

**Claiming Legitimacy, Constructing Difference: Exploring the
Identity Negotiation of “Heritage” Learners in Japanese
Language Classes**

Kenta Koshiba

LLB *Keio University*, MA *Monash University*

A thesis submitted
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics
Monash University
June 2013

Copyright Notice

Under the Copyright Act 1968, this thesis must be used only under the normal conditions of scholarly fair dealing. In particular no results or conclusions should be extracted from it, nor should it be copied or closely paraphrased in whole or in part without the written consent of the author. Proper written acknowledgement should be made for any assistance obtained from this thesis.

I certify that I have made all reasonable efforts to secure copyright permissions for third-party content included in this thesis and have not knowingly added copyright content to my work without the owner's permission

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	vi
STATEMENT	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS	x
CHAPTER 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Background of the study	1
1.2 Research questions	6
1.3 Definitions and choice of terminology	7
1.4 Justification and significance of the study	10
1.5 Structure of the thesis	12
CHAPTER 2: Literature review	14
2.1 Heritage language education	14
2.1.1 Linguistic abilities of heritage learners	14
2.1.2 Motivation, attitude and other socio-psychological factors	20
2.2 Identity and language learning	22
2.2.1 Identity and language learning in naturalistic contexts	24
2.2.2 Identity and language learning in foreign language contexts	28
CHAPTER 3: Theoretical and conceptual frameworks	33
3.1 Language expertise, language inheritance and language affiliation	33
3.2 Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts	36
3.3 <i>Field, habitus</i> and capital	37
CHAPTER 4: Methodology	42
4.1 Overall approach	42
4.2 Participants	44
4.3 Data collection	48
4.3.1 Semi-structured interviews	48
4.3.2 Recording of translation and interpreting tasks	51
4.3.3 Stimulated recall interviews	52
CHAPTER 5: Participants' histories and their language identities	53

5.1 Students' narratives.....	53
5.1.1 Anthony	53
5.1.2 Takeshi.....	59
5.1.3 Chika.....	64
5.1.4 Fumiya	68
5.1.5 Teru	71
5.1.6 Yuta	78
5.1.7 John.....	85
5.2 The value of Japanese as a form of capital	87
5.3 Conclusion.....	92
CHAPTER 6: Claiming legitimacy in second language classrooms	93
6.1 Japanese linguistic resources as potential capital	93
6.2 Reflexivity towards “composition” and “volume” of capital.....	96
6.3 Fitting in as a legitimate “second language learner”	99
6.4 Standing out as a “Japanese”	105
6.5 Caught in-between two “centres”	111
6.6 Conclusion.....	114
CHAPTER 7 Constructing difference in the Japanese for Background Speakers’ subject.....	117
7.1 Setting the context	117
7.2 Conceptualising Japanese as a “heritage”	122
7.3 Proving one’s legitimacy	126
7.4 Aligning to alternative ways of being “Japanese”	131
7.4.1 Constructing transnational identities	131
7.4.2 Claiming authenticity	135
7.5 Polycentricity and the complexity of investment	138
7.6 Conclusion.....	146
CHAPTER 8 Use of bilingual resources in translation and interpreting activities	149
8.1 Moving between Japanese and English	149
8.1.1 Flexible bilingualism and the use of bilingual resources	151
8.1.2 Translingual competence in translation activities.....	153
8.2 Moving between multiple discourses	159

8.2.1 Transcultural competence in translation activities	159
8.2.2 Engaging in mediation.....	163
8.3 Other aspects of translation and interpreting activities	168
8.3.1 Necessity to confront challenges	168
8.3.2 English as a legitimate resource	177
8. 4 Conclusion	179
CHAPTER 9: Concluding chapter	182
9.1 Summary of major findings.....	182
9.1.1 Construction of transnational identities.....	183
9.1.2 Polycentric view of Japanese language classrooms	185
9.1.3 Multiplicity of different ways of being “Japanese”.....	186
9.1.4 The Japanese language as a “heritage” and as a “capital”	188
9.1.5 Use of bilingual resources in translation and interpreting tasks	189
9.2 Educational implications	191
9.3 Limitations and directions for future research.....	196
9.4 Conclusion.....	198
REFERENCES	199
APPENDIX 1 Language use diary	215
APPENDIX 2 Interview guide.....	216

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Types of capital (Carrington and Luke, 1997: 102)..... 38

Table 2: Participants' family backgrounds..... 46

Table 3: Participants' educational backgrounds..... 47

ABSTRACT

A steady rise in the Japanese population in Australia has been contributing to an increase in the number of heritage learners enrolling in Japanese language classrooms. However, past studies on this group of students, especially in Australia, have typically focused on examining these learners' experiences and identities in connection to particular communities or ethnic groups. In contrast, this case study explores the language learning experiences of individual Japanese heritage learners, focusing on the local as well as trans-local factors influencing the construction and negotiation of their identities.

This study is based on qualitative data derived from semi-structured interviews conducted with seven secondary and tertiary level heritage learners who were recruited from a subject for Japanese heritage learners that was offered by an Australian university. In addition, week-long language use diaries, recordings of classroom activities and stimulated recall interviews, which were conducted in relation to translation and interpreting tasks, were also collected. The data was then analysed utilising a poststructuralist framework that recognises how power relations and discourses influence the negotiation of identities across various social fields.

This study has revealed significant heterogeneity within this group of Japanese heritage learners in terms of their educational and family backgrounds as well as in the ways they present their language and ethnic identities. Indeed, these students were not inheritors of fixed identities as a Japanese, but rather were constructing complex senses of belonging through life trajectories and linguistic practices that spanned multiple nations and communities.

It was also found that the participants of this study were strategically managing their identities in Japanese language classes in order to claim legitimacy as speakers of Japanese. However, this was not equated with an investment in a Japanese identity. Instead, they seemed to be pursuing the acquisition of cultural capital that such legitimacy facilitated access to (for example, high tertiary entrance scores, friendship groups and entrance into desired universities), or what the legitimacy allowed them to

index (for example, the quality of one's linguistic capital, transnational mobility, academic competence and the plurality of one's identity). As such, for this group of heritage learners, the function of the Japanese language as a marker of ethnicity was downplayed for a view of the language as capital in itself for obtaining a wide range of interests and for constructing difference vis-à-vis monolingual peers and less competent bilinguals.

In addition, a detailed analysis of the students' engagement in translation and interpreting tasks revealed that the bilingual nature of these tasks not only provided the students with an opportunity to reflect and compare their Japanese and English, but also prompted them to contemplate and attempt to mediate between multiple social, historical and political discourses.

