

Japanese and English as Lingua Francas: Language Choices for International Students in Contemporary Japan

Keiko Ikeda and Don Bysouth

1 Introduction

In January 2008, the then Prime Minister Fukuda put forward a “Plan for 300,000 Exchange Students” as a policy measure to create “A Japan that is Open to the World.” The government initiative (named “the Global 30 project”) was undertaken in order to boost the number of foreign students to 300,000 by 2020 to address the issue of Japan lagging far behind the United States and major European countries in the recruitment of international students. The plan was approved by the cabinet in July. The plan entails supporting universities to hire more English-speaking teachers, offer more courses in English so that degrees can be earned through English-only classes, enhance systems for receiving/hosting international students, and to increase the number of Japanese language classes for foreign students in order to help students find jobs in Japan after graduation. The idea is to further promote internationalization of not just higher education in Japan, but indeed the entire country, by establishing systems that encourage highly qualified foreign residents to stay long term within Japan.

Of particular research interest with regard to this most recent trend for internationalization of Japan is a question relating to what kind of new linguistic ecology (Mühlhäusler 1995) is going to be requested of the international students in such a context. At least for international students in the Global 30 programs, English will be the dominant and expected language to be used. However, students are going to live in a new country where another language is spoken by the local residents, and will clearly have strong incentives (and pressures) to speak (and use) it. What has not

K. Ikeda (✉)

Division of International Affairs, Kansai University, Osaka, Japan
e-mail: keikoike@kansai-u.ac.jp

D. Bysouth

School of Human Sciences, Osaka University, Osaka, Japan

been explicitly addressed in the initiative or the proposals by the core universities is how extensive the need for the local language of the society (i.e. Japanese) will be for the prospective students.

In this regard, the Japanese Ministry of Education only suggests that high quality language training in Japanese is “important,” but this leaves open the question of how each institution is to interpret and implement this in terms of both policy and practice. Further, what remains unspecified is how hosting institutions are to incorporate the views and perspectives of one of the key stakeholders - the international students. What language choices do they actually face every day, and how do they use the languages available to them in different interactional settings? In what situations do they find the need to use the local language, and what kind of linguistic competencies (and which languages) do they need to have so that they can manage their daily interactions? To this date, these questions remain unanswered.

The aforementioned may appear surprising to readers, given the strong emphasis that has been placed on the importance of promoting and nurturing “internationalization” in the Japanese higher education sector since the 1980s. One reason why this line of investigation has not been well explored may stem from underestimating the importance of developing a multi-linguistic ecology for international students in Japan. The notion that Japan is a monolingual society is perhaps a ubiquitous and well accepted truism both within and outside of Japan; “multilingual Japan” would perhaps be a rarely used term to explain the society. With regard to scholarship on this issue, a rich literature can be found on Japanese language education for foreigners (e.g. Hashimoto 2000; Kubota 2002 for a review) and English language education for Japanese-speaking residents. The multilingual landscape in Japan has received some attention (e.g. Maher and Yashiro 1995), and ethnic and linguistic diversity within Japan certainly exists and is growing rapidly. Still, we are not considering the extent to which international students actually may experience multilingualism in their daily lives in Japan.

In order to investigate language choice and language use in the daily lives of international students in contemporary Japan, the current study details findings from a case study undertaken in the first author’s institution (Kansai University), a large private university with over 30,000 students and approximately 670 international students (as of May 2011) in the second largest city of Osaka. While the Global 30 students have just begun their residence in Japan (or will start their program in the very near future), we present the following as a preliminary case study, with further investigations to follow.

2 The Current Study

Participants

The participants in this case study are categorized as “foreign exchange students,” to differentiate from the international students who are studying at Kansai University

for a longer period of time (e.g. at least 2–3 years for graduate students, and at least 4 years for undergraduate students). Exchange students study for either one or two semesters. While the majority of the degree-seeking international students at Kansai University are East Asians (China, Korea, and Taiwan), participants in the current study are diverse. The foreign exchange students who participated in this study are from Australia, Belgium, China PRC, England, France, Germany, Haiti, Hong Kong SAR, New Zealand, Switzerland, Taiwan, Thailand, USA, and Vietnam (alphabetical order). During their stay in Japan, these students are responsible for maintaining their student visa status, and in order for them to do so, Kansai University requires at least two courses in Japanese language and three or more courses taught in English on Japanese culture (history, society, law, economics, etc.). Some students who come in with already very high competency in Japanese language can take courses in Japanese, offered in the 13 academic departments at the university.

Methods of Data Collection and Analysis

In this study two kinds of analysis were conducted, namely (i) micro-ethnographic analysis drawing on conversation analysis (e.g. Sacks et al. 1974), and (ii) critical sociolinguistic analysis (Heller 2006) of LF choice (lingua franca choice) by international students. Drawing on the emic approach to language use in conversation analysis (hereafter CA), our conceptualization of individual and social behaviours (including language usage) requires that they be empirically investigated and with careful attention directed toward how they are assembled, produced and performed as social action. We draw our analytic references from ethnomethodology and conversation analysis and expand the arguments based on the observations from the data analysis. Conversation analysis (CA) affords a rigorous analysis of the sequentiality of discursive interaction and enables detailed analyses of moment-to-moment interactions that take place in a wide variety of settings (Schegloff 2007). The focus of CA is on examining a broad range of interactional practices, particularly those involving turn taking (sequential organization of multiparty interactions), repair (interactional problems with speaking, hearing and displayed understanding) and the organization of preference (structural constraints on the interactional availability of particular social actions). In this regard CA is particularly useful for empirical investigations of interaction in multilingual and intercultural settings (Schegloff et al. 2002).

Conversation analytic studies have investigated a range of classroom talk settings and examined social interactions such as teachers' questioning acts (e.g. Koshik 2005), turn-taking structures, role-plays (e.g. Ikeda and Ishihara 2008), and interactions with guest native speakers (e.g. Mori 2002; Tateyama and Kasper 2008).

For the present study, the authors also draw on critical sociolinguistic ethnography as being highly integral for understandings of locally developing social interaction. Critical sociolinguistic ethnography (e.g. Heller 2006) and linguistic

ethnography (e.g. Rampton 2001, 2009) show how situated language practices, such as language choice or language alternation, are shaped by sociocultural and historical contexts. These approaches originally draw on the tradition of Dell Hymes and John Gumperz (e.g. Gumperz and Hymes 1972) and adopt the concepts from studies of the socioeconomic system such as “field” and “market” or “discursive space” (reviewed in Pérez-Milans 2011). The framework pays attention to how the local organization of communicative practices is linked to wider social processes of change (Pérez-Milans 2011). Recent sociolinguistic studies have begun to examine situated discursive practices in more detail. The present study also follows this trend by compiling ethnographic and interactional data for a critical sociolinguistic analysis.

