu ooikara ne. Dakara
hayame ni yatta hoo ga ii yo. Orera mo **science** demo aruyo.
'Hon nee yo' tte itterukara ne. Hon nai to saiaku dakara ne.
99.D: Nai. Marude nai.
100.C: Dakara yoku tootteru yo. **Assignment** de...
101.D: Ore kekkoo rakkinan yo. Imamade ore **essay** toka anmari umai
hoo janai noni ne. Nanya kanya, dipuromamo ne..adobansu mo...

Translation
57.D: This time I took four units, and two of them are **tourism**.
58.C: Are the other units **Spanish**?
59.D: Yes, **Spanish**.
60.C: Then, you'll be **Ok**, right?
61.D: Well, **Spanish** for me is...
62.C: You don't even have to study hard...
63.D: I'll be all right even if I don't study hard. I usually don't
attend the class actually.
64.C: You sound all right.
65.D: I'm sure I passed. It wasn't so difficult because that was an
introduction.
66.C: So, you're going to continue it, aren't you?
67.D: Ha?
68.C: You took **Spanish**, introduction. You'll keep studying (it)
and ...

69.D: No, I won't take **Spanish** anymore.
70.C: Why?
71.D: Uh... I'm thinking. I might not take **tourism** as a **major** because I didn't do well. I don't think it's going to be useful for me in the future.
72.C: You mean for getting a job? What are you going to do after you go back to Japan?
73.D: Studying **tourism** isn't going to be useful unless you work here. So, there is not much point for me. Basically, we learn only **domestic** things, there's not much in the way of **international** things, so studying **law, agency law**...
74.C: Then, it's going to take time (to get degree).
75.D: I can study it as a **minor**.
76.C: Then, what about a **major**?
77.D: That's why I'm thinking that may be I should study marketing or computer ....
78.C: Aren't you good with a computer?
79.D: I ... because...
80.C: Studying the computer is useful. IT...., Japan technology is the best.
81.D: That doesn't suit me, that's why I think I should study marketing.
82.C: If you're good at dealing with people, then
83.D: If you have a unique idea, then, but I know how difficult studying marketing is.
84.C: Your father's job is in marketing, isn't it? Whatever you study, you have to know about **law**.
85.D: Perhaps.
86.C: I also have to learn **law**. I have a unit studying (law) this **semester**. What should I do?
87.D: What about your **exam**?
88.C: I didn't have to **repeat** any units. I did well in my **exams**, actually, I took three. I was bit worried about one of my **exams**, so I went (to University) to make sure that I had passed after coming back from Sydney. It was one week... yeah, one week after I came back, because I was worried about it. But it was Ok. I was told that I had passed. I don't know if I got a credit or HD, but I've been playing golf since I found out the result.
89.D: I envy you.
90.C: The other two units must be all right. I might have got a distinction or HD. Perhaps, one of them...
91.D: You must have studied hard.
92.C: Not really. I had a hard time during the **semester**, because we had to write three **reports** every week. To write **reports**, I had to study constantly like reading to get **information**. Because of that I could make a note little by little,and by the end of the semester, all I had to do was read them.
93.D: I, I don't study much.
94.C: If you study hard just before the **exam**, it's tough. Of course, I don't like (exam). If you have to get 60% or 70% for the **exam**, then...
95.D: I don't want put myself in that kind of situation, but I'm always like that.
96.C: You usually get an **assignment**, two **assignments**, don't you? If you get a distinction, I mean more than 70% for them, you would pass even if you can't do well your **exam**.
97.D: I can't get a good mark like that.
98.C: I can't either. Anyway, you're better of getting (information) earlier for the topic of the **assignment** from someone who has done the unit. Sometimes, you can't get any books in relation

to the topic if you start working on it at a similar time to
other students. Especially, because there are many **business**
students, so it's better to work on it before any one else
starts. Even us **science** students often complain 'There are no
books available'. You're going to be in trouble if you can't
get any books.
99.D: No books at all.
100.C: Anyway, you've done very well on your **assignment**.
101.D: I'm just lucky. I'm not good at writing **essays**, but I've got
a diploma, and advance....

Passage 6
111.D: **Finance**.
112.C: **Finance** otosanakatta no?
113.D: Otosanakatta ne. Datte yume no, yume no ikkyooka datta no.

Translation
111.D: **Finance**.
112.C: You didn't fail **finance**.
113.D: No, I didn't. That was my favorite subject.

Passage 7
118.C: [person's name] wa **major** nandatta no?
119.D: Issho, issho, **tourism**.
120.C: Kaeru?
121.D: Iya, aitsu wa **double major** desho?
122.C: **Economics**?
123.D: Iya, nani suru tte ittetakke? Aitsu wa ...nandakke... **tourism**
arudesho, ato wa e-komaasu, intaanetto tte hontoo ni
intaanetto tte nani yaru nokana?

Translation
118.C: What is [person's name] **major**?
119.D: Same, same as me, **tourism**.
120.C: (Is he going to) change?
121.D: No, he is taking a **double major**.
122.C: (Is his other major) **economics**?
123.D: No, what did he say? He....ah...what was that ... **tourism**, e-
commerce and internet. I'm wondering what kind of things I
can learn about studying the internet.

Passage 8
130.C: ...Sorega nakattara moo **environment science** owatterukara ne.
Sen **semester** kara atarashiino ga dekita no, **environment
chemistry** tte iuno ga, kankyoo kagaku tte, kagakuno hoo no,
sore ni norikaete tte iun janai kedo sorede...
131.D: Nande, nande mata moo ikko **degree** o troo to omotta no?
132.C: Dakara ore ne... sono, kankyoogaku no anmari seiseki ga
yokunain da.
133.D: Imano yatteru yatsu?
134.C: Kankyoogaku no imano, kon **semester** no tottano wa kagaku no
hoo, sore wa atarashii hoo no **environment**, hurui yatsu wa
kankyoogaku nanda kedo, **environment science** de anmari ore
seiseki yokunainda. De muitenaino wakatta kedo sa. Kakuno
toka, **writing** toka tokuija naikara **assignment** wa torerunda
kedo sa. Yoku nakatta kara sa. Sore de kagaku toka ore ni
muiteru to omotta.

Translation
130.C: ....If there was no problem, I could have completed
environment science. The new unit, called **environment**

> **chemistry**, commenced last semester, **environment chemistry**,
> study of chemistry. I don't mean I switched to that course...

131.D: Why, why did you decide to take another **degree**?

132.C: Because I..., well (I) could'nt get a better result for
environment science.

133.D: You mean, the course you are taking now?

134.D: I took **environment science**, no, chemistry this **semester**. This
is a new course in the study of the **environment**. The old one
is called environment science. I actually couldn't get a good
result (for environment science). I realised that it doesn't
suit me. I was able to get quite good mark in my **assignment**,
but basically I'm not good at **writing**. The result was not
good. That's why I thought studying chemistry suited me.

Passage 9

140.C: Sorede sono saki tatoeba honors toka ue ni ikitakutemo
seiseki ga warukattara ikenai mon. Dakara ore **environment
science** demo onaazu made ikiktakatta kedo. Datte yaritai to
omowanakatta kara. Demo kaete kagaku no hoo dattara
omoshirosoodana to. Kagaku no hoo dattara tabun **master** toka
yaresoona ki ga shita kara yaroo kana to omotte.

Translation

140.C: You can't go any further, like getting honors is impossible,
if your result isn't good enough. I was not going got make it
to honors in **environment science**, because I didn't feel like
it. But I think I probably can take **master** in chemistry. I
think studying chemistry is interesting.

Passage 10

157.D: Datte sa maaketingu ni suruka konpyuuta ni suruka soreto
imano **tourism** o sonomamayaruka.

158.C: Ano sa, **business** toka yatte yappari areda yone. Anmari
atarashii mono ga naitte iuka arejanai. Ore nanka
kankyoogaku tte iuno wa korekara iroironano ga dete kuru
kara tanoshii. Tanoshiminano wa tanoshiminanda kedo.
Unnn ... **business** wa korekara taihenda yone. Moo hayai koto
shoku mitsuketa hoo ga ii yone.

159.D: Soo yanen, **tourism** nanka yattemo omoshiroku nainda yone.
Manabumono ga nainda yone. Manabumono ga nai.

160.C: **Computer science** toka wa kekkoo omoshiroi to omoondakedo ne.
Manabumono ga. Gogaku tokamo omoshiroin janai?

161.D: Gogaku wa omoshiroi yo. Demo imakara gogaku ni iku ki mo
naishi ne.

162.C: Nande?

163.D: Unnn.. **Spanish** toka imakara yattemo....**major** wa yappari **major**
jan. Daiji yan. Imakara gogaku no **major** toru wake ni
ikanaishi ne.

164.C: Nande?

165.D: Nanno **major** yo? **Spanish**? Oosutoraria e kite...shoku tsuku
toki ni **major**...

166.C: Oosutoraria de shoku sagashiteru no?

167.D: Oosutoraria de shigoto sagashite nai mon.

Translation

157.D: (I'm wondering which unit I should take) marketing, computer,
or should I continue in **tourism**.

158.C: Something like **business** is what can I say, you can't find
anything new in it. Environment science has more possibilities,
so I feel excited. Ah...**business** is going to be hard. It would
be better if you find a job as soon as possible.

159.D: You're right. I can't find anything interesting in **tourism**.
There is nothing to learn, nothing.
160.C: I think **computer science** would be quite interesting to learn.
Language too. Don't you think?
161.D: Language is interesting, but I don't like taking language.
162.C: Why?
163.D: Ah....if I take **Spanish** now... my major, **major** is important.
I can't take language as a **major**.
164.C: Why?
165.D: What can I take as a **major**? **Spanish**? I came to Australia...if
I try to find a job and my **major**...
166.C: Are you going to get a job in Australia?
167.D: No, I'm not, not in Australia.

Passage 11
168.C: Datte moshi, tomodachi toka inai? Nihon e kaettara kaettade
iinda kedo, nihon de shoku mo mitsukattani wa mitsukattan
dakedo anmari seikatsu tte iuka sa, nihon no sei(ktsu)...**style**
ga sukija nai toka awanai toka iidasu yatsura ga kekkoo irunda
yo.

Translation
168.C: But if, ...have you heard from your friends? I've heard about
when people start complaining about the Japanese li(fe)..
style when they go back and start working in Japan.

TOPIC 2: THE YEAR 2000

Passage 1
12.C: Aitsu (otooto) wa, dakara basuketto de hairu tte, hairitakatta
kedo senpai toka ga chan to **record** o nokoshite inai kara,
dakara ima hisshi ni sagashite iru.

Translation
12.C: He (my brother) was going to get a job (at the company)
because of his basketball skills. However the students from
his university in the past did not **record** any wins. For this
reason he has been struggling.