Given the above-mentioned findings, this study thus argues for the importance of considering the transnational nature of these students' identities and calls for a pedagogical approach that takes into account and fosters the bilingual repertoire of this group of heritage learners.

STATEMENT

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other institution. To the best of my knowledge the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference is made in the text of the thesis.

Kenta Koshiba

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the eight students who participated in this study for sharing with me their personal stories and experiences. Their stories have taught me a lot and have helped me grow as a researcher. Without their generous cooperation, this study would not have been possible.

It goes without saying that this thesis is indebted to my supervisors, Associate Professor Helen Marriott and Dr Masato Takimoto, who guided me throughout the development of this research. Helen has inspired me with her deep insight and supported me with her warm encouragements when I needed it most. She taught me not only the rigours, but also the joy of research. Masato, whom I simply choose to call “*sensei*”, has also provided me with valuable support. He has been an inspiring role-model, and it would not be an overstatement to say that without his mentorship, I would not be where I am today.

I would also like to thank my colleagues in the School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics for their feedback at conferences and seminars, which has significantly enriched this thesis. I thank the two teachers of the Japanese for Background Speakers’ subject for allowing me to recruit participants from their class and to audio-record their class activities.

This research was made possible by the Monash International Postgraduate Research Scholarship and the MCJLE Scholarship for research related to the Acquisition of Japanese Language and Cultural Literacy. I express my gratitude to Monash University and the Melbourne Centre for Japanese Language Education for the respective scholarships.

As always, I am grateful to my family for their understanding and for encouraging me to pursue my passion. Last but not least, I express my deepest appreciation to Mari, my wife, for always believing in me and for giving me her unconditional love and support.

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

(()) Author's remarks or explanations

[] Ellipted words or phrases

Italics Author's translation

Notes for translations of extracts

The translations provided in this thesis were translated by the researcher and indicated in italics. As the aim of the interview data was to gain an understanding of the participants' lives and experiences, I have attempted to translate the participants' utterances in a natural manner that conveyed the meaning as well as the voice of each participant. In cases where the participants themselves utilised incorrect lexicon, I have indicated them in the text.

CHAPTER 1: Introduction

This chapter aims to set the background of the study by providing a brief overview of Japanese heritage learners in the Australian context and identifying the issues to be addressed. It will also discuss the various definitions for heritage learners that have been proposed by scholars, and the choice of the terminology utilised in this study. Lastly, the research questions and the rationale for undertaking this study will be explained.

1.1 Background of the study

According to the statistics of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan (2012), as at October of 2011, Australia had the third largest population of Japanese nationals after the United States and China, with 74,679 long-term visitors and permanent residents. This is more than double the figure for 2000 and represents an increase of 5.40% compared to the previous year. More specifically, in Melbourne, the site of this research, the number of Japanese residents reached 17,208 in 2011 and this number too has steadily increased over the past decade. Similar trends can also be observed in other major metropolitan areas such as Sydney, Perth, Brisbane and Cairns, where Japanese nationals have tended to cluster (Mizukami, 1991). While the growth in the number of long-term residents (i.e. Japanese nationals residing in the country for more than three months, as defined in the Japanese government's statistics) in these areas has remained quite stable between 2005 and 2008, the number of permanent residents has sharply increased. In fact, all of the Japanese consulates in Australia have seen an increase of more than 25% in the number of permanent residents during this period (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, 2009) and, as a result, the country now has a larger population of Japanese permanent residents than long-term visitors and sojourners from Japan.

This change in demographics suggests a shift in the way Japanese nationals are settling in Australia. Previously, the Japanese population in Australia was characterised by sojourning families who stayed for a few years and then returned to Japan (Yoshimitsu, 1999). Now, more families are settling permanently in Australia, which means more and more children are growing up in Australia as Australians or as second generation Japanese. As some of these children grow up exposed to English, Japanese and perhaps

other languages, albeit to different degrees of competence, they may develop complex linguistic repertoires. This, at times, raises issues of language maintenance and development and creates language situations that have not been seen very much in previous generations of sojourning Japanese families. How to develop these children's Japanese language in an environment where English is the medium of instruction in the general education system may thus become a key issue for those families seeking to maximise their children's linguistic potential.

Traditionally, full-time Japanese schools, such as the Japanese School of Melbourne, which was established in 1986, provide Japanese education similar to the one available in Japan to children of Japanese families. Full-time Japanese schools are also found in at least several other cities in Australia. In addition, Japanese Saturday Schools or *hoshūkō* are also found in some main Australian cities, and they have served the needs of Japanese families living abroad who wish to maintain and develop their children's Japanese ability. In Melbourne, the Melbourne International School of Japanese (hereafter referred to as "the Japanese Saturday School") is one such Saturday School with 406 students enrolled in 2013 (The Melbourne International School of Japanese, 2013). However, the aim of many of these Saturday Schools has been to teach Japanese as a "national language" so that children will be able to re-enter the Japanese educational system when they return to Japan (Kataoka, Koshiyama, & Shibata, 2008). The underlying assumption is that the children who enter Saturday Schools will be from sojourning families and that these schools are bridges that fill the gap in the children's Japanese education. As a result, both the Saturday Schools and the full-time Japanese Schools typically perceive Japan as the students' "home" and Australia as a place of temporary residence. However, this assumption has less relevance to second-generation children and children of mixed marriages who are permanent residents of Australia, but who nonetheless want to develop their Japanese proficiency. For these children who may have never lived in Japan or lived there only for a short time, and furthermore may never continue their education in Japan, the curriculum designed for Japan may not be appropriate. The increasing presence of such students raises an important issue of how Japanese should be taught to students who have a home-background in Japanese but who may be neither "native speakers" nor foreign language learners due to varying degrees of home exposure to the language. Indeed, the Melbourne International School

of Japanese (2010) reports that especially in the younger age groups, the majority of the students are now permanent residents and that their curriculum and other issues related to the teaching of Japanese are major issues that the school needs to reconsider.

The presence of the students described above is also felt at the tertiary level. As some students with Japanese home-backgrounds progress past Year 12, they have tended to enrol in advanced-level Japanese language subjects at the university level to maintain and consolidate their Japanese language ability (Yoshimitsu, 2008). For example, Yoshimitsu (2008) reports that in 2007, at the university where her research was undertaken, 30 percent of an advanced-level Japanese language classroom consisted of these students. However, she lamented that much of the post-secondary school language education has targeted foreign language learners and, therefore, could not appropriately serve the needs of this group of students.