The data we have examined for this particular study are (1) participant observation and audio-recordings of Japanese language classrooms, and (2) two informal interviews with foreign students. We observed language classes which the students undertook during the fall of 2009 and the spring of 2011. In addition, we audio-recorded students’ group work interaction during classes in the fall of 2009, in order to examine the actual language use in social interaction. The interactional data amounted to a total of 18 h of recording. The first author was the instructor of the classrooms used for audio-recording. All the exchange students participating in this study took Japanese language courses during their residence. The main medium of communication as well as the target of the discussion for these courses was Japanese, which is the dominant first language used by the instructors of the courses (i.e. so-called “native speakers” of Japanese). However, this does not automatically specify what language choices were made in students’ moment-to-moment communication, particularly when they engaged in talk among themselves. In the past 10 years or so, studies have shown that various types of “classroom talk” (Markee and Kasper 2004) take place in a single class hour, and the ways in which the students and the teacher participate vary accordingly.

One type of talk which takes place within the classroom which this chapter has targeted is what has been characterized as “off-task talk” (Cook 1998; Markee 2005). Language classes often involve the use of task-based group work in which students are put in groups of three or four and given a language-learning task to pursue collaboratively. In order to encourage spontaneous use of the target language (in this case Japanese) by group members, the instructor withdrew from participating in their communication. When the students were “left on their own” to carry out their talk, interaction in the interstices of the main tasks talk emerged; the students would talk with each other about things off-tangent from the main topic.

Two informal interviews with a total of four students were conducted. Both were audio- and video-recorded. The four students comprised one female student from Switzerland, one female student from Belgium, and two male students from Haiti. The authors of this study requested that these students participate in an informal interview (group interview, two at a time) since they spoke (a) local language(s) from their country and English as a lingua franca, and since, in addition, they were studying Japanese at a relatively high level at Kansai University. The interviews were conducted by a male researcher from Denmark. Since the interviewer speaks multiple languages (English, Japanese, Danish, and French) and the participating

students knew that, we did not limit or set which language to use for the interviewing occasion. Each interview is approximately 40 min in duration. The interviewer had brought a few topic-initiating questions for further discussion (e.g. “When do you find yourself using Japanese, English, or your local language in your daily lives?” “Do you sometimes get indecisive (i.e. not sure of decision) about which language to use to communicate? What kind of situation would that be?”). However, they were not restricted only to talk about the given questions.

Language competence in Japanese and English varied among the participating students. For the audio-recorded data, all the students had at least B1 level in Japanese (CEFR¹). Those who spoke English as their L2 had studied it as part of their primary and secondary school education in their home countries. In other words, it is safe to claim that all informants had fairly good competence in both languages in the classes observed by the researchers.

3 Data Analysis

A lingua franca is generally understood as a language systematically used to make communication possible between people not sharing their first language (L1). Thus, the use of a LF then can be simply instrumental at times, in order to communicate; the speakers would necessarily choose one systematic code. The situation is even further complicated when the participants of the context share a third (LF) language other than Japanese or English as LF choices. In our study, we found a case where the participating foreign students shared Chinese (Putonghua) as another potential language for interaction with each other, yet they opted for other LF choices, Japanese and English. In our analysis, we sort our findings into three patterns of language choice. They are (i) insertive use of English as a LF in Japanese as a LF talk, (ii) preferred use of English as the LF, and (iii) persistent use of the same LF (Japanese).

Insertive Use of English as a LF

In Example 1, the students were one male student from Hong Kong (HM), one female student from Shanghai (SF), and another female student from Beijing (CF). After a class discussion activity to discuss *sooshoku danshi* ‘herbivorous men’ (an increasingly used social categorization of young men in contemporary Japan who can be characterized as men who are not interested in any intimate relationship with

¹The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment, known as CEFR, is a guideline used to describe achievements of learners of foreign languages across Europe and, increasingly, in other countries including Japan. It was put together by the Council of Europe as the main part of the project “Language Learning for European Citizenship” between 1989 and 1996.

others, men or women) students were asked to provide a list of characteristics of these young men, which they had heard or seen in the media or from their Japanese friends. After this on-task talk, and a few minutes before the instructor cut them off to guide them on another task, one group consisting of three students from East Asia briefly had the following casual social talk among themselves.

Example 1

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 1 | SF: <i>demo HM wa: renai ni tsuite sekishoku- (.) sekkyokuteki de wa nai. De sho?</i> | You are not really aggressive about relationships, are you? |
| 2 | HM: <i>hanbun</i> | Half (correct). |
| 3 | CF: <i>han[bun?</i> | Half? |
| 4 | SF: <i>[hanbun? nande.</i> | Half? Why (half correct)? |
| 5 → | HM: <i>d- *¹kono kono sentence, >you know< hanbun.</i> | Wh- this, this sentence, you know, (it's) half (correct). |
| 6 | CF: <i>hanbu:n.</i> | Half (correct, I see). |
| 7 | SF: <i>ja (.) ryoori kaji yoku shiteru ne.</i> | So (that's why) you often take care of the house and cook by yourself. |

*1 HM points to the note, in which a sentence in Japanese language is jotted down. The sentence says *renai ni tsuite shookyokuteki de, ryoori ya sooji ga suki* 'not interested in relationships and likes things such as cooking and cleaning'

The participants in this example also share Putonghua as a common language in this group (although HM speaks mainly Cantonese, he understands Putonghua). However, as we can observe, they choose English, not Putonghua, for an insertion into a response in Japanese. In this example, HM was asked by SF in line 1 if he also had the same characteristics as these Japanese young men (*sooshoku danshi*). In line 2, HM jokingly answers "It's half correct" in Japanese, which invokes puzzlement in SF and CF, as expressed in lines 3 and 4. In line 4, SF seeks a repair (Sacks et al. 1974; Schegloff 2007) of the answer from HM by asking *nande* 'why'. In the next turn (line 5), HM points to a sentence in Japanese in the memo in front of him. This sentence in Japanese was produced by these three as a group during the task, and it says "not interested in relationships and likes things such as cooking and cleaning." Along with the pointing gesture to the sentence, HM says *kono kono sentence* 'this this sentence', then recycles a Japanese word *hanbun* 'half' from their previous sequence (lines 2–4). Here, HM implies that half of the sentence is describing him correctly, but the other half is not, through the use of a deictic pointing gesture rather than the use of language (e.g. Goodwin 2000, 2007). Here HM implies that while he *is* interested in relationships, unlike a typical herbivorous man as described in the memo, he also likes to do other things such as cooking and cleaning, in common with a herbivorous man. We learn this from SF's response in the next turn (line 7), where SF re-formulates HM's answer *hanbun* 'half' as "*so (that's why) you often take care of the house and cook by yourself.*"

We can observe that the self-repair turn upon his audience's puzzled reaction (SF), where he attempted to quickly recover what he had meant, featured the use of English. The word 'sentence' is used, then HM inserts a pragmatic attention getter 'you know' while he points at the written sentence in the memo. The use of English here symbolizes a quick shift of footing (Goffman 1974), with HM performing an insertive social action rather than carrying on the main social action.