Passage 2
19.D: Kankyoogaku tte tokushuna mono dakara shuushoku toka mo
competition ga nai, tabun.
20.C: Ah, hikuikara ne.
21.D: Dakara, docchika tte iu to kenkyuutekina mon toka soo iu
mono ga haitte kuru kara sa. Ma, **skill** dakara, soo iuno wa.
Moshi yo, **tourism** o **major** ni shitatte sa ryokoodairi nante
dare ni demo dekiru koto yan. Heta shitara kookoo kara
tatakiageru hoo ga sorya sugoi yo. Mata ima ryokoo nante ima
konna ni nihon hukeiki dakara korekara motto hukeiki ni natte
ikuto sureba yo. Moo ima nanka nihon no **style** kara shitara moo
ryokoo nante jibun de katte ni iku yan. Betsu ni sonna
ryokoogaisha ga tsukutta yoona, sonna kunda ryokoo nanka
shinakutemo iikara ne.
22.C: Soonanda yo. Soko de gogaku toka tte iuno wa **advantage** ga
detekurun janai no?
23.D: Soo iu tokoro de adobanteegi nano wa gogaku nandaroo kedomo, ma
demo korekara nihon nante gaki demo eigo toka umakunatte
konpyuutaa tsukaidashite nantoka kantoka natte iku to omoo yo.
24.C: Natte iku to omou? Demo konpyuutaa demo sa...

25.D: Datte, ore iwareta mon. Konpyuutaa toka yatte mo dareka ga
ittanda kedo, shosen chiisai kotachi wa shoogakoo no toki kara
konpyuutaa ijikuridashite iru kara ojisan tachi wa kanawan te.
Ma, demo soo wa itta mono no ima no **update** de oretachi wa
konpyuutaa suruno wa, sore wa ima no orera no jidai no hito de
orera no ojisantachi ga konpyuutaa dekinai kara orera no
konpyuutaa dekiruno ga iru wake yan. Dakara, oretachi wa sono,
orera wa konpyuutaa yatte mo ii to omoo. Dakara ima no
kuitsunagi ni naru to omoo.

Translation
19.D: There is no **competition** in getting a job which is related to
environment science, perhaps, because it's so specific.
20.C: Oh yeah, it's less popular.
21.D: That kind of thing requires **skill** since it involves something
like research. But anyone can be your competitor, when trying
to get a job in a travel agency, even if you take **tourism** as a
major. Possibly, the competitor can be a person who is highly
trained (in the field of tourism) at high school. Besides,
Japan is experiencing a serious depression now, and if it gets
worse, people would start travelling individually, without
relying on a travel agency. That's the Japanese present **style**.
People realized that it's not necessary to take advantage of
luxary tours which are organized by a tour company.
22.C: That's right. Language study then becomes an **advantage**. Don't
you think?
23.D: Language study may be an advantage in that case. But, in the
future even little kids could become good English speakers and
computer users in Japan, I guess.
24.C: Do you think so? But computer, but...
25.D: I was told, actually. Somebody told me that middle aged men
are no better than little children because they start learning
the computer at primary school. That's true, but we are
learning something update about the computer which others have
not yet learnt. Since those middle aged men are not able to
use the computer well, people in our generation are going to
be a necessity. That's why the study of the computer now is
good. Up till now, you can eke out a living with it.

Passage 4
47.D: ....Danseino hooga sa docchika tte iu to ima no jidai shinu
made shuushinkoyoo nayoo na huniki ga mada nokotte iru wake.
Kocchidatara sa **contract** toka nannen de yametari toka nantoka
ga arukedo.
48.C: Nihon de **contract** nai kara ne. Hyookajitai ga hikui kara ne.

Translation
47.D: ...Even now, men expect life employment. But here, there are
many cases in which (people) quit (their job) after completing
their **contract** or something like that.
48.C: **Contract** doesn't exist in Japan. It's evaluated as low.

Passage 5
58.C: Nenkoojoretsu datte iu yorimo nani, koko no rain ni sotte
ireba koredake no kyuuryoo ga moraerushi, ano hito ga yamereba
ore wa tsugi no ue ni agareru kara tte iu huu ni narun jan.
Soshitara kyoosankoku janai kedo hontoo ni roshia mitai ni
naru janai. Kaishajitai ga ne. Kaisha zenbu no, kaisha ga
soodattara kyoosooritsu mo zenzen nai wakedashi shakaijitai ga
soo iu huu ni nacchatte zenzen **competitive** ja naijanai.
59.D: Demo sono, kaisha ni haittara dooki no ningen ga ippai iru

285

wake janai, juunin, nijuunin. Sono naka no chiisana
competition wa machigainaku aru wana.

Translation
58.C: It's not something like the seniority system, but if you
    follow the line (of a company), you would receive a certain
    wage, and if someone quits, you might get promoted to the next
    stage. It's not like the communist bloc, like Russia, I mean
    the company itself. If the whole company, company is like
    that, no competitive rate exists, and therefore, society
    itself could not be competitive at all.
59.D: But there would be many people of the same period in a
    company, ten or twenty, so there is a small amount of
    competition which happens amongst them.

Passage 6
62.C: Demo banban kirareru nowa kowai kedo ne. Aru imi dewa dekiru
    yatsu wa dondon dondon, dakara shita no hito ga sa, yonjussai
    toka gojussai no occhan ga hataraiterunoni sa, **contract** de
    ikinari ueno hito ga niju nansai toka sanjussai de bari bari
    shigoto ga dekiru tte yatsu ga sa, dete kuru kamo shirenai.
    Sore ga jibun dattara ii desho?

Translation
62.C: It's scarely to be sucked. It means that because of the
    contract, a man of ability who is in his 20's or 30's can
    quickly get to a higher position than a middle aged man who is
    in his 40's or 50's. Don't you hope it will be yourself?

Passage 7
76.C: ....Nihon te sa, sisutemu ga machigatte iru to wa omowanai
    kedo kagiraresugite gendo ga arutte iu ka, nenreitekini mo..
    sore ga ikenai to omoo. Dakara nihon de moshi sa, kyoomi toka
    sa, gogaku o benkyoo shitai to omotte mo daigaku de benkyoo
    suru hito nanka inain janai kato omoo. Soo iuno ga areda sa,
    datte nansai ni naroo to jinsei niwa manabu koto ga ippai aru
    to omoonda yone, ore wa. Ore wa ne. Dakara sore o yamechattara
    soko ni **stay** suru dake janai. Sore wa omoshiromi ga nai janai.

Translation
76.C: ....I wouldn't say the education system in Japan is wrong. But
    I think it's so limited, especially for mature people. I think
    that's bad. I don't think anybody who wants to study language
    as a hobby, can study language at university in Japan.
    There're lots of things you can learn in a life time, even
    when you get old, I, I think. If you stop doing it, then you
    would just **stay** in the same position. It's not enjoyable.

Passage 8
88.C: Iya, chigau. Sekkei janakute hanbun doboku janai kedo, biru
    toka no **basement** o tsukuru yatsu. Conkuri toka hatte. Kare no
    tokugi dayo sore wa.

Translation
88.C: No, (he) doesn't. Not design, but something like engineering,
    making the **basement** of buildings, with concrete. That's his
    speciality.

PAIR 3 (speaker E & F)

TOPIC 1: STUDY
Passage 1
22.F: Omotta kurai toreta?
23.E: Omotta ijoo ni toreta. Dakara watashi no itte iru irukoto wa koo nante iuno... **ethics** ni kankei surukoto dakara. Watashi wa risuukei no soo iu **report** o kakuno wa nareterukedo. Nani ga tadashii toka soo iu.. **ethics** no koto ni tsuite kaitakoto ga nakattara kekkoku...
24.F: Demo kekkyoku umaku dekitan yaro?
25.E: Demo sensei ga sugoku amakkata kamo shirenai. Ano hito zenzen **grammar** toka mo chekku shinaishi, kaiteiru koto ga tadashii ka dooka mite iru kara.

Translation
22.F: Did you get the mark you expected?
23.E: I got a much better mark than I expected. As you know, what I wrote was something related to **ethics**. I'm used to writing **report**s in the science or mathematics field, but I haven't written anything which is related to **ethics** which is supposed to discuss what is correct or wrong. So, I was very....
24.F: But eventually you got a good mark for it, didn't you?
25.E: I think my lecturer was tolerant. That lecturer respects the content of a paper, and (he/she) does not check **grammar**.

Passage 2
38.F: Mata nihon ni ikana akan no?
39.E: Dakara moshikashitara **exchange** no **program** de ikeru kamo shirenai shi.

Translation
38.F: Do you have to go to Japan again?
39.E: I might go (there) on an **exchange program**.

Passage 3
51.E: [interlocutor's name], kono tsugi nani suruno? Are no koto kiita? **Level one** ga dekiruka dooka.
52.F: Iya mada. Tabun dekehen to omoo.
53.E: Ja doo suru no sono kawari ni.
54.F: Yaritainyakedo na, ano **unit**.
55.E: Ja sore ga dekinakattara tefu toka de yaruno? Ja tsugi no **semester** de juu-ni **point** toranakattara **summer school** de yaranakya dame? Ma docchi ni shitemo...
56.F: Docchini shiro **summer school**.
57.E: Demo **summer school** tte ni-kyooka wa dekinain desho?

Translation
51.E: [interlocutor's name], what are you going to do next? Have you asked about it? if you can do **level one**.
52.F: No, not yet. I don't think I can do (it).
53.E: Then what are you going to do instead?
54.F: I wish I could take that **unit**.
55.E: If you can't take it, then are you going to do it at Tafe?, or if you don't get twelve **points** for the next **semester**, do you have to do it in **summer school**?
56.F: Anyway I have to do it in **summer school**.
57.E: But you can't take two units in **summer school**, can you?

Passage 4

67.E: Nande mae no gakki de toranakatta no, serekutibu no tokini mae
no gakkide serekutibu de torerutte itta desho? Nande
toranakatta no?

68.F: Kono na, **selective** no na, chau **elective** no **part two** no naka
ni haitte ita nya. Kono aida ano are da, seminaa chau wa...

69.E: Ano **course guide book** mitai nano?

70.F: **Session, session** itta nya.

71.E: Nani? sesshon? **enrolment**...

72.F: **Enrolment**. Honnara betsuni erande iiyo tte iu, nanka **example**
mitaina mon ga...... unde, sono kyooka haittetan yakedo hon
mitara....

73.E: Demo sore **level one** datta no?

74.F: Iya, **level two** de.

75.E: Sore wa **level two** datta no? Ja **level two** mo arunjanai.

76.F: Iya, demo hon yondara **guide book** mitara chigau.

77.E: Ja, soo kiite mitara iijanai. **Level two** ga arundesuka tte
itte.

78.F: Chau, chau, chau, **level one** de **part two** ni haitte iru yanka,
(elective) toreru hazu yanen...

79.E: Yoku wakannai kedo. Demo sore wa **point** ni.. nante iuno.. **add**
sareruka dooka wakaranainjanai?

Translation

67.E: Why didn't you take it last semester as a selective. You said
that you could take it as a selective? Why didn't you take it?

68.F: It was listed in part two as **selective**, no **elective**. The other
day, that was seminar, no that wasn't.

69.E: Do you mean like a **course guide book**?

70.F: **Session, session,** that was what I went to.

71.E: What session? Do you mean **enrolment**?

72.F: That was **enrolment**. There was an **example** which shows that the
subject can be taken, but when (I) look at the book.

73.E: Was it in the list of **level one**?

74.F: No, (it) was in **level two.**

75.E: Was it in **level two,** then the **level two** has...

76.F: No, the guide book doesn't say so.

77.E: Then why don't you ask if the subject is available in **level
two.**

78.F: No, no, no, that is **level one** and in **part two**, so it must be
taken (as an elective).