In the Australian context, such language learners described above are often called “background speakers” and researchers have been investigating them from as early as the late 1960s, although in more established communities such as Italian, German, and Chinese (for example, Clyne, 1970, 1991, 1997b; Clyne & Kipp, 1996). Clyne, Fernandez, Chen and Summo-O’Connel (1997) explain that in the 1960s, background speakers were considered a “problem” in the Australian language classroom as they were seen to have unfair advantages over foreign language learners. In the 1970s, reflecting this belief and the assimilationist policies of the time, sometimes schools were reluctant to introduce language subjects such as German and Italian, which had sizeable immigrant populations. While further large-scale immigration in the 1990s led to policies that recognised Australia’s cultural and linguistic diversity, Clyne et al. (1997) above state that the problem of background speakers was treated in a vacuum without specific knowledge. This is no exception for the Japanese, who are a smaller-sized community and much more recent arrivals and therefore the problem is a more recent one. Consequently, many of the issues that the other community languages faced in the last half-century have only begun emerging in the past decade or so for the Japanese as a result of the changing demographics described above.

The situation itself, however, is not unique to Australia. In the wider global context,

issues concerning background speakers have been investigated under the term “heritage (language) learner” in various countries. For example, in the United States, which also has a large immigrant population, researchers have been examining these students from as early as the 1930s, and studies, especially on Spanish heritage learners became more widely known in the 1970s and 1980s (Valdés, 1995). There, an increasing number of heritage learners have been enrolling in language classes at various levels of the educational system to learn their “heritage” language. Though there is still much debate as to the definition, according to Draper and Hicks (2000), heritage learners are language learners who have had exposure to a heritage language (often, but not always, connected to their ethnic heritage) at home or elsewhere prior to entering the language classroom. Consequently, these students may understand and have varying degrees of prior knowledge of the language and may feel some sense of affiliation to the language and its culture. They, therefore, may possess distinct abilities and characteristics that differentiate them from foreign language learners and also from “native speakers” who speak the language as their first language. In Canada, as well, heritage language education has received considerable attention, but there much of the drive has been towards English and French (Clyne, et al., 1997).

In an increasingly globalised world with transnational movements becoming more marked, the situation in Australia described above is part of a global phenomenon. Accordingly, this so-called heritage language education has gained significant attention in recent decades as more and more heritage learners are entering university to learn their heritage language, which has made the insufficiency of current foreign language curricula more salient. As Valdés (1995) states, it is imperative that applied linguists develop principles to deal with this emerging group of students who are neither beginners nor experts. Valdes (1995) describes them as follows:

The so-called background, residual, and quasi-native speakers about whom these professionals are concerned are not simply imperfect speakers of Spanish who have fallen short of the monolingual norm. They are, rather, complex individuals who are fundamentally, different from monolinguals.
(p. 316)

In describing them as such, Valdés distinguishes them as a totally different group of learners from foreign language learners and highlights the need for more in-depth examination into their language learning experiences and development.

Responding to this statement, recent years have seen a great increase in the number of studies that have investigated various aspects of heritage language education: pedagogical approaches, curriculum development and a rapidly increasing number of empirical studies on the language ability of heritage learners. Paralleling this surge in interest in heritage learners, there is also a movement among academics to establish heritage language education as a distinct sub-discipline of foreign language education. For example, the *Heritage Language Journal*, an academic journal devoted to the study of heritage language education, was established in 2002 in the United States, and the *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* published a special issue on heritage language education in 2005. In addition, at least three edited books that focus on heritage learners have been published in the past decade (Brinton, Kagan, & Baucks, 2009; Kondo-Brown & Brown, 2008; Peyton, Ranard, & McGinnis, 2001). Furthermore, a significant step in heritage language education was the Heritage Language Research Priorities Conference held in 2000, which was organised by the University of California, Los Angeles Steering Committee to address the “major substantive issues and pressing research gaps in heritage language education” (The UCLA Steering Committee, 2000: 476). This conference identified broad areas of research and various research questions within these areas: 1) heritage speakers, 2) family, 3) community, 4) language-specific focus, 5) policy, 6) programs, and 7) assessment. The conference revealed that there was still a substantial gap in our understanding of heritage learners, with many areas still requiring in-depth examination.

However, despite the emerging interest in heritage language education, as I will illustrate in Chapter 2, the number of empirical studies that provide in-depth investigations into these students and their language learning experiences are still limited. In particular, Japanese heritage learners or background speakers are a relatively under-researched group of students, and studies in the Australian context have been relatively few to date (for example, Koshiba & Kurata, 2012; Oguro & Moloney, 2010, 2012; Oriyama, 2010, 2011; Yoshimitsu, 2008).

1.2 Research questions

In the light of the situation described above, this study aims to contribute to this emerging field by investigating the identities and language learning experiences of a particular group of Year 12 and tertiary-level Japanese heritage learners. More specifically, this study addresses the following research questions:

1. What are the profiles of Japanese heritage learners and how do they perceive their linguistic and ethnic identities?
2. How do these students negotiate their identities in Japanese language classes and what interests are being pursued?
3. How do these students utilise their bilingual resources in these classes and in translation and interpreting activities in particular?

In the first research question, I will explicate the Japanese heritage speakers' personal histories and profiles, including their family and educational backgrounds, connections to Japan as well as their future aspirations. Moreover, I will examine the complexity and diversity of these students' linguistic and ethnic identification utilising the notions of language expertise, language affiliation and language inheritance (Leung, Harris, & Rampton, 1997; Rampton, 1990), which will be discussed in detail in Chapter 3 below.

The second research question will explore how Japanese heritage learners draw on their linguistic and cultural resources to construct and negotiate their identities in Japanese language classes. Firstly, it will examine their identity negotiation vis-à-vis foreign language learners in Japanese second language classes. Secondly, I will focus on a special Japanese heritage learners' subject that was offered by an Australian university (hereafter referred to as the "Japanese for Background Speakers", as this was the official name utilised by the university), to examine the identity negotiation amongst Japanese heritage learners themselves. Moreover, the interests pursued through these identity negotiations will also be discussed.

Lastly, the third research question addresses how Japanese heritage learners actually utilise their bilingual resources in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject. In

particular, I will focus on the students' engagement in translation and interpreting activities that were conducted as part of the class and examine how these activities may contribute to the students' bilingual development.