Another example (Example 2) is drawn from interaction involving another group of three male students, two from Belgium (Dutch-speaking but they could also speak French and English), namely BK and BU, and one from France (FA). The discussion below in Example 2 occurred while they were engaged in the discussion task (Example 1). They stopped making a list to describe *sooshoku danshi* 'herbivorous men' and started to engage in bantering about each other.

Example 2

- | | | | |
|----|-----|--|---|
| 1 | FA: | BK <i>wa itsumo monku o itteru.</i> | BK always complains. |
| 2 | BU: | <i>monku: shoku. monku-shoku danshi.</i> | Complaints-monger. Complaints-mongering male. |
| 3 | BK: | he[heh | |
| 4 | BU: | [heh .hh heh! HEH! | |
| 5 | FA: | [° hehe ° | |
| 6 | BK: | <i>\$suimasen.\$</i> | Sorry. |
| 7 | FA: | <i>atarashii taipu ga dekita.</i> | We created a new type. |
| 8 | BK: | <i>\$suimasen.\$</i> | Sorry. |
| 9 | BU: | <i>sooshoku danshi. mo [nku bakkkari]</i> | Herbivorous man too. (He) complains a lot. |
| 10 | BK: | [<i>suimasen (.)</i>] | Excuse me. |
| 11 | | ↑ <i>gatsugatsu wa nan no imi desu ka.</i> | What does <i>gatsugatsu</i> mean? |
| 12 | FA: | *1 _e ? *1 | What? |
| 13 | BK: | <i>gatsuga[tsu.</i> | |
| 14 | BU: | [*2greedy*2 | |
| 15 | | (1) | |
| 16 | FA: | *3greedy. | |
| 17 | BK: | hh ↑ ah::↓ | |
| 18 | BU: | yeah. | |
| 19 | FA: | *4g[reedy*4 | |
| 20 | BU: | [*5greedy*5 | |

*1 BU looks down and checks the word with his electronic dictionary

*2 BU looks up away from the dictionary

*3 FA gazes towards BU

*4 FA gazes towards BK

*5 BU gazes towards BK

In this example, BK is the target of a tease (Drew 1987); BU has named him "complaints-monger," and jokingly BK responds back with "sorry." FA comments "we created a new type," displaying his participation in this bantering social interaction (line 7). After this conjoint laughter over a tease, BK initiates a shift

of topic by asking the others about unfamiliar vocabulary (lines 10–11). BU looks it up in his electronic dictionary quickly, and then looks towards BK. BU says in English “greedy,” which is a good translation of *gatsugatsu* in Japanese. After one second, FA recycles BU’s translation in line 16, acknowledging that this translation is correct. In line 17, BK produces a change of state token in Japanese *ah::* (Heritage 1984; Ikeda 2007; Nishizaka 2001), which serves to display his acknowledgement. Upon this, BU and FA further confirm that the particular Japanese word does translate to mean “greedy” in lines 19 and 20, in the form of collaborative chorus-like production (Ikeda and Ko 2011; Lerner 1993).

Asking for the meaning of a word in one language in a multilingual context would often become a moment of language choice for participants. Their linguistic background suggests to us that both French and English are shared among them, and they are quite aware of this. The chosen code is English in this particular context, and the sequential development of the segment shows that the mission was accomplished with that choice. Various contextual factors are relevant in participants choosing English over French in this excerpt; first, BK’s electronic dictionary only had a Japanese-English option, which is a common issue for foreign students who purchase electronic dictionaries after arrival in Japan. Another remark to be made here about this example is that if this word-meaning search had taken place as on-task talk, they might have chosen to explain the meaning in Japanese instead of English. The students were often told in the class that they should try not to opt for English or their first language in a similar context. However, in this interaction, these three were engaged in “off-task” talk. Even though they are doing the same type of activity, their language choice (or choice of lingua franca) for pursuing it may represent a kind of display to each other as to precisely what *kind* of social action (on-task talk vs. off-task talk) this activity is embedded within.

Although we were unable to collect it as an actually recorded datum, we have witnessed sentence-level output in English during the students’ social talk as well. In this regard, consider the following ethnographic memo from the participant observations.

Example 3

Date: June 24th, 2011 10:40–12:00

Two female students, both in a course which takes place in a PC room, are given a task to research about a particular topic (Japan’s new adoption of a jury system). A female student, Grace, from Hong Kong is sitting next to a Malaysian (Chinese-heritage) female student, Sofie. They spend a few minutes facing their individual PC monitor, then the Malaysian student turns to the Hong Kong student and says **in English:** “Oh, I forgot my homework in the dormitory.”

Grace, while still gazing at the PC monitor, replies in lower volume of voice, again **in English:** “Ask her” (referring to the instructor).

Sofie quickly turns to the instructor and says **in Japanese:** “Sensei. Shukudai domitorii ni arimasu. ato de motteite-mo ii desu ka?” (Teacher, my homework is at the dormitory. Can I bring it to you later?)

In this particular case, we learn that Sofie had used two lingua francas in accordance with the linguistic competencies of her respective addressees (Li 1998). Note that Sofie is a Chinese-heritage Malaysian as well as speaking fluent Putonghua. This exchange took place while the instructor was walking around collecting the students' homework. Both the first and second utterances produced by Sofie indicate more or less the same message: she has forgotten her homework. However, the different identities of the recipients of these turns are made obvious. The first utterance was interactionally addressed to her peer, Grace. In the second production, in Japanese, Sofie has "officially declared" her homework missing, addressing the instructor. The choice between two lingua francas in this case does not indicate competition; rather, it shows how this choice enables the speaker to carry out a variety of social actions.