79.E: I don't understand. Anyway, we don't know if it can be, what
can I say.. **added** to [our] **point**, do we?

Passage 5

87.E: **Service** tte, **service** tte hospitality tte koto?

88.F: Chigau yo.

89.E: Nanka **retail** toka soo iu koto?

90.F: **Service** tte chigau. **Product** no bunrui.

91.E: Denwa toka soo iu koto?

92.F: Chigau tte, butsuritekina monoja naidesho.

93.E: Dakara denwa toka soo iuno desho?

94.F: Denwa dakeja nai.

95.E: Gasu toka?

96.F: Betsu ni sonna nanka ueetoresu demo ueetaa toka demo **service**
ya.

97.E: Ja, **hospitality** tte koto?

Translation

87.E: **Service....service**... do you mean hospitality?

88.F: No.

288

89.E: **Retail** or something like that?
90.F: It's not **service**. It relates to the dividing of a **product**....
91.E: Do you mean telephone or something like that?
92.F: No, it doesn't mean objects or anything.
93.E: So, telephone or something like that, isn't it?
94.F: Not only telephone.
95.E: Then, gas?
96.F: Something like waitress and waiter are considered to be a **service.**
97.E: So, you mean **hospitality,** don't you?

Passage 6
107.E: Soo naru to hontoo **grammar** ki o tsuketahoo ga iiyo. Maaketingu nanka toku ni.
108.F: Soona no?
109.E: Tabun. Datte maaketingu tte hito no me ni tsuku mono desho? Tabun dakara, koo, nante iuno.. **brochure** nanka kakutoki ni.

Translation
107.E: Then you have to be careful about **grammar**, especially marketing.
108.F: Do I?
109.E: Perhaps. Because marketing involves visual things, doesn't it? May be, something... what can I say.... If you write a **brochure** or something.

Passage 7
123.E: [person's name] toka to auno? Mata hanseikai mitainano suru no? **project** no, ocha dake nonde...
124.F: Yaa, ocha dake nonde...
125.E: Kyoo atta no? **Exam** de?
126.F: Iya.
127.E: De kyoo atta no? Kekkoo hito ookatta? Are wa kekka deta no?
128.F: Nanno?
129.E: Sono...
130.F: **project.**
131.E: **project** no..
132.F: B datta.
133.E: B datta. Sore nan paasento?
134.F: Sanjuu paasento gurai.
135.E: Atto... **exam** nanka?
136.F: Niju-go paasento.
137.E: Ja, ato no yonjuu-go paasento wa?
138.F: Eeetoo, **assignment** mittsu to.. .**presentation** hutatsu to...
139.E: Attake sonano? Tesuto tesuto, **presentation, presentation.**
140.F: **Presentation** wa C toka B.
141.E: C? B?
142.F: Eeeee...
143.E: **Assignment** wa?

Translation
123.E: Are you going to see [person's name]? Are you going to have a meeting for a **project** or just have tea?
124.F: Yes, we just had tea...
125.E: Did you see (her) at the **exam**?
126.F: No....
127.E: Haven't you seen her? Were there many people? Have you got a result?
128.F: Which result?
129.E: Ah....
130.F: **Project?**

131.E: **Project..**
132.F: I got a B.
133.E: You got a B. What was your overall percentage?
134.F: About 30 percent.
135.E: What else.... What about the **exam**?
136.F: I got 25 percent.
137.E: What was the remaining 45 percent?
138.F: Ah.... They were three **assignments**, two **presentations**....
139.E: Did you do these? test, test, **presentation, presentation.**
140.F: I got C or B in my **presentation.**
141.E: C or B ?
142.F: Ah....
143.E: What about the **assignment**?

Passage 8
153.E: Watashi no hoo ga saki ni owaruno ga ikenaina. Demo kinoo
       datte watashi yatteta janai, hora, honors no ano....
154.F: Sonna taipu surudake yan.
155.E: **Proposal** ....
156.F: Jibun no yaritaikoto, **enrolment** to kawarahenyanai. Ichiban
       uki uki shiteru toki ya.
157.E: Sonna koto nai. Ichiban unzari shiteru wayo. Hontoo ni
       kooiuno ga kakerunokana tte.
158.F: Sooka. Sore wa akan na.
159.E: Sooyo, sugoi **nervous** yo. Koo, **expectation** tte iuno ga arukara
       [person's name] ga yappa hajimete nihonjin ga ...nantte iuka
       nihon no tochikeikaku no soo iu **detail** no koto o kaku wake
       janai? Imamade [person's name] wa dekinakatta wakejanai.
       Nihon no sono shiryoo ga yomenakatta kara.
160.F: So iuno wa chan to **enrolment** ni kaku wake?
161.E: Chigau noyo. Sore wa sugoi kowai yo. De, watashi ga ne,
       zenzen nihon ni arumono o koo **describe** dekinaku tte jibun de
       ne katte ni...
162.F: Demo, ano [person's name] hanbun gurai shiranain janai nihon
       no koto.
163.E: Unn, dakara... Dakara ne, shiranai de watashi ga omotte iru
       koto o **paper** ni kaichatte sore o yonda hito ga nihon wa koo
       datta noka to omotte zenzen sore ga jissai to chigatte itara
       sore wa sugoi watashi wa..
164.F: Shokkuda yone.
165.E: Shokku to iuka, ikenai koto shichatta na tte kanji jan.
       Sore wa kowai kana. Sore ni nihon wa amari. Watashi wa nihon
       ni anmari ii omoi o nante iuno... ii omoiire o mottenai tte
       iuka, nihon no toshikeikaku wa tadashii to omotte inai kara
       soo iu **view point** de zenbu semete ikuwake janai?

Translation
153.E: Perhaps, finishing my (exam) earlier than you is not good for
       you. But I was doing ... you know... honors....
154.F: That's only typing
155.E: **Proposal.....**
156.F: That's something you want to do, like the **enrolment**. That must
       have been a very exiting moment for you.
157.E: No way. I was fed up with (doing it), because I was worried
       if I would really be able to write something I wanted to.
158.F: Is that true? That's not good.
159.E: Of course, I'm so **nervous,** because I feel that I am the
       object of a lot of **expectation**. I'm going to be the first
       Japanese person who write the **detail** of Japanese city
       planning, aren't I? Until now [person's name] was not able to

do it, since (he) could not understand the materials written
in Japanese.

160.F: Are you going to write it down on the **enrolment**?

161.E: No, I was so scared. If I can't **describe**, or if I
misunderstand something about Japan then.....

162.F: Anyway, you don't know much about Japan, do you?

163.E: No, if the readers get the wrong idea about Japan, just
because of my **paper**, based on my own interpretation and not
accurate research, I would be so....

164.F: Shock, wouldn't you?

165.E: Not shock, but I would feel guilty. That's what I'm worried
about. Besides, I will approach (to my topic) from my **view
point** which derives from critical opinion about the city
planning of Japan. Do you understand what I mean?

Passage 9

181.E: Zurich wa GNP ga takai wake, sekai de ichiban minna
kanemochi nawake. Soredakedo sono gomi wa ichinichi ni hitori
nan guramu toka tte kimete iruwakejanai. Dakara sugoi
yuuhukuna hito nanoni jibun no seikatsu niwa **restrict** shiteru
wakejanai? Sono seikatsu no nante iuno....

182.F: Yoyuu ga arukara dekirun janai?

183.E: Kankyoo o mamoru tame ni...

184.F: Yoyuu ga arukara dekirunjanai?

185.E: Demone, Osaka toka nihon de ne sugoi yuuhukuna hito ga sonna
koto suru ka? Omoikkiri suteru mono wa suterushi kau mono wa
kaudesho?

186.F: Datte kaumono ga sore ni tsuite kuru nya, gomi to issho ni
kangaete mii.

187.E: Kaumono ni gomi ga tsuite kuru tte koto? Soo iu mono wa
package janai? Datte, **package** ga nai to nihonjin wa kawanai
jan.

Translation

181.E: Zurich has very higher GNP, and as the largest consentration of
wealth in the world.In spite of this, the people **restrict** the
amount of rubbish they are allowed to discharge). For example,
they have decide...

182.F: They are wealthy. That's why they can afford to do it, can't
they?

183.E: In order to protect the environment ....

184.F: They are wealthy. That's why they can afford to do it, can't
they?

185.E: Think about people in Osaka, in Japan. Do wealthy people do
it? They easily throw things away and by new ones, don't
they?

186.F: Because, anything you buy comes with litter. Think about it.

187.E: Do you mean you buy something with litter? That is a **package**,
isn't it? Because Japanese wouldn't buy anything without a
package.

Passage 10

232.E: Datte watashi chuugaku de sono chishiki o tsukawanai de itsu
kore detekurundaro tte mattetan dakedo kekkyoku dete
konakatta mon. Kocchi no kookoo mo hidoijanai? Suugaku tte
kekkoo.

233.F: Zenzen imi nakattanjanai?

234.E: Imi nakatta. Datte **physics** yatte mo dete konakakatta mon. Are
wa nande detekuruhazu? Kookoo de dete kuru hazudattandaroo
ne.

Translation
232.E: I was expecting to use my knowledge at Junior high school,
       but I didn't have to use it. High school here are terrible,
       especially mathematics, aren't they?
233.F: So, there was no point in learning it.
234.E: That's right. I didn't come across it even in the study of
       physics. When was I supposed to learn it? Perhaps, I was
       supposed to learn it at high school.

TOPIC 2: THE YEAR 200

Passage 1
3.E: Demo yappari nihon ni taisuru kiboo wa motto soo iu, nante iu
     no... kankyoo o yoku suru tte iu, sono yoku suru mono ima no
     nihon no yarikata wa **engineering solution** to itte jinkooteki na
     solution shikanai wake. Soo janakute motto ningen to shizenkai
     ga tasukeatte ikeru yoo na shakai o tsukutte hoshiito
     iuno ga watashi no kiboo. De motto, nante iuno, sono nanmo
     shiranai hito ga, **economics** no koto shika kangaenai yoona hito
     ga **policy making** surunja nakkutte, hontoo ni **community** no
     shita kara iken o motte kuru yoona shakai ni suru ko'   [her
     interlocutor's name] wa?

Translation
3.E: My hope for Japan is to create a society where human beings and
     nature can coexist. It must not be achieved by current means,
     that is an **engineering solution**, this is an artificial
     solution. This is my hope for Japan. And I also hope to create
     a society which respects people's opinion, through the
     community. I hope that the people who do **policy making** are not
     only concerned with or think about **economics**. What about you?

Passage 2
9.E: Motto, sono nante iuno, shizenkai ni ningen wa hukumarete
     irunda yo tte iu kanji no **education** o shite ireba....

Translation
9.E: What can I say? It would be much better if **education** (in
     Japan) becomes based more on the idea that the human being
     belongs to nature.