1.3 Definitions and choice of terminology

In the above section, I have utilised both the terms “heritage learner” in reference to studies in the United States and elsewhere, and “background speaker” in reference to studies done in Australia. While there are certainly similarities and overlaps between these two terms, they have different origins and thus different connotations. As these terms are central to the thesis, it is important to address the various definitions that have been proposed to date and the choice of the terminology that will be utilised in this study.

One central and recurring issue in the field of heritage language education is how to define the term “heritage learner”. Many researchers have provided definitions for the term and all of them can be said to be valid for specific communities and specific purposes (Carreira, 2004). One of the most commonly accepted definitions of heritage language learner is the one proposed by Valdés (2000), which states as follows:

The term “heritage” speaker is used to refer to a student who is raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken, who speaks or merely understands the heritage language, and who is to some degree bilingual in English and the heritage language. (p.1)

While the above definition assumes a degree of bilingual proficiency, it seems to imply that the heritage learner is more proficient in English and excludes learners whose first language is not English. Also, this definition links the heritage language with the language spoken at home. Other definitions seem to agree with Valdés that the home language plays an important role in defining who is included and who is not. For example, Campbell and Peyton (1998) provide a much broader definition of heritage language learner as individuals “who speak their first language, which is not English, in the home, or are foreign-born” (p.38). This definition focuses on the ability to speak the

heritage language and includes both “native” and foreign-born individuals with home-backgrounds. Contrarily, some definitions maintain that the degree of exposure to the language, not home-background or ethnicity, is the defining factor. For instance, Draper and Hicks (2000) define heritage learners as follows:

Someone who has had exposure to a non-English language outside the formal education system. It most often refers to someone with a home background in the language, but may refer to anyone who has had in-depth exposure to another language. (p.19)

The above definition on the other hand, accounts for heritage learners who do not necessarily have home-backgrounds in the heritage language (for example, a child of an Australian sojourner, who grew up in Japan speaking Japanese). Scalera (2004) takes an even broader definition by stating that anyone with a personal emotional connection to a language should be considered a heritage language learner. However, this view may be criticised for ignoring the link between the heritage language learner and the ancestral language (Fishman, 1991). Still others, like Kondo-Brown (2005) and Kagan (2005), argue for a proficiency-based definition to account for the diversity within this group of learners.

In their comprehensive overview of the definitions of heritage language learners to date, Hornberger and Wang (2009) argue that these definitions do not focus enough on the heritage language learner’s cultural and socio-psychological struggles. They also indicate, more importantly, that these definitions do not include children of international/interracial marriages or international adoptions who do not know or who are uncertain which language is their heritage language. Hornberger and Wang (2009) thus define heritage language learners as “individuals with familial or ancestral ties to a language other than English who exert their agency in determining if they are heritage language learners of that language” (p. 6). While this definition excludes those who do not have any home-background, it effectively focuses on the issue of agency and the identity of heritage learners.

More recently, some scholars point out that the term heritage language has a specific

political implication in the United States. For instance García (2005) explains that the words bilingual education is increasingly being replaced by the term heritage language education. She contends that the use of this new term is a way for opening up space for bilingual education in a country where there is a strong monolingual bias. She explains that “it (heritage language education) is a way of continuing to operate even a small modicum of professional bilingual activity in times of an increasingly bilingual U.S. reality but strict English monolingual imposition” (p. 604). Thus, she further explains that the utilisation of the term at the secondary and tertiary levels has indeed made language classes available to a wider range of learners and has widened the pedagogical strategies that could be employed to teach such students.

However, as important as the term “heritage” may be in categorising these groups of learners, the word may have a connotation that the heritage language is out-dated and has little relevance to today’s society (Baker & Jones, 1998). Thus, as mentioned above, an alternative term used in Australia is the term “background speaker”, largely due to the earlier studies by Clyne, which examine speakers of “community languages” (Clyne, 1970, 1991, 1997a, 1997b). Clyne et al. (1997) classify background speakers according to whether they are ethnic or non-ethnic background speakers (for example, those without “heritage” links to the language). Ethnic background speakers are then divided depending on which generation they belonged to and then further divided by their pattern of language use. Non-ethnic background speakers are divided according to their experience in the language (for example, primary school, exchange program or other). Clyne’s taxonomy of background speakers permits a closer examination of the backgrounds of each background speaker and includes both those with home-background and those with extended exposure to the language.

Taking these multiple definitions into consideration, for the purpose of this study, I will utilise the term “heritage learner” since it is more widely employed in a number of countries. However, the terms “background speaker” will be used when referring to studies that utilise these terms and also when referring to the Japanese for Background Speakers’ subject, which will be explained more in detail in Chapter 3 below. This is, of course, not to uncritically accept the validity of these constructs in describing this particular group of students. It should be noted that as a corollary to the research

questions described above, I will query these constructs throughout this study and also examine the influences they may have on the students' own identities.

1.4 Justification and significance of the study

Qualitative case study approach

As discussed above, Japanese heritage learners are a newly emerging group of students whose needs require urgent attention. With the steady growth of the Japanese population in Australia, it is likely that this will become a more pressing issue not only for researchers but also for schools and teachers of all levels who do not have sufficient information and appropriate approaches to cope with this group of language learners. As such, heritage language education is gaining significant attention at the national level in Australia, and there is a project led by the New South Wales Board of Studies to develop a national curriculum for the teaching of Chinese, Japanese, Indonesian and Korean as heritage languages. However, there is a substantial lack of qualitative studies that emphasises the emic perspectives and accounts of each individual background speaker. Therefore, as I will describe further in Chapter 4, this study will take a qualitative case study approach in order to examine the personal histories of individual Japanese speakers in detail and also investigate their identities from a more participant-oriented perspective.

The Japanese for Background Speakers' subject

In addition, this research will be different from other studies because it will examine, as one of the focuses of this study, a special Japanese language subject offered by a university to Japanese heritage learners. While past studies have examined Japanese heritage learners in foreign language classrooms (for example, Yoshimitsu, 2008), there has been relatively few studies conducted at the secondary or tertiary level on the influence of a Japanese heritage learners' subject on the students' identities. An examination of this particular subject allows me to examine the interaction and the identity negotiation amongst Japanese heritage learners, which may be difficult to examine in foreign language classrooms.

Translation and interpreting activities

Furthermore, this study will examine translation and interpreting tasks that were conducted as part of the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject mentioned above. In past decades, the use of translation tasks as part of a language curriculum is not new, but it has been largely downplayed in language teaching since the movement for more communicative approaches. This is because translation, especially those associated with the earlier grammar-translation method, has often been considered an out-dated method of language teaching (Cook, 2010; Tudor, 1987).