These three examples all show that English comes into an interactional scene when interactants engage in off-task talk, insertion of an activity that occurs beside the main interactional project. Example 1 shows English use in a repair sequence while interactants were conversing in Japanese. Example 2 shows the moment of language choice in an interaction in which an unknown word is Japanese, one of the lingua francas available to interactants. In both of these examples interactants utilizing Japanese have "failed" to achieve (or maintain) intersubjectivity and switch to a second choice, English, in order to effect repair. In Example 3 students engage in a quick interaction among themselves before officially addressing their teacher in the classroom, with the interstice exchange also done in English.

What is interesting in the collections here is that the participants had another choice of language besides English available. Why would they opt for English, but not the other language choice (besides Japanese)? One plausible account would suggest that what is of importance is the *physical* location in which the interactions are undertaken. These exchanges took place where other foreign students and the instructor were present in the room, and very frequently the researchers were able to witness their interaction and the others could overhear (Goffman 1981) them talk. In other words, while the primary participants of the talk in each excerpt are involved in closed, "private" interactions, these interactions are nonetheless undertaken and performed in *public* spaces. This sense of "public" interaction may have led them to choose a widely accepted language they had in common, that is, in this case, English. As mentioned in the beginning, the dichotomy of Japanese or English permeates these specific incidents.

Preference for English as LF

In the interview data, we examined the students' perspectives on language use in their lives in Japan, and observed an oft repeated claim that they mostly use English for their communication. Such a claim occurred frequently in interactions featuring two students from European countries (those whom we interviewed for this study did not speak English as their L1). English is, according to BA, "always" spoken among the exchange students.

Example 4

BA: “I guess, our daily life language is mostly English—because just;; among the exchange students, we’re always speaking English. Only when there are Japanese students involved, then we use Japanese.”

The above commentary implies that the exchange students see the need to speak Japanese only when Japanese students are around. Probing into why this is the case, BA further elaborates on this issue in Example 5:

Example 5

BA: “because everybody’s level in Japanese is different. So you have people who can’t speak Japanese; and people whose Japanese is really good (.) so kind of English is the easiest.”

According to her, the Japanese language competency of the foreign students has more variability than their English language competency; thus in order to avoid any conflict they opt to speak English throughout. In other words, they are not just casually opting to speak English, but are under pressure to choose English.

A student from Switzerland (SR) suggests that she would use English even with German speaking European students. She says that sometimes dialectal differences of German may present an obstacle to use, so that English becomes the choice of students.

Example 6

SR: “I’m the only exchange student from Switzerland. There are others from Germany, and I normally try to talk in German but they don’t understand that it’s German. And the German exchange students more or less understand English.”

Example 6 suggests another possible solution for our earlier puzzle as to why at times some students with another language besides English in common do not choose to use it. In Examples 2 and 3 we observed that students employed English in Japanese-based interaction even when Putonghua was a viable option. As SR points out for her own case, perceived linguistic competency (particularly in the case of those who are bilingual in two local languages in their own country, for example in Malaysia) may depend upon accentual differences among the participants which can be quite salient. Choosing German or Putonghua for the cases discussed would bring about a different social consequence for these students. Despite having an awareness of linguistic varieties within German or Putonghua, students’ choice of language is not likely to be treated as involving an intentional adoption of a lingua franca, rather such choice will be oriented to as involving the use of their mother tongue,

“commonly shared” among them. As in SR’s comment, soon they would encounter some difficulty in interaction due to the variability within that “mother tongue,” thus they would have to utilize some other code. On the other hand, English is regarded as an L2 for all the participants and as such would also present interactants with similar challenges with regard to variability of use (e.g. Kachru 1986; Lowenberg 2002; Pakir 1991). Because English is a foreign language acquired in addition to their local language(s), it is often the case that the speakers’ level of proficiency varies. However, interactional approaches to lingua franca communication have suggested that a cooperative attitude is strongly present in lingua franca communication (e.g. Firth 1996; Knapp and Meierkord 2002), perhaps because the chosen medium is everyone’s “foreign” language (Firth 1996: 240). Therefore, we can perhaps say that choosing English would become indeed the “easiest” in both a social psychological and sociolinguistic sense.

From the interview data, we also observed that English can be the preferred choice of communication medium even when the exchange students (whose local language is not English) encounter Japanese local students at university. Contrary to BA’s claim (in Example 4), SR says that there are some cases when English is the chosen lingua franca even with the local Japanese students:

Example 7

SR: “I think it depends more on the person; because with Japanese people we speak Japanese and sometime because they wanna learn English they try to speak English to us which does (.) not always work. And then we go .h either to a mix between the two or we speak Japanese, but they still speak English. We’ll just try to communicate.”

Example 8

SR: “there are a lot of students who approach you and say >let’s be friends, teach me English hehe .h so. I-I had that in my last exchange here, she tried to speak English and normally the beginning of the sentence was in English and then the end was in Japanese because she couldn’t go through with it.”

The comment here reveals that any language choice for the international students is deeply interrelated with the linguistic ideologies of Japanese students. The dominance of English serves to influence the Japanese language and people’s views of language, culture, race, ethnicity and identity (Kubota 1998; Tsuda 1990). SR’s description of local Japanese students is worth commenting upon here. We learn that, in first encounters, the local students assume that SR is an English speaker. They approach her asking her “to teach them English.” Note that SR has a relatively high proficiency in Japanese and that her first language is Swiss German.

In this regard, consider that Wada (1999) has argued that English demonstrates a *linear logic* whereas Japanese has a *circular logic*, and that Japanese students need to learn to think according to the English logic. Now, despite recent criticisms of this view (e.g. Kubota 2002; Pennycook 1998) we would argue that such extreme interpretations of internationalization still linger in Japan. *Kokusaika* ‘internationalization’ emerged as economic conflicts between Japan and its trade partners became intense in the 1980s. A strategy that Japan employed in order to fulfill the need to communicate better with its overseas partners was to accommodate the “hegemony of the West” (Kubota 1998). The discourse of *kokusaika* implied learning the communication mode of English. The broad and ambiguous definition of the West was adopted in Japan’s rhetoric of *kokusaika*.

Learning English and *kokusaika* would appear to be inextricably bound up together, with anecdotes such as those provided by SR ubiquitous in daily exchanges on Japanese university campuses (at least in the authors’ experiences). As one (anecdotal) example from the first author, in an exchange with a Japanese school teacher in an elementary school, in which she discussed planning an event for her third grade students and the foreign students from Kansai University, the teacher commented that “it is such a great opportunity for the kids to get to speak English.” However, the students who signed up to participate in this particular event turned out to be mainly from South Asia and East Asia, where English may or may not be spoken so fluently.