Passage 3
17.E: **Unlimited growth** tte atta kedo, Sore wa nante iuno, **economy**
      ‑o iuno wa moo sooiu kangae wa hurui tte natte kite irunoka
      na? Koredake no shigen ga atte kagirareta shigen de dono gurai
      tte. Watashi wa moo hitotsu kiboo itte ii? Nihon ga
      genshiryoku kara hanareru koto.
18.F: Ma, itsu demo dekiruyaro na.
19.E: Nande shinai noka wakannai. Sore wa nande kaku ni annani,
      nante iuno...
20.F: Yappari, kane mooke ni narunyaro.
21.E: Demo osen toka kangaetara sore de zuibun...
22.F: Ya, jinkenhi toka soo iuno **maintenance** kangaetara...
23.E: Ya, **maintenance** nante ichiban takainda yo. Nandeka shitteru?
      Ninen ka sannen ni ikkai wa kowasanakya ikenai no, demo
      tatoeba ne, solar toka yarudesho...
24.F: Solar no hoo ga yasui to omoo.
25.E: Solar wa **capital cost** no..
26.F: Onnaji denki o are suru no?

292

27.E: Datte, are attadesho? **'discount cash flow analysis'** tte. Are
yaru to zettai ni **capital cost** ga takai wake. De, **maintenance**
koso mechakucha takai wake.
28.F: Yappari, are wa aruyanai no, sensoo de.
29.E: **Politics** desho?

Translation
17.E: I've read about **unlimited growth**. That is, what can I say.. the
idea that the **economy** becomes an old belief, because we have
limited resources, and therfore our activity is limited. Can I
say another hope for Japan? I hope Japan forgets about atomic
energy.
18.F: I think it can be dropped anytime.
19.E: I don't understand why they don't stop it. Why do they...
atomic, what can I say?
20.F: Maybe, because of the benefits.
21.E: Considering about contamination, it must...
22.F: If you think about personal expenses and **maintenance** for
(it)..
23.E: **Maintenance** is most costly. Do you know why? Because (it) must
be destroyed every two or three years. But if you use solar...
24.F: I think solar doesn't cost much.
25.E: The **capital cost** of solar is....
26.F: Can the same electricity be (used)?
27.E: You know about **'discount cash flow analysis'**. If you consider
it you would find out that **capital cost** is costly, and
maintenance is even more costly.
28.F: I think it becomes associated with wars.
29.E: **Politics**?

Passage 4
71.E: **Chinese** mo, yoppodo, **China** mo abunai to omoo kedo.
72.F: Chuugoku wa mada...
73.E: Mada tooi?
74.F: Chikara wa aru kedo mada nankaaa.

Translation
71.E: I think **Chinese** are also, **China** is quite powerful.
72.F: China is still...
73.E: Still it is far?
74.F: They have the power, but still..

Passage 5
85.E: Kosobo wa **United Nation** no hata agetete.
86.F: Moo owatta no?
87.E: Moo shuusen. Kyoo nyuusu de yatteta. **United Nation** no
hata agete.
88.F: Shuusen ni natte nani ga aruno?
89.E: Ya, moo nanka kaettekurun jan. Tabun canpu ni itte iru hito
kaette kuru to omoo. Ie toka tatenaoshitari.
90.F: Kane nai yan.
91.E: Sonna, **United Nation** no **fund** ga arujanai. Nan no tame ni aru
no.
92.F: Sono **United Nation** ga tsubushite.. (United Nation) ga karande
irun janai no?
93.E: Chigau, nato ga tsubushitanda yo. Nato ga tsubushite **United
Nation** ga kondo heiwa jooyaku mitainano to aida ni haitte nato
wa, datte betsu ni **Serbian** no hoo **attack** suru dake daata kara.
94.F: A souunano, de **Serbian** ga Kosobo o **attack** suru?

95.E: Soo soo soo, de, dakara **Sarbian** ga Kosobo ni irukara
saishuuteki ni nato ga **Sarbian,**.. Kosobo o **attack** suru koto ni
natta Kara kosobo no hito ga nigecchatta no.

Translation
85.E: Kosovo holds the flag of the **United Nations**.
86.F: Has (it) already finished?
87.E: The war has finished. I saw the news, and the flag of the
United Nations was...
88.F: What is going to happen after the war is finished?
89.E: I think the people, in the camps, may go back to build tneir
houses, or something like that.
90.F: They haven't got any money.
91.E: **Funds** are available from the **United Nation**s. What do you think
the **United Nation**s is for?
92.F: That **United Nations** began the destruction caused (the war),
didn't they?
93.E: No, NATO destroyed. NATO began the destruction and the **United
Nation**s brought about the peace. The only thing NATO wanted to
do was **attack Serbia**.
94.F: Oh is that right? then **Serbia attack**ed Kosovo?
95.E: That's right. Because **Serbia** was in Kosovo, NATO eventually
attacked Serbia..., Kosovo, and they evacuated.

Passage 6
160.F: Sono **supervisor** no [her supervisor's name] to dokoka e itte
shimau no?
161.E: Betsu ni [her supervisor's name] ja nakuttate ii janai.
162.F: Kaeru koto wa dekiruno?
163.E: Ha? Kaeru koto tte? Datte honors to PHD ja kankei nai yo.
164.F: Iya, saiten suruno ni.
165.E: Unn, datte honors to PHD wa kankeinainda tte, honors no...
166.F: Chigau, chigau, chigau, omae no korekara **thesis** yarun yaro?
167.E: Un, sore wa [her supervisor's name] ga yarunda yo. Mukoo kara
wa, iya, **supervisor** tte iuno wa **supervise** surudake.
168.F: Dare ga ten tsukeru no?
169.E: Gonin gurai **select** suru. Sore wa iin dakedo, nanka kiboo wa
aru?

Translation
160.F: Are you going somewhere with your **supervisor** [her
supervisor's name]?
161.E: It's not necessary going to be [her supervisor's name].
162.F: Is it possible to change?
163.E: What? what do you mean 'change'? There is no relation between
honors and PHD.
164.F: I'm talking about marking.
165.E: There is nothing to do with honors and PHD. Honors...
166.F: No, no, no, I'm talking about your **thesis**.
167.E: [Her supervisor's name] is going to do it. He..., ha? no, the
supervisor only **supervise**s.
168.F: So, who's going to mark it?
169.E: About five people are going to be **select**ed. Anyway, do you
have any hope (for Japan)?

Passage 7
180.E: Demo senkyo katsudoo tte iuno wa too ga **back up** shite iru
wake desho?
181.F: Nanman tsukatte ii kurai chigauno?
182.E: Usodaro? Datte, too no hito **representative** de yatte iru
representative...

183.F: Chan to **budget** ga mawatte kuruno kana?

Translation
180.E: But parties **back up** an election campaign, don't they?
181.F: They may only give some of the money, don't you think?
182.E: That's not true, is it? Candidates are **representative** of the party, **representative**..
183.F: I wonder if they have a **budget.**

PAIR 4 (speaker G & H)

TCPIC 1: WORK
Passage 1
1.G: Nani o hanaseba iinokashira?
2.H: **I don't know. Why do you work then?**
3.G: **Well**...mochioron nahika ii koto ga arunde anatani mo watashi nimo..

Translation
1.G: what should we talk about?
2.H: **I don't know. Why do you work then?**
3.G: **Well**...of course...there is something good for you and as well as for me ...

Passage 2
6.H: Genjitsu ni nanika soto no kuuki o suwanai to nanika hakike ga suruyoona ki ga suru noyone. Hutsuka, mikka **OK. I can manage. I can sleep everyday,** yokka...
7.G: moo soro soro ira ira shite kite...
8.H: **What can I make for him lunch?**
9.G: Honto ne.
10.H: **What can I make for him dinner?** Ie ni itara nani mo surukoto ga nai desho? Ma sooji, **ironing, vacuuming, you can do that, but you can not do that twenty-four hours a day. You can sleep, you can read a book, that's Ok. That fine. You can watch TV. That's ok. But if you stay home whole week, I don't know what to do, then I think I'm so glad I have a job.**
11.G: Genjitsu ni soo kanjiru?
12.H: **Yes, I do.**

Translation
6.H: If I don't get outside and get some air, I get fed up with it. The second day, the third day is OK. **I can manage. I can sleep every day.** The forth day...
7.G: You are getting irritated...
8.H: **What can I make for him lunch?**
9.G: I can imagine how you feel.
10.H: **What can I make for him dinner?** If you stay at home, you don't have anything to do, do you? Well, cleaning, **ironing, vacuuming, you can do that, but you can't do that twenty-four hours a day. You can sleep, you can read a book. That's ok, that's fine. You can watch TV. That's ok. But if you stay home whole week, I don't know what to do. Then I think I 'm glad I have a job.**
11.G: Do you really feel like that?
12.H: **Yes, I do.**

Passage 3

19.G: Ittan soo naru to hai doozo, nijuu-yo jikan doozo, to naru to
ne, ningen tte.... yomitakumo nakunarun desu tte hon o.

20.H: Sonnamon yo. Ningen tte, ano naimono o itsudemo naimono o
hoshigaru desho? Dakara shigoto ga nai toki wa shigoto ga
attara iinoni to omoo kedo shigoto ga takusan arisugiru to
retire shitai, hayaku **retire** shitai to omoukedomo ne. Ano,
retire tte hontoo ni sonna ni tanoshii monoja nai to omoo.
Unless, you have a very active life. Nanika **going out**
everyday, today is [   ], tomorrow is swimming and
tomorrow is, you know, going out for dinner. Sore mo maishuu
maishuu tsuzuku to yappari....

Translation

19.G: People lose their desire for reading, if they are given
twenty-four hours a day to do it.

20.H: People are always like that. They usually want to get
something they don't have, don't they? That's why, when you
don't have a job, you want to have a job, but if you have too
much to do at work, then you want to **retire**, thinking about
retire as soon as possible. I don't think 'retirement' is
enjoyable. **Unless, you have a very active life**, something
like, **going out everyday, today is [   ], tomorrow is**
swimming and tomorrow is, you know, going out for dinner. But
if you do it continuously through the week, ...

Passage 4

23.G: Areba ne. Mashite sono shigoto ga jibun no **talent** datoka jibun
no nooryoku, soshite jibun no shumi o ikaseru shigotodato iito
omoo. So iu koto ga dekinai de iyada iyada to omotte iiuto
sonohito no karada mo waruku narushi yappari kenkoo mo waruku
natte shimau. Dakara sono hen ga korekara jibuntachi no kodomo
nimo ... dakara omoo noyo. Jibun no yaritai koto o shigoto ni
erabetara hontoo ni ii to omoo.

24.H: **Lucky** yone. Hontoo ni.

Translation

23.G: That's right, if you have a job. Besides if the job is based
on your **talent** or skill, or if feels like a happy, then I
think that to me, it's a good job. If that's not possible, and
you don't like the job, you would become unhealthy. I hope
that our child also..., so I think it's so nice, if they can
pick up a job which they really like.

24.H: (They would be) **lucky**, really.

Passage 5

32.H: Watashi wa ne. Watashi ni wa kodomo ga inaikara ie ni kaette
kitemo sewa o suru hitsuyoo mo naishi mondai nain dakedo
[interlocutor's name] no tokoro wa okosan mo ite, mata goshujin
mo ite, sore de mata shigoto o motte to, watashi wa sono
hahaoya no **power** tte erai monda na tte shocchuu omotte ita no.

Translation

32.H: I don't have any children, so I don't have to look after or
worry about anybody when I get home. But you have a child,
husband and besides a job. You often make me think about
women's **power**.

Passage 7

46.H: Sore de dooshite shigoto ni modoroo to omotta no. Sore wa
taikutsu shita kara, yappari ie ni zutto ite...