However, recent studies have begun to further examine the possibility of introducing translation tasks as effective methods of teaching language and culture (E.-Y. Kim, 2010; Olk, 2003). For example, Kim (2010) asked university level Korean learners to translate their Korean essays into English and produce comments about what they have learned or noticed about their Korean writing. The findings suggest that the translation exercises did, in fact, lead students to notice aspects of their Korean writing such as the syntax, word choice, content, and accuracy.

In particular, the usefulness of translation tasks in raising students' awareness towards language and cultural aspects of texts is highlighted in a study by Takimoto and Hashimoto (2008), who examined a Japanese subject that utilised translation and interpreting activities utilising data from subject evaluations of 58 students and interviews with eight students. They found that many students may have been engaged in "deep learning" (Biggs & Tang, 2007) through such translation and interpreting tasks. To further investigate their claim, Takimoto and Hashimoto (2010) interviewed 10 students who took the same subject in a different year, utilising the notion of "Intercultural Language Teaching" (Liddicoat, Papademetre, Scarino, & Kohler, 2003) as the theoretical framework. They found that translation and interpreting tasks encouraged students to actively compare and move between the two languages. In other words, the use of both languages engaged students in "intercultural exploration" (Liddicoat, 2002) that led to an increased awareness towards the languages and cultural aspects of the texts they translated.

The above-mentioned studies provide insightful starting points for examining the potential that interpreting and translation activities may have in language education in general and in heritage language education more specifically. Moreover, as the activities require the use of both Japanese and English, examining the students' engagement in the activities may also provide insight into the students' bilingual repertoire that may not be observable in typical monolingual exercises. Furthermore, it may provide suggestions for possible pedagogical approaches to teaching Japanese to this group of learners.

Globalisation and transnationalism

The presence of Japanese heritage learners in language classrooms is certainly a contemporary situation, made possible by the transnational flow of people and the mobility of resources and ideas around the globe thanks to the evolution of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT). Thus, globalisation has significantly influenced the context that Japanese heritage learners are placed in and raises theoretical issues that may need further investigation. Although a considerable amount of research into background speakers and community languages has been conducted in Australia in the past, as the word "community" suggests, researchers were primarily concerned with the language experience of groups and the issues related to language shift and maintenance (Berardi-Wiltshire, 2009). However, with the influence of globalisation becoming more prominent, the term community may have very different meanings. As Hall (1992b) states, the processes of globalisation has connected and integrated communities in previously unobserved ways. It can thus be said that we are in a different context compared to the time when previous researchers – even as recent as the 1980s and the 1990s – examined community languages. For instance, these days, issues regarding identity may not be describable in terms of a connection to a single community, ethnicity or nationality. This study also attempts to shed light on the nature of identity and identification in a time of globalisation, transnational movement and the ever-developing ICT.

1.5 Structure of the thesis

Having laid out the basic overview for this study, Chapter 2 continues with a survey of

the literature particularly relevant to this examination of heritage learners and the study of language and identity. In Chapter 3, I will then present the overall framework and the key concepts that will be utilised in this study. This will be followed by Chapter 4, which explains the methodological approach taken and the justification for choosing the methods employed. Chapter 5 will set the context of the subsequent analytical chapters by examining the Japanese heritage learners' individual narratives to illustrate the diversity of their profiles as well as the complexity of their linguistic and ethnic identifications. In Chapter 6, building on this discussion and based on the students' accounts of their participation in Japanese second language classes at the Year 11 level, I will illustrate the ways in which the students draw on their linguistic and cultural resources to negotiate their identities in the Japanese second language classroom. In Chapter 7, I turn my focus to the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject, which all of students were enrolled in at the time of study, to investigate the identity negotiation amongst heritage learners. In Chapter 8, I analyse the students' engagement in translation and interpreting activities that were conducted as part of the above-mentioned Japanese for Background Speakers' subject to examine how the students utilise their bilingual resources in those tasks. Finally, Chapter 9 provides a summary of the major findings, outline some implications and the limitations of this study and gives suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER 2: Literature review

This chapter will provide a survey of some of the empirical studies that have been conducted to date on heritage learners and background speakers in order to clarify what is known, and identify which areas still require further examination. Firstly, I will review the empirical studies on heritage learners' and background speakers' language use and abilities, which has received considerable attention to date. This will be followed by a review of the literature on the concept of identity, which is one of the key concepts examined in this thesis. These two aspects taken together will form the basis for the discussions in the following chapters on the students' identities and how they are negotiated in language classrooms.

2.1 Heritage language education

As discussed briefly in Chapter 1, studies on heritage learners have been conducted since as early as the 1930s, and studies in the United States have focused primarily on Spanish heritage learners (for example, Aparcio, 1983; Garcia & Diaz, 1992; Valdés, 1995; Valdés, 2000; Valdés, Lozano, & Garcia-Moya, 1981). However, many of these studies have been confined to non-empirical studies that focus primarily on classroom strategies, pedagogy, curriculum, materials development and so on. On the other hand, studies supported by empirical evidence have been relatively few. Only in the past decade or so has there been a substantial number of empirical studies that examine heritage learners themselves with regard to their linguistic abilities and the affective variables influencing their bilingual development. Such studies have often compared heritage learners to non-heritage learners in an attempt to distinguish them as a different group of learners from foreign language learners and, therefore, in need of different pedagogical approaches.

2.1.1 Linguistic abilities of heritage learners

Over the years, researchers and educators have formulated many hypotheses about the linguistic ability of heritage learners. For example, the National Standards for Foreign Language Learning (1999, as cited in Xiao, 2006) describes heritage learners' linguistic

ability as follows:

These [heritage] students may come to class able to converse in the language in home and community situations but may lack the abilities to interact comfortably in more formal settings. Further, they may be quite comfortable with oral language but possess limited skills in reading and writing. (p. 47)

These characteristics of heritage learners are echoed in Campbell and Rosenthal's (2000) "working hypothesis" that describes a typical heritage learner as one whose pronunciation, stress and intonation conform almost completely with those of native speakers, and have 80 to 90 percent of the grammar rules. However, their vocabulary is limited to social-cultural domains with frequent borrowings from the majority language. They also have the ability to control the register of communication with family and community members. These and other hypotheses describe heritage learners as a distinctly different group from foreign language learners. While the details are various, it seems that many agree that heritage learners' strengths comes from their home oral exposure to the language, which fosters their speaking and listening but not their reading and writing skills. However, as Campbell and Rosenthal admit, these have been observations without the support of empirical evidence.