To return to Example 8, note that SR says that even with her ideologically motivated decision to speak English, a local Japanese friend failed to achieve communication. As a “second option” after this failure, her Japanese came back into use so she could interact with SR. Once termed the “English allergy” (Tsuda 1992) this phenomenon would appear to be alive and well in contemporary Japanese society.

Persistent Use of Japanese as the LF

Thus far, we have seen illustrations of cases in which the foreign students are making use of English as a lingua franca over other options. Of course, not all students are opting to use English for daily communications. There are those who “stick to” Japanese in all daily interactional settings, even when English is available for them to utilize relatively unproblematically. In interactional settings where all speakers are exchange students, Japanese is indeed a foreign language. When chosen as a lingua franca code among them, it has been suggested that various socio-pragmatic aspects of LF interactions may be observable in their talk. In the following section we explore such aspects by consideration of relevant phenomena observed in actual interactional data.

Example 9, for example, provides an interesting fragment of conversation taken from an interview with two male Haitian students, RH and SH. Here they are telling the interviewer that they use various languages in their daily lives, depending on the

context and whom they are talking with. SH takes the initiative in explaining his case as an example, using Japanese. Their stance to “stick to speaking Japanese” reveals what we are conceptualizing as a third type of linguistic attitude among international students.

Example 9

1	SH: <i>hai.eto.:</i> (1) <i>hmmm. eto: soo desu ne. Saikin wa:</i>	yes uhm:: hmm let me see.
2	<i>eto watas- watashitachi wa (.) nihongo de</i>	Recently we
3	RH: <i>nihongo de=</i>	speak in Japanese.
4	V: <i>=nihongo de hana</i> [<i>su</i>	in Japanese.
5	RH: [<i>>hai hai hai<</i>	you speak in Japanese.
6	(1)	yes yes yes.
7	SH: <i>nihongo- nihongo hanashite, kara: eto dondon</i>	Since we speak Japanese,
8	<i>dondon joozu (.) narimasu kara:., creole to</i>	we rapidly get
9	<i>furansugo: chotto (1) tsukaimasen.</i>	better in Japanese. So we
10	V: <i>hmn. Hm.</i>	have not used
11→	SH: <i>eto: eego wa, sun- hmm: sun, °san° sangen?</i>	much French or Creole.
12→	<i>>Ye no< not sangen? Go jugyoo? arimasu?</i>	Uhm, for English, three-
13→	RH: <i>eego no jugyoo?</i>	three- third period?
14→	SH: <i>eego no jugyoo.</i>	no not third period, five
15→	RH: <i>itsu nan-na- nanyoobi desu ka.</i>	classes? We have.
16→	SH: <i>eto (1) isshuukan?</i>	English classes?
17	RH: <i>.h a: uh k- kansai kansai de?=</i>	English classes.
18	SH: <i>=hai kansai [de</i>	When- which- which day of
19	V: [<i>so so so so >kore wa<</i>	the week do you mean?
20	<i>kono (.) (ta[me ni)</i>	Uh in one week?
21	RH: [<i>eh:: san</i>	Oh at Kansai University?
22	SH: <i>san? yon?</i>	Yes at Kansai University
23	RH: <i>ima san.</i>	Right right right, this one
24	SH: <i>san. Kore wa eego (.)</i>	is for this (university)
25	V: <i>hm</i>	Well three
26→	SH: <i>o tsukaimasu, demo uchi. Uchi de: (.) tokidoki eto</i>	Three? four?
27→	<i>eego to furansu go to creolego to nihongo.</i>	Right now three.
28→	<i>Zenbu de (.) eto (.) mix (.)</i> [<i>mitainahanashimasu.</i>	Three. These are (taught in)
29	RH: [<i>hehe °he °</i>	English.
		We use English, but at
		home, sometimes we
		use English, French, Creole
		and Japanese.
		We mix them all and talk.

Here SH tells V (interviewer) that they mainly use Japanese, so their language skills are rapidly improving (lines 7–8). When he attempts to inform V of how many courses they take that are taught in English, SH initiates an inserted exchange with RH to make sure exactly how many classes they have this term. This is a quick action initiated by SH to seek correct information with his friend from the same country, Haiti. Here, while the participants had many language choices in which to engage in this activity (e.g. French, Creole and English) their choice is to stick to Japanese, the exchange being performed in front of the interviewer. Note that in the later turns (lines 26–28), SH tells V that they do use all the languages at home, often all mixed in one setting. Here too, SH and RH do not shift to use other languages but continue their exchange using Japanese. Their determination to stick to Japanese for communication is worth commenting upon, as these students only started learning the language just 8 months prior to the interview, and their language level has improved to an intermediate-high level in a short length of time. Interestingly, two other students from Europe with a much higher proficiency of Japanese (SR and BA) opted for English for this interview, while SH and RH with lower proficiency in Japanese (and higher proficiency in English for both of them) had opted to use Japanese as the LF with the interviewer. We observed that it was common for some students to prefer *not* to speak any other languages, including English, with SH and RH a good illustration of such a case. This ties in with the authors' anecdotal experiences of daily interactions with foreign students in Japan. For example, during office hours students may try to discuss a highly complex problem (e.g. about a housing contract with a real estate agent) in Japanese, yet their skills may be at the low-intermediate level (below B1).

To account for this pattern, we must consider the details of multilingual dynamics for foreign students in Japan. Japanese is indeed the local language of the community of their residence, and most of the foreign exchange students consider acquiring Japanese language skills their primary mission. For many of them, Japanese is a “target” language to learn, as well as the lingua franca which they would resort to in order to communicate with those who do not share any other common communication medium. Thus, their social identity as language learners (Block 2007) may always be in competition with another relevant social identity, that of being a member of a group of international peers.

4 Beyond a Matter of LF Selection: Styling in Lingua Franca Talk

Regardless of L1 or L2, speakers will construct and employ some kind of linguistic styles as social practice to manage their social and personal identities and relations, affiliation or disaffiliation with a particular social community or persona. In our collection of interactional data, we observed some revealing examples of how the LF speakers made use of linguistic styles to facilitate particular kinds of social

projects, particularly when such projects required the sophisticated management of interactional business. Before turning to an examination of such examples, it is worthwhile to briefly review previous work which has examined how speakers' application of particular linguistic styles affords or constrains a range of social acts and how such styles can serve to enable a particular social identity to become highlighted and foregrounded against the background of its immediate context. Coupland (2007) has termed this "styling," emphasizing that use of styles should be understood as occurring in (inter)action. In this study, we were able to observe styling in the participants' LF interactions, particularly when they were engaged in an extensive use of Japanese with each other.