47.G: Uuuu watashi wa hachi nenkan yappari...
48.H: Shuhu to iu **home maker** to iu **position** ni.
49.G: Sugoku munashii to omotta no, itsu mo oshime o hoshite.

Translation
46.H: Then why did you get a job? It's because you got bored at home
all the time...
47.G: Well, I thought I should stay home for eight years..
48.H: In the **position** of a house wife, a **home maker**.
49.G: I felt so empty. I just washed dipers all the time...

Passage 8
58.H: Hajimeta koro wa omoshiroi to omotta?
59.G: Watashi no baai wa **lucky** datta no. Ichiban hajime ga sugoku
totemo ii jooshi de subarashii jooshi de totemo **lucky** datta
no.
60.H: Sono jooshi tte iuno wa **French**?

Translation
58.H: Did you find (your job) interesting in the beginning?
59.G: In my case, I was **lucky**. The first boss was really nice. a
wonderful boss, so I was so **lucky**.
60.H: Was your boss **French**?

Passage 9
64.H: Nihon de nihon no jooshi no tame ni hataraita koto wa arimasu?
65.G: Naidesu ne.
66.H: **You've never worked for Japanese.**
67.G: **No,** ...pari demo yappari huransujin. watashi no shigoto wa
furansujin bakkari de konkai ga hajimete nihonjin.
68.H: **What's the difference between the Japanese boss and foreign
boss?**
69.G: **Totally.**
70.H: **Totally.** Ma. anata no baai wa shigoto to shite wa tokubetsuna
keesu yone. Hutsuu no jooshi to mattaku chigau wa yone.
Diplomat dakara chigau noyo. Hutsuu no jooshi to chigau noyo.
71.G: Demo huransu de hataraita toki wa amerika no kaisha de
hataraita koto ga aru no, shinbunsha no... sono toki no
jooshi mo mata **totally different**. Mattaku chigau wane.
Yappari, sorezore chigatta wa. Sorezore ii benkyoo ni
narimashita.
72.H: Demo zenzen warui **boss** ni attata koto ga naino?
73.G: Kore wa **cut** shimashoo ne. Demo ningen desu kara...

Translation
64.H: Have you ever worked for a Japanese boss?
65.G: No, I haven't.
66.H: **You're never worked for Japanese.**
67.G: **No,** .... In Paris I had a French (boss). My job always deals
with the French. This is the first time I've ever worked for
Japanese.
68.H: **What's the difference between the Japanese boss and foreign
boss?**
69.G: **Totally.**
70.H: **Totally.** Well, in your case your boss is different from others
on account of your working place. They are a **diplomat**, so it's
different from an ordinary boss.
71.G: But I've worked at an American company, a newspaper office
when I was in France... A boss I had at that time was also
totally different. Of course, each one is totally different
from the other. I've learnt something from each of them.

72.H: Have you ever had a nasty **boss**?
73.G: Should we **cut** this topic, shall we? Of cor .se, we are all
human being....

Passage 10
79.G: ....Nanimokamo gisei ni suru toki ni kiken ga aru to omoo.
Shigoto mo taisetsuda keredomo jinsei o **enjoy** suru koto mo
taisetsu dato omoo. Yappari ishiki shite inainda to omoo kedo,
hitotsu no mono o motteru tame ni amarinimo gisei ga ookattara
watashi wa shooshin nanokamo shirenai kedo aru teido **enjoy
life,** jinsei tanoshiminagara no shigoto dakara taishite seikoo
shinai wayo.

Translation
79.G: ...There is a danger when you sacrifice everything for (your
job). Of course (your) job is important, but it is also
important to **enjoy** your life. I think I'm not really aware of
it, but I try (to enjoy life), especially when it comes to the
stage when too many things are being sacrificed. I'm a bit of
a coward. I work, but I also like to **enjoy life,** this is why I
have never been very successful in my job.

TOPIC 2: THE YEAR 2000

Passage 1
6.H: Yappari iidaa ga inai to iu koto ne.
7.G: Soona no, dakara yappari dooshite **leader** ga inaika tte iuto,
yahari aruteido kokusaiteki na **level** de katsuyaku shite
itadakeru yoona seijika ga inai tte koto. Dakara kekkyoku ikura
keizai de ne, imamade isshookenmei keizai keizai de yatte kita
wa yone. Sore de sekaiteki ni wa keizaitaikoku ni natta desho.
Demo iza huta o akete mitara yappari imamade no nihon to onaji
yoona kankaku de, yahari supaapawaa no amerika to, sorekara
hokano yooroppa no kuni no katagata no iinari ni natteitawake.
Soshite iinari ni naruno ga ii warui janaku 'he yappari nihon to
iu kuni ga moo sukoshi sekai to dooyoo ni onaji **level** de
katsuyaku dekinai?
8.H: Demo sore wa watashi wa omoo kedo, sore wa **politician** no
mondai janai to omoo.
9.G: Sore wa dare no mondai kashira?
10.H: Sore wa **politician** jishin no mondai janaku tte **politician** ga
erabu **bureaucrats** no nooryoku dato omoo, tte iu nowa tatoeba
politician tee iuno wa tokubetsuna ano nante iuno... **very
very particular job. Politician** tte iu nowa, toku ni nihon
dewa otoosan, ojiisan, ojiisan ga **politician** ni natte, sono
mata musuko ga **politician** ni natte. Nanka kakei de zutt
politician de tsunagatte iru janai?
11.G: Tte iu koto wa sunawachi nihon no seiji to iuno wa wariai ni
ano chokusetsusenkyo ja nakute kansetsutekina mono de...
kokumin ga eraberu to iu, soo iu huuna mono ni shita hoo ga
taiseitekini wa ii. Tashika ni sore wa aru wayone. Demo sore
wa kangaeru koto wa dekitemo soo iu **system** ni gara tto kaeru
wake ni ikanai.
12.H: Demo watashi wa omoonda kedo **politician** tte iuno wa tada
jissai ni shigoto o suru hitotachi de wa nai to watashi wa omo.
13.G: dakara, dakara kanryoo...
14.H: **Personally, personally, I think,** jissai ni shigoto o suruno wa
bureaucrats dato omoo.
15.G: Demo sore wa yappari shigoto de atte sono **ideology** tte iu ka
sono kangae o oshitooseruno wa yappari aruteido seijikada to

298

omo wayo. Yappari Clinton toka Thatcher demo ne. So iu
hitotachi tte iuno wa wariai ni **leadership** tte iuno ga
shidooryoku tte iuno wa kokumin ni dakeja nakute sekai o
atama ni irete no shidooryoku desho?

16.H: Ie,demo watashi wa, shidooryoku tte iu keredomo Clinton no
shidooryoku tte kare hitori no chikaraja nai wake desho? Kare
wa kanarazu **brain** ga iru desho, **advisor** ga ...

17.G: Un, sore wa **advisor**. ... Un, demo tada hitotsu chigaukoto wa
wariai ni ano, koodooryoku ga aru janai, nihon no seijika tte
iuno wa aidea o motte ite sore o sekaitekina butai de sekai no
butai de koodoo ni utsusu tte iu sokomade itte nain janai.
Sore wa doo shite, ja?

18.H: Sore wa yappari watashi wa soremo yappari **advisor** no sekinin
da to omoo. **Politician** no sekinin ja naku te mawari ni iru
hitotachi no mondaida to omoo. Dakara, ano **politician** ga hito
o erabu toki ni **brain** ∩ erabu moto ni brain no naka ni
tokubetsu ni ii hito ga ireba sono **politician** mo zutto kawatte
iku to omoo, watashi wa...

19.G: Watashi wa yappari mawari ni iru hito no hoo mo taisetsu
dakedo, yahari iwayuru sono jibun no kangae o wariai ni sekai
no **level** made motte itte doodoo to hatsugen deki te mata
koodoo ni utsuseru, soo iu seijika ga nihon mo dete kureba
imamade no keizaitaikoku to sono hutatsu o kami shite
hutatsu ga dooji ni shinkoo shite iku to iu jootai dattaraba
aru teido, nante iuno kashira, kono iza huta o aketara yahari
ginkoo no soshiki datoka iu mono ga iwayuru **globalization**
towa mattaku kakehanarete ita to iu desho? Tomokaku, soo iu
seizika ga iza nihon o minagara taezu ano, sekai no **level** de
yatte itte kurete itaraba kona huu ni natte inakatta to omoo
no yone.

Translation

6.H: Because, there is no leader.

7.G: That's it. There is no politician who can actually work at the
international **level**, this is the reason why there is no **leader**.
Until recently, (Japan) worked very hard at improving its
economy, and it because an economically strong country.
However, it appears that Japan has always obeyed the American
super power, and other European countries. The main point here
is not to discuss if obeying (them) is good or bad. But is
there any possibilities for Japan to work at the same **level** in
the world?

8.H: I don't think that it has anything to do with **politician**s.

9.G: Who them?

10.H: I don't think that there is a problem with the **politicians**
themselves, rather, it is the ability of the **politicians** to
select capable **bureaucrats**. For example, **politicians** are
special.. what can I say... **very very particular job**.
Politician, especially in Japan, their fathers and (their)
grand fathers, the grand father becomes a **politician**, then his
son becomes a **politician**, and then his son becomes a
politician too. It seems to me that **politicians** hand their job
down through each generation, keeping it within the family.

11.G: Do you mean that Japanese politics is based on indirect
election rather than direct election. It's better to create a
system in which people can elect (politicians) directly. This
is true, and it's easy to think, but it's not possible to
change the **system** totally.

12.H: I don't think **politicians** are people who simply do their job.

13.G: so, so bureaucrats...

14.H: **Personally. Personally, I think** that in fact the **bureaucrats**
      actually do the job.

15.G: The politician's job is to present... their **ideology**, I mean
      some politicians can achieve this better than others.
      Politicians like Clinton and Thatcher have leadership. Here
      the quality of **leadership** exists. This kind of leadership is
      based on considerations of not only the citizen, but also the
      world.

16.H: You say they have leadership, but Clinton's leadership does not
      only belong to him, does it? He has a **brain,** and he also has
      advisors.

17.G: Yes, there are **advisors**. But thee is one difference (between
      them and Japanese politicians). They are decisive. Japanese
      politicians can't take action at the international level, even
      though they have this own idea. What's the reason for it then?

18.H: That is also the **advisor**'s responsibility. It's the
      responsibility of the people who are around (them). Therefore,
      if a **politician** selects useful people, or **brain**, the
      politicians will be better. I think..

19.G: I don't think so. I think if we had politiciars who could
      improve their ideas, and present them at the international
      level, then take action, together with economic strength,
      Japan would not be like this. I mean we realized that the
      banking **level** of organization in Japan is totally different
      from the **globalizing** banking system, isn't it?

Passage 2

24.H: Igirisu nanka zenzen shimaguni ja nai wayo. Datte karera wa
      sore koso sekai o **common wealth** de...

25.G: Keizaiteki ni wane, mochiron soo. Sangyookakumei mo Igirisu de
      are shite...

Translation

24.H: England is not an island country, because they ruled the world
      common wealth...

25.G: Of course, economically. The industrial revolution occurred in
      England...

Passage 3

29.G: .... Yappari koo nattara ato wa kokumin no doryokushidai de
      atte, yappari sono aru imi de jibuntachi no riten to shite iru
      seijika ga tateru yoona **system** ni kaete iku to iukoto ga
      hitotsu nanja nai kana.