In light of the above-mentioned hypotheses and the lack of empirical studies to verify such claims, many of the studies that began to emerge in the past decade or so have focused on examining the linguistic profiles of heritage learners from a more data-oriented perspective. These studies have primarily utilised proficiency tests, either administered independently or as part of a curriculum, and they examine specific aspects of heritage learners' linguistic ability by comparing them to non-heritage learners. A number of studies have also utilised self-assessment and self-reports, sometimes in conjunction with proficiency tests, to examine how students' backgrounds influence their language ability (for example, Beaudrie & Ducar, 2005; Clyne, et al., 1997; Jensen, 2007; Lee, 2002; Oh & Au, 2005; Shum, 2001). However, the number of such empirical studies, especially at the university level, still remains relatively few.

Japanese heritage learners

There are only a limited number of studies that examine the linguistic ability of university-level Japanese heritage learners (for example, K. Kanno, Hasegawa, Ikeda, Ito, & Long, 2009; Kondo-Brown, 2001, 2005, 2006, 2009; Kondo-Brown & Fukuda, 2008; Matsunaga, 2003). There are also a small number of empirical studies that examine the linguistic ability of younger Japanese heritage learners (Kataoka, et al., 2008). One of the earlier empirical studies that compares the linguistic ability of Japanese heritage learners with that of non-heritage learners is Kondo-Brown's (2001) relatively large-scale study which was conducted as part of a placement test at the University of Hawai'i. She examined the relationship between the years of formal high-school Japanese in the United States and the students' demonstrated receptive and productive skills for both heritage and non-heritage incoming university students wishing to enrol in a Japanese class. The data is based on an essay placement test (n=156) and a multiple-choice test (n=642) that consisted of listening, grammar and character recognition. The findings showed that heritage learners scored higher than non-heritage learners in all aspects, though a correlation was not found between the number of years of high-school Japanese and test scores among heritage learners. One interesting interpretation she provides for this non-correlation is that traditional high-school Japanese classes do very little, if anything, to consolidate heritage learners' linguistic ability and that these students may be wasting their time in traditional foreign language classrooms.

On a much smaller scale, similar results are found in a subsequent study by Matsunaga (2003). Utilising a proficiency test, Matsunaga examined the reading performance (i.e. comprehension and reading speed) and oral skills (i.e. pronunciation, appropriateness of vocabulary, grammar, naturalness, and communication) of 14 heritage and 25 non-heritage learners who were intermediate and advanced learners of Japanese utilising. A particular focus was given to the effect of Japanese character recognition on students' reading performance. The results showed that heritage learners outperformed non-heritage learners in oral skills, and that heritage learners' reading proficiency was not low, provided that they were able to understand the characters in the text. Matsunaga thus suggests that characters are an important variable in the reading development of

heritage learners.

This line of study, that is, reading and character knowledge, is pursued in depth in two sets of studies by Kondo-Brown (2006) and Kondo-Brown and Fukuda (2008). Kondo-Brown's (2006) study conducted through proficiency tests, revealed that there were considerable differences in character inference ability among the Japanese heritage learners. However, when comparing Japanese heritage learners to non-heritage learners with equal reading comprehension ability, heritage background did not seem to be a factor influencing character inference ability. Kondo-Brown and Fukuda's study (2008), on the other hand, examined the ability of heritage learners and non-heritage learners to monitor and recover zero-pronouns. Their statistical analysis found that heritage learners had significantly better ability to identify zero pronouns.

Further examination of heritage learners' listening, grammar and reading ability is carried out in a significant and detailed study by Kondo-Brown (2005) of 185 heritage learners and non-heritage learners of Japanese between the ages of 17 and 22 years and residing in Hawai'i, with a close look at the relationship between students' family background, self-assessment and their linguistic ability – an aspect that was missing in many previous studies. What differentiates this study from similar previous ones is that it places an emphasis on background information as a means of subdividing heritage learners and identifying intra-group differences in their linguistic abilities. The data is based on a Japanese proficiency test, background questionnaire and a self-assessment questionnaire. Based on the results from the background questionnaire, she divided participants into three categories: the Japanese heritage language identity group (JHL identity, for example, born in the U.S., of Japanese descent but no Japanese-speaking parent or grandparent); the Japanese heritage language competent group (JHL competent, for example, born in U.S. or Japan, at least one Japanese-speaking parent); and the Japanese foreign language group (JFL group, for example, born in U.S., neither of the above, no Japanese-speaking relative). The results of the tests showed that while there was a clear advantage of the JHL competent group over the other two groups in listening, grammar, and reading ability, the JHL identity group and the JFL group displayed similar characteristics. Perhaps the most significant finding to come out of this study is the empirical evidence that there is considerable heterogeneity of language

skills and patterns of use within heritage learners themselves. Kondo-Brown concludes by stressing the importance of recognising intra-group differences within heritage learners and points out that the definition of “heritage learner” itself becomes an important variable for research.

Heritage learners of other languages

A few small-scale studies have been conducted in languages such as Chinese (Xiao, 2006), Korean (E. J. Kim, 2003; H.-S. H. Kim, 2001; J. T. Kim, 2001; O' Grady, Lee, & Choo, 2001), and Russian (Friedman & Kagan, 2009; Kagan, 2005) or a combination of them (Jensen, 2007) with mixed results. For example, Xiao's (2006) study of 18 Chinese heritage learners and 18 non-heritage learners in the United States investigated the students' Chinese competence in speaking, listening, grammar, sentence construction, reading, vocabulary and character writing. Two sets of data were examined: one collected from tests administered throughout a semester of a Chinese course and the other collected from the results of a Chinese SAT II test (n=148). The findings showed that heritage learners out-performed non-heritage learners in speaking, listening, grammar and sentence construction. However, no statistically significant difference between heritage learners and non-heritage learners was found in reading comprehension, vocabulary and character writing. Xiao concluded that because the input in the homes was limited to oral language, a home-background did not necessarily strengthen students' reading and writing skills. Xiao suggests that exposure to linguistic input at home facilitates the development of listening and speaking development but that it does not automatically lead to literacy. She further states that for languages with a difficult orthography, character recognition is a key variable that affects reading development, often hindering their reading/writing ability. An earlier study by Ke (1998) complements this study by stating that a home-background has no effect on a student's learning of Chinese characters. Some findings from Chinese heritage learners regarding character recognition are likely to be applicable to Japanese heritage learners as both languages are character-based.