Interactional approaches to lingua franca interaction in the literature have generally focused on examinations of how two non-L1 speakers of the LF code cooperate with each other, and on capturing the process of code selection in multilingual interaction. Such literature has shown that LF speakers make use of various social and multimodal cues in interaction to choose which language code should be used in each context. However, the lingua franca literature to this date has not explored in any detail what takes place *after* a selection of language. In the case of international exchange students in a Japanese university context, speakers may choose to use Japanese as the LF on one occasion, for example in off-task talk during class, and not on another. What we would want to investigate further at this point is how they would present themselves vis-à-vis each other for that LF talk, particularly in terms of social identity construction (e.g. Block 2007; Bucholtz and Skapoulli 2009; Norton 2000), participation stance (e.g. Goodwin 2007), or in the particular conduct of a social act (Coupland 2007; Rampton 2009). In other words, we would want to go beyond merely treating the LF speakers as L2 speakers.

LF speakers, at least those featured in our present analyses, can be considered to comprise part of the community of practice in Japan, and they are constantly engaged in the local language. As they spend more time in Japan as exchange students, they would become more sensitive to "the purchase of different linguistic resources on the linguistic market" (Jaspers 2010: 196). Importantly, speakers of a language are also simultaneously creators of the language they utilize. They can transcend the boundaries of their linguistic repertoires by drawing upon their knowledge of local associations between particular linguistic forms and their social meanings. In this sense, they are learning to style themselves in the language as they negotiate social meanings with other people and engage in the construction of identities.

In examining styling in the LF talk among foreign exchange students in Japan, we draw upon Rampton's notion of "language crossing" (1995), since it is indeed a language use that indexes groups of which the speaker does not claim membership. No speaker *a priori* "owns" any code as their L1; therefore, the right to cross must be negotiated in interaction. Rampton's examples were the use of Panjabi by young people of Anglo and Afro-Caribbean descent, the use of Creole by Anglos and Panjabis, and the use of stylized Indian English by all three groups (1995). Another example of language crossing is the case of European Americans' use

of stereotyped African American English (e.g. Bucholtz 1999). Importantly, what speakers do by language crossing is highly dependent on varied contexts and human relationships, and their social accomplishment by making use of a particular social style/dialect/language is not necessarily the same over time.

Turning back to a consideration of our examples, here we would like to present some illustrations that evince the creative use of linguistic styles by LF speakers of Japanese. In Example 10, the students in a group have just discussed one criminal case as if they were “jurors” themselves. The group consisted of one male student from New Zealand (RB), one female student from Belgium (KR), another male student from Belgium (GT), and one female student from Taiwan (CH). They decided that the defendant was to be sentenced to life-in-prison. One of the students, RB, was not quite happy with the decision made by the group and decided to continue to disagree after the task was officially finished. RB in Example 10 makes a point that the defendant just wanted to kill, and that money was not his motivation.

Example 10

1	KR: <i>ni-nihongo de doo ieba ii no? ma sono</i>	How can I say in Japanese? The money
		was stolen
2	<i>hanzai no ato de ma:</i>	after the crime, so (he) had an intention.
3	<i>sono koroshita hito wa</i>	Well the man who killed
4	<i>doo de mo ii (.) to omotta.</i>	thought it doesn't matter.
5	<i>okane (.) wa daiji. ga kibun ga su-</i>	Money is important. (his) feeling was-
6 →	RB: <i>gya-(.)gya- gyaku ni na:?</i>	On the contrary, you know?
7	(1)	
8	<i>moshi: -tk! (.) okane totte, a!</i>	If (he) took money, (then) oh!
9	<i>mirarete, koroshite,=</i>	(He) was witnessed, so killed (that witness),
10	<i>=n de okane nao- naoshitara (.)</i>	then if he put the money back, wouldn't it be
11	<i>yabaku nai?</i>	suspicious?
12	GT: <i>u[ee ° (so desu [ne) °</i>	Yeah that's right, isn't it?
13	CH: [hmm	
14	RB: [sore wa tada dareka o	That's, (he) simply killed someone.
15	<i>koroshita.</i>	
16	CH: <i>un soo ma: bideo de sono: (.) uh:</i>	Right well I think in the video it shows that (he) stole
17	<i>(.) okusan o koroshita ato de, okane o</i>	the money after (he) killed the wife, I think.
18	<i>toraretato omou=misete miseta to</i>	
19	<i>omou</i>	

For our purposes the key line in this stretch of interaction is line 6, where RB inserts his disjunctive objection to how the group decision is about to go. Here, RB makes a use of local dialectal style *gyaku ni na?* (On the contrary, you know?). The use of dialectal style (note that the interactional particle *na* is used instead of a standard *ne* in line 6) is found in the prefacing phrase as a singular insertion in this context. At this point, RB is about to pursue an extended version of his opposition against his peers, in order to make a point that the money stolen by the defendant is not really a concern, with such a version clearly arguing against what KR has just said immediately before *okane wa daiji* (the money is important). Lines 10–11 show that RB designs his turn as being rather offensive (hostile) with the use of a negative yes/no interrogative structure to make his point (e.g. don't you think X?, cf. Heritage 2002). Here we can say that as an initiator of this rather disrupting action, RB has made use of a local (Kansai) dialectal form in his turn. However, the sudden use of this particular style is likely to be oriented to as a marked usage (rather than embedded or expected as a regular occurrence) to an L1 speaker's ear; the dialectal use appeared just in this particular phrase and not elsewhere in their talk.

To understand further the style change in his production at this point, we can draw upon Rampton's (2001, 2009) notion of interactional ritual. In the context of an offensive social action, dialectal stylization (Coupland 2007) is inserted to remedy the "moment of jeopardy" of the relations on hand and social order among the participants (Goffman 1974). People generally amplify the symbolic dimensions of their conduct, shifting briefly away from the appropriately modulated/hedged production of propositional utterances geared to truth and falsity (Rampton 2001). In this regard, Kansai dialect is (as with other local Japanese dialects) known for its informality, and many speakers of the dialect use it as a marker of positive affective stance (Ochs 1993) when engaged in everyday, mundane conversation. RB's adoption of such a style in his usage of Japanese (as a lingua franca) may well reflect his sociolinguistic knowledge about it.

We present another example of the use of Japanese as a lingua franca in Example 11. This is a stretch of interaction featuring three female students, one from Vietnam (H), one from Hong Kong (J), and one from Germany (G). G did not speak in the following segment, but she displayed appreciation of the on-going conversation by smiling. They had just finished watching a brief film in Japanese as a task in class. In the drama, two friends (one male and one female) have attended a mutual friend's wedding, and they worry about their own marriage in the future. After this task the three students engaged in talking about these characters casually. H, who seemed to have a vivid imagination for how these two characters would end up in the future, spoke about her thoughts from line 1 in Japanese. Our interest in this example is with how J, a Hong Kong student, makes use of various linguistic politeness styles in her utterances.