30.H: Ano, seijikazitai ga kawaranakute mo kokumin tte iuka ano
      global, zenbu **global** ni natte iru desho? Ano, kigyoo ni shite
      mo zenbu **combine** sarete amerika to nihon no kigyoo to zenbu
      issho ni natte nanika doitsu no ginkoo ga BT o kattari toka,
      zenbu ano **merger** ga tsuite irukara zenbu kaishazentai no
      keizai ga keizai tte iuno ga ittaika shite iru to omoo none.

30.G: .....Demo sore wa kawatte kuru keredomo sono taisei ga kichin
      to totonowanakereba ikura ano gakusei ga daigaku o sotsugyoo
      shite kaisha ni haitte mo kono kaisha jishin no taisei ga
      kichin to **globalization** ni natte ikeruyoona kaisha ja
      nakattara sore mo mata dame deshoo.

32.H: Sore wa, sore wa daijoobuda to omoo.

33.G: Daijoobuda to omoo?

34.H: **Public servant** igai hutsuu no ano...

Translation

29.G: ....Therefore, it is the responsibility of the people
themselves to change the **system** which allows people to select
the right person as a politician.

30.H: Although politicians have not changed, nations have **globalize**,
everything has **globalized**. Even many enterprises were **combined**
and the German bank bought BT. It seems to me the whole
economic system has been integrated due to **merger**.

31.G: ....it can be changed, but it's not possible if the system
itself is not stable, and the company can not follow the trend
of **globalization**, even thought they employ people who are
educated.

32.H: I think it will be alright.

33.G: Do you think so?

34.H: Except the **public servant.**

Passage 4

38.H: Sore wa moo jidai to tomo ni kawatte itteru. Shoosha wa...

39.G: Kawatte itteru?

40.H: **Yes**, shoosha nanka wa toku ni gaikoku tono kooshoo ga
ooidesho...

Translation

38.H: It has been changed recently. A trading company...

39.G: Changed?

40.H: **Yes,** especially the trading company, they deal much more with
foreign countries, don't they?

Passage 5

46.H: Kitai wa dekinai kedo **survive** suru to omoo.

Translation

46.H: I don't expect them to change that much, but they will
survive.

Passage 6

48.H: Watashi wa ne, ano seijika ni michibiite morau tte iu kangae
wa nihonjin niwa nai to omoo.

49.G: Hontoo? Demo yappari...

50.H: **As far as leadership is concerned**, nihon no hitotachi wa
zenzen kitai shite inai.

51.G: Yappari sore wa kitai subeki janai?

52.H: Demo sakki no hanashi ni modoru kedo, tatoeba **top** no **leader** ga
inakutemo seiji wa ugoku to omoo.

53.G: Soo omou?

54.H: Un, kuni wa ugoite ikumonoda to seijika ga inakutemo.

55.G: Ya, hontoo?

56.H: **Yes, yes, I, I believe that.** Seijika ga inakutemo kuni wa
ugoku.

Translation

48.H: I don't think that the Japanese people expect leadership from
politicians.

49.G: Really, but...

50.H: **As far as leadership is concerned,** Japanese people don't
expect that from politicians at all.

51.G: But, don't you think they should expect it?

52.H: I'll go back to the previous story, for example, the
government carries on without a **top leader.**

53.G: Do you think so?

54.H: Yes, a country can carry on without a leader.

55.G: Is it true?
56.H: **Yes, yes, I, believe that.** A country carries on without a
      leader.

Passage 7

61.G: Yappari de Gaulle ga inakattara yappari pari ga asokomade....
62.H: **No,** ano watashi wa seijika no nihonjin ni kansuru kagiri wa
      seijika no **leadership** wa zenzen nai to omotte imasu.
63.G: Ah, ja [interlocutor's name] ga ossharuno wa nihon no bawai ne
      seiji...
64.H: **Yes,** nihon no seijika ni, **as far as leadership is concerned,**
      seijikano **leadership** wa naito omoo. Demo Clinton mo Thacher mo
      soo dakedomo kekkyoku karetachi hitori no chikara dewa
      naidesho? Sakki to onaji koto ni naru kedo.

Translation

61.G: If de Gaulle did not exist, Paris couldn't ....
62.H: **No,** as far as Japanese politicians are concerned they don't
      have **leadership**.
63.G: Oh, you're only talking of the Japanese case, aren't you?
64.H: **yes,** in Japanese politicians' case, **as far as leadership is
      concerned,** I don't think they have leadership. Both Clinton
      and Thacher can't stand by themselves. This is the same
      discussion.

Passage 8

71.G: Kekkyoku sono kuni ni totte nani ga ichiban hitsuyoo de
      arooka. Tatoeba, **privatization** Igirisu dewa... sore ni me o
      tsukete jikko shite iku koodooryoku, sore wa seijika no talent
      dato omoo.
72.H: Demo sore wa seijika no **talent** kashira, demo sore wa kojino
      are kashira ne?
73.G: Sore wa **leader** ga eikyoo suru to omoo wa.

      . . . .

76.H: Sore wa dakara **power** yone.
77.G: Nooryoku, nooryoku. Yappari nooryoku...
78.H: Watashi wane, kokumin wa tomokatu **top leader** wa soushite
      moraitai wane. Kokumin ni kanshite ieba **I'm very very
      pessimistic actually. Even even English people, ordinary
      people, are they global? Can you say that?
      No, I don't think so. French ordinary people, are they global?
      No, I don't think so.** (laugh)
79.G: **True.** Sore wa zettai ni ieru koto ne...

Translation

71.G: Consequently, the **talent** of politicians does exist. They are
      able to recognise what is the most important thing to a
      country, and decide how to achieve it, like **privatization** in
      England.
72.H: But, is it the politician's **talent**?
73.G: That is the influence of a **leader**, I think.

      . . . .

76.H: It's **power.**
77.G: That is ability, ability, their ability...
78.H: I hold hope that a **top leader** do it, but I'm doubtful about
      the citizen. In terms of the citizen, **I'm very pessimistic
      actually. Even even English people, ordinary people, are they**

global? can you say that? No, I don't think so. French ordinary
people, are they global? No, I don't think so. (laugh)
79.G: True. You can definitely say that.

Passage 9
85.G: .... Doodoo to jibuntachi no iken nari, koodoo nari ga iwayuru
global tekina mono de areba kekyoku kyakkoo o abirushi shizen
ni sore wa shizen to natte iku mono de atte kyooseitekina
monode wa nai.

Translation
85.G: ....If their opinion or activity is globalistic, then they
would naturally gain approval.

Passage 10
89.G: ....Yappari wareware no sedai no kangae tte iu no wa imakara
nijuu nen mae no kangae towa chigatte motto motto...
international dato omoo?
90.H: No, kawatte inai. Watashitachi wa kaigai ni kurashite iru kara
soo omoo daro kedo...

Translation
89.G: ....Do you think our generation's thinking is more
international than the one of twenty years ago?
90.H: No, it hasn't changed. You feel that way because, we have
li·ed in a foreign county.

Passage 11
98.H: Nihon? watashi wane ano, seijika niwa kitai shite inai
keredomo nihon no kokumin wa survive suru to omoo.
99.G: Survive suru to omoo?
100.H: Yes, watashi wa nihon jinshujitai wa shinyoo wa oite iru
wakedakara. Hutsuu no nihonjin (laugh) nihonjin wa umaku
survive shite iku wayone, kitto, nani ga okottemo.

Translation
98.G: Japan? I don't expect much from politicians, but I think
Japanese people will survive.
99.G: Do you think (they) will survive?
100.H: Yes, because I trust the Japanese race itself, ordinary
people. Japanese people will surely survive, whatever
happens.

PAIR (speaker I & J)

TOPIC 1 : WORK
Passage 1
14.J: Dakara sono kijun ga kocchi no hito no kijun ga wakaranainda
yone. Owner, owner ni kiitara owner wa kiraida tte. Manager
ataride, dokomade, meikaku ni natte nai wake ne. Manager atari
made itte stop suruka, sono keeki tesuto no...
15.I: Iiyo, sonna manager made ikanai yo. Sanpuru dasu koto mo aru
kedo, daitai [company's name] 'ja kore tesuto' tte iuno mo..
keeki mo arudeshoo. [company's name] de kanarazu yatterun
dakara.

Translation

14.J: Actually, I don't know the standard of it. I asked an **owner** his opinion about it (a cake), and the **owner** said, the **owner** doesn't like it. It's not clear whether the **manager, manager** has the authority to be able to **stop** a sample cake from being sold in the shop or not.

15.I: No, it's not (be stopped) by the **manager**. We sometimes put a sample in the shop, but there are some test cakes. We definitely do it.

Passage 2

19.I: Wakannai ka. Kono mae ne, uchi no kanai to musume to kaettanda yo. Isshuu kan hodo asobi de, sono **brochure** o ne, moratte kaettara ne, 'nonno' toka nantoka tte iu takusan chiizu keeʰ notterun dayo.

20.J: Boku wa karuchaa sentaa toka no **library** kara nyoboo ga karite kurun desukedo ne, kekkoo chiizu keeki detemasu yo.

21.I: Un, ureterunda yone. Ma, chiiizu jitai ga kocchi wa yasui kara ne.

Translation

19.I: You don't know. Last time, I went back to (Japan) with my wife and daughter for about one week during my holiday. When I got some **brochure**, like 'nonno', I came across lots of articles about cheese cakes.

20.J: I often see some articles about cheese cakes here too, on books which my wife takes from the **library** of the cultural center.

21.I: Yes, It seems to be popular. Cheese itself is very cheap here, isn't it?

Passage 3

24.J: Dakarane, dono **section** ni kumikomu toka ne. Koo iu mono o.

25.I: Sore wa moo ne, rain o tsukuranakya ne. Hiru demo yoru demo iikara, hiru demo iiya, patto lain tsukutte moo sore bakkari yatteruno yo. Doregurai kikai ga haireru ka sore wa wakaranaikedo ne. Sore wa ookina tanni dakara iku to shitara, sore wa ni-man, san-man wa tsukuranakya ikenai isshuu kan de.

Translation

24.J: I'm wondering which **section** can produce something like this.

25.I: I think we create a production line. It doesn't matter whether it's day time or night time, day time would be ok. We can make a clear line and produce only that one. I don't know how many machines we can get. But anyway, we have to produce twenty thousand or three thousand each week, because it has to be big amount.

Passage 4

38.J: Ukundesu yo. Patto sorega ne. **Fan** o mawashita wake mae ne, **fan** o mawashite yaita wake. Yappari, sositara onajida na tto omotta. Chiri ga ue ni paatto, dakara ano **oven** mo onajida ne. Yogore ga..

39.I: Ma, rakku jitai ga yogoreterukara ne. Dakara, rakku o kireinano ni shite **special** ni shite, shitara doo kana. Ma, mawari ga yogoreteruno kana, naka ga yogoreteruno kana.

40.J: Ano **rack** ga ne. Zenbu ga yogoreterukara ne.

Translation

38.J: (The dust)is scattered, because I turned on the **fan**. I had the same experience when I baked (cakes) with **fan,** and the dust flew everywhere. That **oven** is the same. Lots of dust....