A slightly different approach is taken by H.-S. H. Kim (2001), who compared how the writing and speaking skills of Korean heritage learners differ from those of non-heritage

learners. A qualitative analysis was conducted based on writing and speaking samples collected from 26 students to examine the types of errors made by both groups. The findings showed that while non-heritage learners tended to “speak as they write”, heritage learners “write as it sounds”. Here, too, it is perhaps the influence of a predominantly oral exposure at home that transfers to (or interferes with) their writing.

In a non-character based language, Kagan (2005) conducted a study with university-level Russian heritage learners in an attempt to define them according to their academic backgrounds. She suggested the division of heritage learners into three groups based on the years of schooling in the country where the language was the medium of instruction. Group one was the most proficient group that consisted of students who graduated from high school in Russia or a Russian-speaking country. Group two consisted of students who attended school in a Russian-speaking country for five to seven years. The third group was defined as the “incomplete acquirers”, in other words, students who attended elementary school in a Russian-speaking country, those who emigrated as preschoolers or who were born in the U.S. to Russian-speaking parents. Citing a previous preliminary study (n=44) that examined the translation of a series of sentences to test the students’ grammatical knowledge, she found that the students’ grammatical knowledge and vocabulary correlated with their years of schooling in Russia. In this study, 10 students (five heritage learners, five non-heritage learners) were asked to translate a cohesive text of 250 words from Russian into English. The translations were checked for mistakes in spelling, grammar, vocabulary and discourse. The results showed that the heritage learners performed considerably better on the verbal aspects and produced more native-like discourse. Similar to the study by Kondo-Brown (2005) above, Kagan found that there was indeed a difference between the needs of different types of heritage learners.

The findings presented above contribute to our understanding of heritage learners’ linguistic abilities, but with a number of exceptions (for example, Kagan, 2005; Kondo-Brown, 2005), few studies have clearly defined the target group under investigation and thus the collection of studies provide a general but fragmented idea of the language abilities of heritage learners. Furthermore, there is a lack of in-depth qualitative case studies that examine how such learners are different from non-heritage learners and

from “native speakers” of the language. Their language profiles, more specifically, whom they communicate with, which language is used for what purpose, and how they use their languages still need to be examined.

2.1.2 Motivation, attitude and other socio-psychological factors

Another line of research on heritage learners examines the socio-psychological link between heritage learners and their heritage language. The basis for the studies that examine such links is that one of the defining factors that distinguish heritage learners from foreign language learners is the motivational orientations and ethnolinguistic affiliations that heritage learners may have towards their heritage languages (Lee & Kim, 2008). For example, in the Japanese language, Kondo (1998) examined Japanese heritage learners and the socio-psychological factors influencing their language maintenance. She conducted interviews with six new second-generation Japanese university students, in other words, children of first generation Japanese who immigrated to Hawai’i after the liberalisation of immigration laws in 1965, and analysed the data utilising Landry and Allard’s (1992) concept of “individual network of linguistic contact” which examines the influence of ethnographic vitality of the minority and majority languages on an individual’s learning behaviour and his/her willingness to use the languages. Kondo found that there were various factors influencing the way new second-generation Japanese students developed or chose not to develop their Japanese skills. For instance, some of the participants refused to speak Japanese at times because they did not want to be associated with Japanese tourists and investors who were resented by the local Hawaiian community. Another factor that diminished the students’ interest in Japanese was the isolation that many of them felt in Japanese language classrooms. There, they were often discriminated against by other non-heritage students for having “unfair” advantages. Her study showed that there was a strong assimilative pull towards English and that there were very few incentives for new second-generation Japanese students to study Japanese. However, she also found that interactions with their mothers served as a critical factor in maintaining these students’ Japanese ability.

In Korean, J. S. Lee (2002) examined the relationship between cultural identity and the heritage language maintenance of 40 second generation Korean-American university

students. The students were first asked to self-assess their language proficiency and then a questionnaire was administered to determine their degree of cultural identification to the Korean and American cultures. The questionnaire consisted of 24 yes-no cultural orientation items (for example, “I consider myself basically a Korean person even though I live in America”), as well as open-ended questions. J. S. Lee found that there were varying degrees of bicultural identities among second generation Korean-Americans. For example, males tended to show stronger identification with Korean culture than females. The data analysis also showed that self-assessed proficiency was highly related to cultural identity. Those students who had self-assessed their heritage language proficiency to be high displayed strong identification to both Korean and American cultures.

A subsequent study of 111 Korean heritage learners by J. S. Lee and H.-Y. Kim (2008) was conducted using questionnaires and interviews to examine the motivational factors related to learning Korean as a heritage language. The researchers utilised Gardner’s (1985) concepts of instrumental and integrative motivation to examine the data and found that instrumental motivation (for example, applying for jobs, receiving higher wages) was not a major factor influencing the participants’ decision to learn Korean. Instead, integrative motivation (for example, passing down the language to children, integrating into Korean communities) played a more vital role. They also found that while ethnolinguistic vitality of the Korean language in America was low, many participants perceived the Korean language as a critical link to their roots and families. J. S. Lee and H.-Y. Kim state that this study confirmed the results of past studies that emphasised the importance of integrative orientation in determining the motivation of heritage learners (for example, Chinen, 2005; Cho, 2000; Cho, Cho, & Tse, 1997). However, the studies on socio-psychological aspects of heritage language education discussed above seem to take a rather static view of identity, and utilise questionnaires and scales as the main method of data collection. Therefore, such studies may not account for the contradictory and complex nature of identities that are addressed by more recent studies on socio-psychological aspects of language learning (for example, Block, 2006; Norton, 2000; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004). Thus, there remains a substantial gap in our understanding of the heritage learners with regard to their cultural identities, which needs to be supplemented by more studies that account for the

variation amongst them.

2.2 Identity and language learning

Sociolinguists and others interested in second language acquisition have long recognised the relationship between an individual's language/language use and his/her identity (for example, Cummins, 1995; Gee, 1996; Heller, 1987; Le Page & Tabouret-Keller, 1985; Toohey, 2000), since language is the means by which individuals construct a sense of self at different locations across time (Heller, 1987). However, scholars have struggled to develop a theory of identity that integrates the language learner and the language learning context (Norton, 2000).