Example 11

1	H:	<i>tabun ato min</i> [na yoku.]	Maybe everyone often does (it) afterwards.
2	J:	[<i>doram-</i>] <i>dorama wa</i>	In dramas,
3 →		<i>kitto soo</i>	surely (it) will be
4		<i>yuu huu ni:</i> ((smiley voice))	like that.
5	H:	<i>soo soo soo.</i> [tabun	That's right, maybe.
6 →	J:	[<i>okonaimasukedo</i> ((smiling	(It) happens but
7 →		voice)).hh ↑ <i>genjitsu wa kanoo dekimasu</i> ==	in reality, can they do (it)?
8 →		= <i>kanooka na.</i> hehe	(Is it) possible, I wonder.
9	H:	° <i>tabu-</i> °	Maybe.
10 →	J:	hehe <i>kanooka na..hh</i>	Hehe (is it) possible, I wonder.
11	H:	<i>demo tabun kono ka-uh sono kanojo wa</i> (.)	But maybe this woman that woman
12		hm (.) <i>chotto toshi na n dakara</i>	has aged a bit now so
13 →	J:	<i>toshiyori hehe</i> > <i>nanka</i> < <i>toshiy(h)ori.</i> hehe	Elderly hehe well elderly.
14	H:	<i>minna: aite no hito wa minna:</i>	All (possible) partners are.
15	J:	uh	
16	H:	<i>kekonn shite</i> == <i>shichatta kara hh</i>	(All) have gotten married so.
17 →	J:	<i>shichatta chotto ko</i> ==	(They) have married.
18	H:	= <i>tabun sono hito wa hh</i> .hh	Maybe that person is.
19 →	J:	<i>kanashii heh a ma daijobu.</i> ° <i>da</i> [to ii kedo] °	How sad, oh well (it's) okay. Hope that's the case.
20	H:	[<i>saigo sono</i>	(I) think (he's) the last
21		<i>hito wa saigo no hh hito to omou k(h)ara</i>	person (left) so.

A switch from a distal politeness style to casual style in Japanese is observed in this example. A mix of politeness styles in talk is commonly found in L1 interaction (e.g. Cook 1998; Okamoto 1998). However, the shift which we find in the above example shows a rather different phenomenon. J has commented that in a fictional drama a situation which H has talked about is possible, but doubts that can be true in reality (lines 6–8). J uses a distal polite style for the first part of this utterance (lines 2–6 *dorama wa kitto soo okonaimasu* ‘in the drama that happens’), then she switches to casual style in lines 7–8 (*kanoo ka na* ‘(I doubt) it’s possible’). While addressing the same recipient (H) J has shifted a politeness level drastically, which would entail that there has been a shift in her social stance from being polite and formal to being informal and rather blunt.

However, if one considers how this style use could be seen as an example of creative styling, another possible description can be proposed for her conduct. In line 8, J could be marking her talk as comprising an initiator for “digressive talk” off the topic, with a switch from polite linguistic style to plain style in Japanese, saying *kanoo ka na* ‘(I doubt) it’s possible.’ Note that in line 10, J repeats this again, however this time prefacing it with a short laugh. With a style shift, she is introducing a special interactional frame (Goffman 1974) for their conversation, that is, it can be oriented to as light-hearted, bantering talk.

There is some evidence in the sequence to support this formulation. Across lines 11–13, H says in a playful mode that since these two people are getting “too old” (*chotto toshi na n dakara*), everyone else around them has been married already and so no one is left for them but each other (lines 14 and 16). Note the use of smiley voice (Jefferson 2004) across these turns, indicating that H is in a digressive, joking mode. J goes along with H’s joking. She appropriates the words from H’s turn, e.g. *toshiyori* ‘elderly’ (line 13), (*kekkon*) *shitchatta* ‘(they’ve) done it (=married)’ (line 17), displaying her appreciation of H’s formulation. Furthermore, J uses plain linguistic style this time in order to display her affective assessments in line 19 *kanashii* (so sad!) *ma daijobu* (well it’s alright), *da to ii kedo* (hope (it’s) okay).

What we see here is the use of a politeness level shift to conduct a spontaneous social act (e.g. joking, bantering). In both Examples 10 and 11, the speakers of a lingua franca (in both cases Japanese) have demonstrated a creative use of linguistic styles to bring about a certain performative effect (Rampton 2009). In our collection of data, we were not able to witness the students’ creative styling in English, the other LF for them. We might have expected that these participants would be doing similar styling work (Coupland 2007) when choosing English as the lingua franca alternatively. Further investigation may well afford some clarification.

5 Conclusion

This case study has sought to provide a preliminary exploration of the linguistic lives of foreign exchange students attending a Japanese university, with a particular focus on how students employ two lingua francas, English and Japanese. Our findings indicate that students routinely utilized English as a lingua franca in interactions with other international students, and in interactions with the local Japanese students on campus, because English was oriented to as being a “trouble-less” communication medium for the participants. However, Japanese was also routinely utilized by international students as a lingua franca in interactions with other international students when such students were determined to speak the “local” language. When we examined actual language use by international students among themselves, we found that they were creatively employing Japanese with rich styling, which suggests that for these language users the code for lingua franca communication has gone beyond mere mutual intelligibility. They are, instead, constructing a community of practice using Japanese as the LF with each other.

This chapter has illustrated a small piece of realistic linguistic ecology for international students at university level institutions in Japan today. With an increase in the number of foreign students on Japanese campuses, and in the context of a broad public discourse on the Japanese government’s efforts to increase international student participation, our interest is in further exploring if and how this form of ecology might integrate dynamic changes. However, returning to the macro issues raised at the start of our chapter, it may be prudent to explicitly examine various competing discourses of how “internationalization” (*kokusaiika*) is understood and

dealt with pragmatically in contemporary Japan in order for any analyses of linguistic ecology to have critical purchase. Given that Japan appears to be resolutely committed to continuing to engage in a rapid process of internationalization of higher education, in the absence of clear policy or grounded empirical studies of what might actually be taking place within and around university campuses, *kokusaika* may remain an unrealized blue print for internationalization of higher education in Japan.