39.I: Well, the rack itself is dirty, so why don't we get a clean and **special** rack. I wonder if around the rack is dirty or inside.

40.J: That **rack** is, totally dirty.

Passage 5

43.I: [person's name], nankane, **time sheet** o rokuji made yatteru noni goji ni kaeteru tte hanashi kiita koto aru? aa iuno wa..

44.J: Wakaranai ne.

45.I: Soshitara wakaru yone. **Time sheet** o rokuji ni tsukete yo, go ji ni kaettara minna ni wakaru monne.

46.J: Wakaranai na.

47.I: [person's name] mada **holiday?**

48.J: [person's name] mada **holiday.**

49.I: Sueeden dayone.

50.J: Nagai yone.

Translation

43.I: I've heard something about [person's name]. Have you heard that he leaves work at five o'clock but records (his) **time sheet** at six o'clock?

44.J: I don't know.

45.I: If (he) does leave at five o'clock but records (his) **time sheet** at six o'clock, everyone can notice it, can't they?

46.J: I don't know.

47.I: Is [person's name] still on **holiday?**

48.J: He is still on **holiday.**

49.I: Sweden, right?

50.J: Too long, isn't it?

Passage 6

54.J: Mondai wa nai, tada anmari [company's name] sisutemu sukija nai tte. Kekkyoku, sono nanka, **cake room** de, tatoeba **freezer** o **day shift** to **night shift** to wakaretete nikai tenken mo aru. Sore wa futsuu dattara hitotsu no guruupu de katametara ikkai de sooji ga sumu wake. Sore toka hito no **trade**, sore mo ironna mondai ga aru. Yoosuru ni [person's name] wa umaku hito o tsukaitai wake, hito o ne, acchi itte, kocchi itte.

55.I: Sore wa sooda yone.

56.J: Sore wa sooda yone. Dakedo yappari nante ittara ii?.. Mukashihuu nanda yone. Hitotsu no **section** de osaete okitai tte iu, soo iu are de, dakara soko ni trade suru tabi ni mondai ga okiru to, tatoeba ne, tatoe ba ima nanka wa ne, **night shift** de, **night shift** de, ano zenbu oodaa o kaiteruyoodesho? **Day shift** shite. Kore tsukure to itte, are tsukure to itte, ima nanka nanimo yattenai yo. Mukashi wane, black forest wa chan to **cream** o hasande, **freezer** no naka ni iretetoka.

Translation

54.J: There is no problem, but (he) said that (he) doesn't like the system of [company's name]. For example, in a **cake room**, a **freezer** is supposed to be checked twice, because there are two separated groups, **day shift** and **night shift**. If there was one group, cleaning would be done only once. Besides, there are many problems in the **trade**. Basically, [person's name] wants to manipulate workers.

55.I: That's true.

56.J: It's true. How can I say, He's inflexible about the
organisation of the **section**. He wants to swap the workers
around. That's why each time the ordering is done, problems
happen. For example, the order used be taken by the **night
shift**.. **night shift** to **day shift,** like 'can you make such and
such', but not any more. There use be the order like 'put the
cream between a black forest and put it in the **freezer**' in the
past.

Passage 7
64.I: Ja, zenbu **night shift** ga shiageteru no? Saisho kara.
65.J: **Night shift** ga yatteru yo.

Translation
64.I: You mean (people in) **night shift** have to be involved in the
whole process?
65.J: **Night shift** is doing.

Passage 8
73.J: Ima [person's name] ga kiterudesho?
74.I: Kiteru kiteru.
75.J: Ima **night shift** ni kiteru. De, minna okotteru.
76.I: [person's name] o doo shite...
77.J: Kaisha ni monku iitaindaroo ne. Hutsuu no hitoyori sanjuppun
mo yonjuppun mo shigoto ga osoi kara. Yonjuppun gurai osoidaro
ne.
78.I: Osoino? tega? tega osoi no?
79.J: Minna okotte ru.
80.I: Osoi kara?
81.J: Kaisha mo bakada yo, **day shift** kara **night shift** ni kaete
penalty rate mo haratte ne. Moo ikka-getsu, ikka getsu hanka,
moo nikka getsu gurai ni naruno kana.. haitte, demo shigoto
ikkoo ni..

Translation
73.J: [person's name] is working with us, isn't (she)?
74.I: Yes, (she) is.
75.J: (She)'s on **night shift,** so everyone gets upset.
76.I: About her? why?
77.J: I guess (they) want to complain about (her) to the company.
(She) is so slow, thirty or forty minutes slower than anyone
else forty minutes, perhaps.
78.I: You mean (she) is slow with her hands?
79.J: Every one gets upset.
80.I: Is it because she is slow?
81.J: The company must be stupid. (They) pay **penalty rates,** and
transfer (her) from **day shift** to **night shift**, but (she) doesn't
improve, even though (she) has been working a month...a month
and a half...two months already...

Passage 9
89.J: Dakara **packer** no hito ga tasukete kureru no, furuutsu no
moritsuke, osoi no, tonikaku osoino. Osokerya osoi de iin
dakedo kondo shaberu desho.

Translation
89.J: (She) is so slow, really slow to arrange to arrange fruits, so a
packer other helps her. (She) is not only slow, but also talks a
lot...

Passage 10

99.J: Watashi ga 'motto hayaku yannakya dameda' tte. 'Moo owattakara
burashi de nuttara chanto **oven rack** ni kakenasai', sashinasai'
tte. **'Packer** ni tasukete moratte nani mo iwanainoka' tte, de
packer niya tte waratte. Kutte kaakatte kurun dane.
100.I: Dare ga? **Packer** ga?

Translation
99.J: I told her that she has to work faster. I said to her 'Hang
the brush on the **oven rack** after you use it', 'Don't you say
anything to a **packer** who helps you'. So the **packer** grinned.
And then she blew up in..
100.I: Who? the **packer**?

Passage 11

111.J: ...Watashi wa atsui oyuo kunde kite saat kakereba sugu
waichau wake. Soshite katachi no **pastry puff** o **cut** shite, pa
pa pa tto yareba ma, yonjuuppun ma, osokutomo yonjuuppun inai
de owachau no.
112.I: Ma, nobo baigurai no supiido de dekiru wake?
113.J: Aa, dekiru dekiru. Yatsura wa ne. Kujikara haitte sugu **start**
shigoto shinai no. Sono mae ni watashi ga kite moo
namakuriimu, juugo hun shigoto ni hairu mae ni juugo hun mae
ni, namakuriimu tatechau no. De, yatsura wa ne suponji o cut
surudesho, soshitara moo sono **cream** sugu tsukaeru.
Asobukara...
114.I: Ma, sore wa kuji tte ittara kocchi no hito wa kuji ni kuru
wane. Demo, kyo nanka [person's name] wa rokuji mae kara
chotto mae ni moo kite yatteta yo. Juppun gurai mae kana?
115.J: Chigaunda, keeki no baai wa suponji cut shitara namakuriimu
ka nakattara...
116.I: Nani mo dekinain desho?
117.J: Nani mo dekinai no. Dakara watashi wa juugo hun, nijuppun mae
ni haitte **machine** de **time** awasete oite mawashite oku wake.
Soshitara ato wa **outside** de matte koo yatte tada kakerudake.
Dakara minna ga kita toki kondo dekiagaru wake. Minna **cut**
shite ikudesho. Dakara sugu kore dekiru wake. Sono chigaina
wake.

Translation
111.J: .... I get hot water first and boil it, so that it doesn't
take so long then, **cut pastry puff** quickly, so, forty
minutes, takes maximum forty minutes.
112.I: You mean you can do it twice as fast?
113.J: Of course I can do. They don't **start** their job at nine
o'clock. I usually go to work fifteen minutes earlier to make
cream, so that they can use the **cream** straight after they cut
sponge. They're always playing around.
114.I: That's normal for people here. If they are supposed to be at
work at nine o'clock then they come at nine o'clock. But
today, [person's name] came little bit earlier, and started
working. Maybe about ten minutes earlier.
115.J: No, I mean if you don't make cream before you cut sponge, you
can't do anything in making a cake.
116.I: That's right, you can't to do anything.
117.J: You can't do anything. That's why I usually go to work
fifteen or twenty minutes earlier, and set there **time** with a
machine. Then I leave it, and wait **outside**. When everyone
comes to work, it would already have been done. The job can
be done quicker after every one has **cut** (sponge). That makes
the difference.

Passage 12
123.J: Tetsudatte kuretari, **packer** ga tetsudatte kurerushi.
124.I: **Packer** ga ne. [person's name] wa nani ga dekiru no?
125.J: Furuutsu no..
126.I: Ma, sore gurai wa dekiru desho. Are mo **baker** dakara.

Translation
123.J: (He) helps us, and a **packer** helps us too.
124.I: A **packer** ..... what can [person's name] do?
125.J: Fruits...
126.I: Of course, he can do something like that, because he's also a
       baker.

Passage 13
133.J: Maene, hantoshi mae kana.., omae dooyatte ie ni kaetteruno tte.
       Soshitara chaaruzu storiito tooranai de furiiuei tooranai de
       doko ka **river side** kara arubaniihaiuei dete, iya sore ga
       docchikara...

Translation
133.J: (I) asked him before, maybe six months ago, how he can get
       home. He said that he usually drives to Albany high way from
       some where **river side** avoiding Charles street and the
       freeway, and...

TOPIC 2 : THE YEAR 2000

Passage 1
7.J: Tada, watashi wa omoonda kedo shinpainano wa nihon o torimaku,
     tatoeba kitachoosen toka..
8.I: Kitachoosen ne.
9.J: **Korean** toka ima wa chuugoku to taiwan ga ima mondai ni natte
     irutoka.
10.I: Natteru ne.

Translation
7.J: I feel danger about the countries surrounding Japan like North
     Korea.
8.I: North Korea, that's right.
9.J: **Korean**, and now it's a controversial issue about China and
     Taiwan.
10.I: It is.

Passage 2
29.J: Sore to nisen nen de ieruno wa shigoto kara intaishita hito
      ne. Sono **population** ga huetemasu yo.
30.I: Fueteru ne. Roojin ga fueru ne.

Translation
29.J: And in the year 2000 the **population** of retired people would
      increase.
30.I: Yeah, increasing, more elderly people.

Passage 3
82.I: ..Boku mo juken toka atta desho. Dakara moo kodomo wa, to iu
      kane, juudai no uchi wa benkyoo shite ireba sorede iinda toka
      ie no tetsudai nanka shinakutemo, soo janainda mon hontoo wa
      ne. Benkyoo shite, tetsudai mo shite, ironna koto o shite

308

hajimete ichininmae ni natte ikunda to iu kane. Ma, ima no
system dewa shoo ga nai yo.

Translation
82.I: ....I also experienced the entrance exam of university, so I
thought (at that time) I don't have to help my parents and all
I have to do is study. But it's not true. You grow not only
through study but also in lots of other ways, like helping
your parents. But it can't help with the **system** now.

Passage 4
93.J: Soo iu koosei ga ne. Nihon no shakai dattara chot o ikkai
nikkai hanzai shitara moo jinsei damedesho?
94.I: Sorya, oosutoraria wa sugoin janai? Soredattara, datte
oosutiraria wa mukashi **convict** no kunidattan damon. Are,
chotto keiki sugitara jiyuuda ttan dakara ne. Sono ten wa
nanka oosutoraria no keimusho nanka warito jiyuu desho. Ma
Amerika mo soo nandesho. Yappari soryaa nihon nanka to
kurabetara soo iu imide wa **chance** ga aru yo.