References

- Block, David. 2007. *Second language identities*. London/New York: Continuum.
- Bucholtz, Mary. 1999. 'Why be normal?': Language and identity practices in a community of nerd girls. *Language in Society* 28(2): 203–223.
- Bucholtz, Mary, and Ella Skapoulli. 2009. Introduction: Youth language at the intersection: From migration to globalization. *Pragmatics* 19(1): 1–16.
- Cook, Haruko M. 1998. Situational meaning of the Japanese social deixis: The mixed use of the masu and plain form. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 8(1): 87–110.
- Coupland, Nikolas. 2007. *Style: Language variation and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, Paul. 1987. Po-faced receipts of teases. *Linguistics* 25: 219–253.
- Firth, Alan. 1996. The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26(2): 237–260.
- Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.
- Goodwin, Charles. 2000. Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 1489–1522.
- Goodwin, Charles. 2007. Participation, stance, and affect in the organization of activities. *Discourse and Society* 18(1): 53–73.
- Gumperz, John J., and Dell Hymes (eds.). 1972. *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Hashimoto, Kayako. 2000. 'Internationalisation' is 'Japanisation': Japan's foreign language education and national identity. *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 21(1): 39–51.
- Heller, Monica. 2006. *Linguistic minorities and modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography*. London: Continuum.
- Heritage, John. 1984. A change of state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In *Structures of social action*, ed. J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage, 299–345. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, John. 2002. The limits of questioning: Negative interrogatives and hostile question content. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 1427–1446.
- Ikeda, Keiko. 2007. The change-of-state token *a* in Japanese language proficiency interviews. In *Proceedings of the 6th annual JALT Pan-SIG conference*, 56–64. Sendai: Tohoku Bunka Gakuen University.
- Ikeda, Keiko, and Chiyoe Ishihara. 2008. The contribution and limitation of roleplays for L2 pragmatics pedagogy: A microanalysis of JFL learner performance. In *JALT 2007 conference proceedings*, eds. Kim Bradford Watts, Theron Muller, and Malcolm Swanson, 1200–1215. Tokyo: JALT.

- Ikeda, Keiko, and Sungbae Ko. 2011. Choral practice patterns in the language classroom. In *L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives*, ed. Gabriel Pallotti and Johannes Wagner, 163–184. Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Jaspers, Jürgen. 2010. Style and styling. In *Sociolinguistics and language education*, ed. Nancy Hornberger and Sandra McKay, 177–204. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Jefferson, Gail. 2004. A note on laughter in ‘male-female’ interaction. *Discourse Studies* 6(1): 117–133.
- Kachru, Braj. 1986. *The alchemy of English*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Knapp, Karlfried, and Christiane Meierkord (eds.). 2002. *Lingua franca communication*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Koshik, Irene. 2005. *Beyond rhetorical questions: Assertive questions in everyday interaction*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kubota, Ryuko. 1998. Ideologies of English in Japan. *World Englishes* 17(3): 295–306.
- Kubota, Ryuko. 2002. Impact of globalization on language teaching in Japan. In *Globalization and language teaching*, ed. David Block and Deborah Cameron, 13–28. London: Routledge.
- Lerner, Gene. 1993. Collectivities in action: Establishing the relevance of conjoined participation in conversation. *Text* 13(2): 213–245.
- Li, Wei. 1998. The ‘why’ and ‘how’ questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching. In *Code-switching in conversation*, ed. Peter Auer, 156–179. London: Routledge.
- Lowenberg, Peter. 2002. Assessing English proficiency in the expanding circle. *World Englishes* 21(3): 431–435.
- Maher, John, and Kyoko Yashiro. 1995. *Multilingual Japan*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Markee, Numa. 2005. The organization of off-task classroom talk in second language classrooms. In *Applying conversation analysis*, ed. Keith Richards and Paul Seedhouse, 197–213. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Markee, Numa, and Gabriele Kasper. 2004. Classroom talks: An introduction. *Modern Language Journal* 88(4): 491–500.
- Mori, Junko. 2002. Task design, plan, and development of talk-in-interaction: A study of a small group activity in a Japanese language classroom. *Applied Linguistics* 23(3): 323–347.
- Mühlhäusler, Peter. 1995. *Linguistic ecology: Language change and linguistic imperialism in the Pacific Rim*. London: Routledge.
- Nishizaka, Aug. 2001. *Kokoro to kooi: Esunomesodorōjii no shiten* [Mind and action: An ethnomethodological perspective]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Norton, Bonny. 2000. *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow: Pearson Educational Limited.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1993. Constructing social identity: A language socialization perspective. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 26(3): 287–306.
- Okamoto, Shigeko. 1998. The use and non-use of honorifics in sales talk in Kyoto and Osaka: Are they rude or friendly? *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 7: 141–157.
- Pakir, Anne. 1991. The range and depth of English-knowing bilinguals in Singapore. *World Englishes* 10(2): 167–179.
- Pennycook, Alastair. 1998. *English and the discourses of colonialism*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Pérez-Milans, Miguel. 2011. Being a Chinese newcomer in Madrid compulsory education: Ideological constructions in language education practice. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(4): 1005–1022.
- Rampton, Ben. 1995. Language crossing and the problematization of ethnicity and socialization. *Pragmatics* 5(4): 483–513.
- Rampton, Ben. 2001. Language crossing, ‘crosstalk’ and cross-disciplinarity in sociolinguistics. In *Sociolinguistics and social theory*, ed. Nikolas Coupland, Srikant Sarangi, and Christopher Candlin, 261–296. London: Longman.
- Rampton, Ben. 2009. Interaction, ritual and not just artful performance in crossing and stylization. *Language in Society* 38(2): 149–176.

- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation. *Language* 50(4): 696–735.
- Schegloff, Emmanuel. 2007. *Sequence organization in interaction. A primer in conversation analysis*, vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, Emmanuel, Irene Koshik, Sally Jacoby, and David Olsher. 2002. Conversation analysis and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 22: 3–31.
- Tateyama, Yumiko, and Gabriele Kasper. 2008. Talking with a classroom guest: Opportunities for learning Japanese pragmatics. In *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing*, ed. E. Alcón Soler and A. Martínez-Flor, 45–71. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Tsuda, Yukio. 1990. *Eigo shihai no kozo* [Structure of English domination]. Tokyo: Daisan Shokan.
- Tsuda, Yukio. 1992. The dominance of English and linguistic discrimination. *Media Development* 34(1): 32–34.
- Wada, Katsuaki. 1999. *Eigo-ka ni okeru kokusai-rikai kyôiku* [International education in EFL classes]. Tokyo: Taishukan shoten.

Language Alternation, Language Choice and Language
Encounter in International Tertiary Education

Haberland, H.; Lønsmann, D.; Preisler, B. (Eds.)

2013, XXIV, 241 p.,

ISBN: 978-94-007-6476-7