Translation
93.J: It's a kind of like starting a new life. If you commit a crime
once or twice in Japanese society, it would be impossible for
you to have a new life.
94.I: In that case, Australia is terrific. Because it was a county
where **convict**s were sent, so (convicts) were given freedom
after completing their sentence. Prisons in Australia seem to
be much freer, America too, don't they? Compared to the
Japanese case, There is much more **chance** (for person who has
committed crime) to start a new life.

Passage 5
112.I: Nihonjin wa **communication** to iu ka, kotoba ga, eigo ga
dekinai yone. Dekinai to iu ka iooto shinai to iu ka,
tatoeba [person's name] nanka mite, kare ne, kono mae nani mo
iwanakattadeshoo. Tabun ne, shittete mo iwanai yo.

Translation
112.I: Japanese people are not good at making **communication**, I mean
not good at speaking English. Or perhaps, they try not too
talk much. For example, [person's name], look at him, he
didn't say anything last time. I guess he wouldn't say
anything even if he knew (about it).

Passage 6
120.I: Sono oseibo toka ochuugen toka binboonin mo okurunda kara ne.
Shoorai no mikaeri o mokuronde yo. Muda yone.
121.J: Sore yorimo anna tsutsumigami toka rippana hako toka iranai
kara sore yorimo **price** o yasuku shite kurrereba...

Translation
120.I: Even people who are not wealthy enough send a year end
present and a midyear present, because they expect something
in return. It's a waste of money.
121.J: I want to get a discount **price** when I buy something for a
present, because I don't want it in wrapping paper or a
beautiful box.

PAIR 6 (speaker K & L)

TOPIC 1 : WORK
Passage 1
12.K: Dochira de? Ano **office** ni irashite itadaita hoo ga saki
desuka?
13.L: Ie, sore wa zutto zutto ato no koto desu yo.

Translation
12.K: Where? did I see you at the **office** first?
13.L: No, that was pretty much later.

Passage 2
20.K: Soshite sore o kakudai nasatta no? Ano **board** o?
21.L: Sore o kakudai ni asoko ni aru **sign board**. Are watashi ga
tsukutta ano jigata nan desu. Ano (company's name) ka nanka
no zasshi kara.

Translation
20.K: And did you make the **board** bigger?
21.L: Yes, I made it bigger. The **sign board** I make with the
stencil came from JAL WING magazine.

Passage 3
29.L: Ma Oosutoraria de shigoto o shiyoo to biza mo toremashite
kyojuuken mo torimashite sore wa umaku ikanakattan desu
kedo sooshita toki ni tamatama soko de tsukatte ita
Chinese no **accountant**, rei no (company 's name) kare ga
nihonjin no shiriai ga iru (speaker K) to iu, are dokoka
de kiita koto ga aru naa to omotte itara sono ato paatii
de attan desu yo.

Translation
29.L: Since I was planning to business in Australia. I've got a
visa and permanent residence. I was not successful in the
business actually. Anyway, at that time I had a **Chinese
accountant**, and (he) said that (he) had a close Japanese
friend. Then, I noticed that it was you when I saw (you) at
the party later on.

Passage 4
36.K: Sono toki ni meishi o itadaita node ano toki wa (company's name)
to iu no o itadaita no o oboete iru no. Nakanaka **intelligent**
na kata ga omie ni nararetana tto omotte. Ano koro wa
imagurai hosoku, ima mata ano kurai ni hosoku narareta kedo.
37.L: Are wa kyuujuu-san nengurai, ja nai, yo nen ka. Watashi ichiban
hidokatta nowa kyuujuu-roku nengurai nan desu yo.
Moo mukunde imashita kara.
38.K: Are wa mukunde iru to iu yori mo **Australian style** no
hokorashii funiki no karadatsuki ni nararete.

Translation
36.K: I remember you and you gave your business card to me. I
thought you seemed to be very **intelligent**. You were thin
at that time, and now you are thin as before.
37.L: That was about 1993, no 1994. I was fat in 1996, I was
really swollen.
38.K: No, you looked quite strong, more like **Australian style**.

Passage 5

43.L: Oostralia de shigoto o suruno wa muzukashii desu ne.
     Shidonii, Meruborun ni ikeba mada chigau no kamo
     shiremasen kedo, paasu wa muzukashii ndeshoo ne.
     Dooshite muzukashii n deshoo ne.

44.K: Yappari ricchijooken kana. Sorekara **popuration** ga sukunai
     deshoo? Sorekara arayuru tokoro kara **isolate** sarete,
     nante iu no kashira sekai demo kore dake no machi to shite
     sakaete iru wariniwa mawarini ni nanimo nai to iu, sorekara
     . . .

Translation

43.L: It's very difficult to start business in Australia.
     Business in Sydney or Melborurne might be different, but
     it is difficult in Perth. I'm wondering why business here
     is difficult.

44.K: It's probably because of location, besides small
     population. And Perth is **isolate**d and there is nothing
     around ever though Perth itself is a vibrant town.
     And ...

Passage 6

47.L: Koko de shika nai mon tte nai deshoo?

48.K: Nanika koo arata ni tsukuridasu, yooshoku o shitari **farm** o
     mottari nanika shite tokubetsuna mono o tsukuri dasanai
     kagiri wa muri ne.

Translation

47.L: There are no special products available something here,
     aren't there?

48.K: Unless you can start something totally new, or create some
     sort of **farm**, its impossible to find.

Passage 7

83.L: Tatoeba koko e kite saisho no toki ni, eeto ku-gatsu ni
     ijuu shite kitandesu kedo sono toshi no juuni-gatu
     atsukattadesu yo. Moo konna atsui oosutoraria de shigoto
     shitetandesu kedone, **airconditionor** mo nai heya dene. Ohiru
     wa nyooboo ga **lunch** tsukutte kureru wake dewa naidesukara.
     Iwayuru nante iundesuka, lunch bar, lunch bar ka nanka
     ni itte katte taberundesukedo ...

Translation

83.L: For example, I emigrated here in September and that
     December it was so hot. I was working in the Australian
     heat without an **airconditionor**. Since my wife did not
     prepare **lunch** for me, I usually got take away from , what
     it is called...., lunch bar lunch bar.

Passage 8

93.L: sooiu mono ni chakumoku shite nanika **business** de **item**
     o mitsukenaito ikenaindeshoo ne.

Translation

93L: Perhaps it is important to look at those **items** which are
     likely bring success in **business**.

Passage 9

106.K: Totemo kenjitsu de kenyakuka no kataga takusan irukedo
     gyaku ni iu to **business** ni yoyuu ga naideshoo? Dakara
     ryutsuu o, nihon nanka chotto hidosugiru gurai yoyuu ga

311

attakara anna ginkoo no ano nante iunokashira...**corruption** ga
corruption nanka ga okottemasu kedo. Nan no
hanashidakke. A koko wa yappari soo iu imi dewa yoyuu ga
naitte iuno? Ryuutsuu rte iuka, aa iu keizai no
nagare no naka ni yoyuu ga naikara tatoeba . . .

107.L: **Cash flow** ga **tight.**
108.K: Soo soo soo, Sore wa kanjimasu ne. Dakara **cash** de katte
morauno ga ichiban arigatai. Kaado toka ne. Sorekara
nante iuno, nihon de iu tegata, sankagetsu gurai yuuyo
o morautoka, aaiukoto wa amari sukijanai wane. Kokono
hito wa soo iu imi dewa sonohi sonohi yone.
109.L: Sore wa kanjimasune.
110.K: **Cash** de yatowareru toka, **business** ga kekkoo mada
teichaku shiteiru yoona kiga surundesukedo . . .

Translation
106.K: Many people here are steady and thrifty, therefore,
business is rather tight. In contrast, Japan possessed
too much currency, and the banks were careless with it,
this has resulted in ...**corruption, corruption.** Where were
we? Oh yes, business here is bit tight, isn't it? For
example....
107.L: **Cash flow** is **tight**
108.K: That's right. I can feel it. That's why paying in **cash**
is most welcome. Paying in card, and what is it called,
'tegata' in Japanese where you can pay there months
later, is not so welcome. People here are only concerned
with today, they have no confidence in the futures.
109.L: I can feel it.
110.K: I think **business** which is kind of "**cash** in hand" is
still popular.

TOPIC 2 : THE YEAR 2000

Passage 1
24.K: Ma, hito ni yoru to nihon ga kooiu baburu ni natte fnkyoo
ni natta to iunomo nyuu yooku no dokode okonawaretakke,
atto dowasure shichatta. Ano tatoeba, imamade sanbyaku-rokujuu
yen datta beidoru ga Nihon yen ni, sorega nagaikoto sore de
kitawakedeshoo? Sore o **adjust** shiyoo to, soshite sekaijuu no
omodatta kuni ga 140 yen ni shiyoo toki tte Nihonen no enyasu o
nihon no endaka ni chikazukeruyoo ni **adjust** shita jidai ga
arimashita yone. Nyuu-yooku ka dochirakade...

Translation
24.K: It has been said that one of the reasons why Japan is
currently experiencing a depression, following a period
of prosperity is that the rate of Japanese currency has
been forced to **adjust** to other major countries of the
world. The Japanese yen was strong, and able to keep at a
stable rate of 360 yen, but it was then **adjust**ed to the
rate of 140 yen. That took place somewhere in New York, I
don't remember exactly where it was...

Passage 2
52.K: Demo ima no wakai, wakai to iuka wareware subete josei
wa daihantai surudeshoone. Datte sore wa Nihon no **symbol**
nandakara. Sore wa zuibun taihenda. Kore wa doo omoimasu ka?

Translation

52.K: Not only young people, but also all women would strongly
    disagree with that idea, because he (the emperor) is a
    symbol (of Japan). That's going to be controversial issue
    what do you think about this?

Passage 3

61.L: Sore wane, akogare to iuyori moshi soo iwareru to, sore wa
    sugoi **pressure** dato omoimasu yo. Gyaku ni iwareru, kore wa
    pressure desu yo.
62.K: Dare ga puresshaa desuka?
63.L: Otoko ni totte wa sokushitsu o motte danshi o
    tsukuranakya ikenai nante josei nimo **pressure** desu kedo
    danshi o agenakya ikenai koto jitai ga **pressure** desuyo.
64.K: Soo ne. Dansei no kata ni ichiban puresshaa ga kakatte
    kuru kamo shiremasen ne. Ja kore wa yameta hoo ga iiwa.
    Kawaisoo.
65.L: Motto ima no kootaishi no nantoka iu hito datte **pressure** desu
    yo.

Translation

61.L: There is going to be big **pressure** on (him the Crown Prince),
    rather than considering it to be something fortunate if (he) is
    asked (to have a mistress), this will only put **pressure** on
    (him).
62.K: Who feels pressure?
63.L: Of course the woman would feel **pressure,** but the man
    would feel more **pressure** because he would have to face
    greater consequences.
64.K: I agree with you. Perhaps there is more pressure on the
    man. I feel sorry (for the Crown Prince). It is not such
    a good idea.
65.L: This is big **pressure** on the Crown Prince.