One of the earliest attempts in sociolinguistics to conceptualise this relationship can be found in Tajfel's (1974, 1981) work on social identity theory which suggests the role of social membership and the value attached to social groups in constructing an individual's identity. Similarly, Berry's (Berry, 1980; Berry, Kim, Power, Young, & Bujaki, 1989) work on acculturation proposes four models of acculturation (i.e. integration, assimilation, separation and marginalization) that describe how individuals transition themselves into a new environment where they are the minority. While these models have described the importance of social context and membership on one's identity formation, they have recently come under criticism for taking an over-simplified view of culture. For instance, these studies have been queried for assuming a one-to-one relationship between language and ethnicity, and a linear view of language acquisition (for a more detailed criticism see Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004). Indeed, it has been argued that these models of identity increasingly became inadequate in addressing the complexities of the post-modern society described by Hall (1992b), where identity could not be categorised under simple and clearly bound notions such as ethnicity, race and sex.

Instead, many researchers became interested in social constructivist or poststructural approaches to conceptualising identity. Researchers in the social constructivist tradition view identity as being constructed through social interactions and poststructuralism takes the position that a person's identity is not a fixed product but rather an ongoing

process (Hall, 1996). A person thus may also have multiple and contradictory identities that are embedded within power relationships. This poststructuralist perspective is adapted by scholars such as Norton Pierce (1995) who suggests that identity is “how a person understands his or her relationship to the world, how that relationship is constructed across time and space, and how the person understands possibilities for the future” (p.5). By viewing identity as a process rather than a product, it became possible for theorists to account for the multiple and sometimes contradictory subject positions that a person takes up in their daily lives, such as language learner, Japanese, worker, middle-class, minority and mother, and how one identity may become salient depending on the context.

Thus, poststructuralism and the view of identity discussed above allowed for a more nuanced investigation of language learners as complex and multidimensional individuals and it greatly influenced the way scholars conceptualise the relationship between language learners and society. Such an approach contributed to a social shift in the studies on second language acquisition in the mid-1990s that shifted the emphasis from language use and linguistic development to the relationship between language and identity (Block, 2003). Since then, there has been a burgeoning literature that deals with the relationship between language and identity that pursue poststructural approaches (Y. Kanno, 2000, 2003; McKay & Wong, 1996; Miller, 2003, 2004; Norton, 1997, 2000; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004). In these studies, the concept of identity has been used as a key analytical tool for understanding how individuals interact with society and how language is used to construct and negotiate multiple identities. Moreover, recent development in some studies in Britain points to the destabilisation of ethnic and linguistic boundaries amongst young bilingual individuals (Harris, 2006; Preece, 2006; Rampton, 1995; Rampton, Harris, & Leung, 1997) and the emergence of “new ethnicities” and “hybrid identities”.

While the literature on identity is vast, this study, like Y. Kanno’s (2003) study of bilingual and bicultural Japanese returnees, is concerned with identity as it relates to language and culture. Y. Kanno’s central concern is how “bilingual individuals position themselves between two languages and two (or more) cultures, and how they incorporate these languages and cultures into their sense of who they are” (p. 3).

Likewise, my study will continue in this vein to explore the identity of background speakers as it relates to their languages.

According to Block (2007), empirical studies on language and identity can be categorised into three major settings: naturalistic, foreign language, and study abroad. While the distinction between these three settings may at times be arbitrary, for the purpose of this research, I will follow Block's (2007) categorisation and review the empirical studies in the naturalistic and foreign language contexts, as they seem to be of more relevance to Japanese background speakers. The naturalistic settings refer to "the learning of language that is the dominant linguistic mediator of communication in the surrounding environment" (p. 864), and foreign language settings refer to "the learning of language in a formal classroom setting, which is embedded in surroundings where the language is not the normal and most common linguistic mediator of day-to-day activity" (p. 864).

2.2.1 Identity and language learning in naturalistic contexts

One of the most influential works in the naturalistic context is the research by Norton (Norton, 1997, 2000; Norton Pierce, 1995). In her significant longitudinal study of the language learning experience of five immigrant women in Canada, Norton (2000) utilised data from questionnaires, interviews and diary entries to examine how immigrant women construct various identities in the process of learning a new language. By drawing on the works of Bourdieu (1977a), Weedon (1987), and West (1992), she suggested that identity should be understood as multiple, a site of struggle, and changing over time (Norton Pierce, 1995). She found that the women in her study had contradictory desires to be seen as equals in the workplace and recognised for their differences. They had multiple and sometimes conflicting identities such as "an immigrant, a mother, a language learner, a worker, a wife" (p. 126). Furthermore, she observed shifts in their identity over time, for instance, from immigrant to multicultural citizen. Through these findings, Norton challenged the idea that these women had fixed motivations to study English. Rather, she introduced the notion of investment as a way of describing how the women in her study made various investments in English as a way of attaining a wider range of symbolic resources (for example, language, education

and friendship) and material resources (for example, capital, real estate and money). Investment in English was also a way of gaining a wider range of identity options in the future.

The multiple nature of identities is also the central concern of Y. Kanno's (2003) longitudinal study which spans both the naturalistic and foreign language contexts following Block's categorisation. The participants were Japanese returnees or *kikokushijo*, who are children of sojourning Japanese families who live overseas and return to Japan after a period of time. While Norton's study focused on the English development of immigrants, Y. Kanno's study focused on both of the languages in the participants' repertoire and how they influenced the participants' bilingual/bicultural development. This study is different from other studies on the identity of immigrants because the participants eventually moved back to their home country (i.e. Japan) and needed to re-adjust to the environment. Y. Kanno followed four Japanese returnee students between 17 and 19 years of age for approximately three years as they left Canada and transitioned back into Japan. As a theoretical framework she utilised Lave and Wenger's (1991) and Wenger's (1998) concept of communities of practice which assumes that individuals learn the language and the identities associated with a community by participating and gaining membership in it. Indeed, she found that the participants desire to participate in the Canadian and Japanese cultures led to the construction of multiple and contradicting identities. In each case, she found that the majority language was seen as a key to participating in their desired communities of practice, while the minority language became an "emblem of their uniqueness" (Y. Kanno, 2000: 2). The longitudinal aspect of her study captured how the participants' views evolved from a rigid view of culture and identity as associated with a single community of practice to a more sophisticated view of culture and identity that allowed them to negotiate their identities in a variety of communities of practice. Y. Kanno's study highlighted how a bilingual/bicultural individual can hold two contradicting worldviews in two contexts and manage hybrid identities. This notion of communities of practice has since been extended by Norton and Gao (2008), who examined recent studies on identity in China to explain how learners make investments not only to gain membership in their present communities but also to gain access to "imagined communities" and thus "imagined identities" (for example, an identity as an English-

speaking Chinese elite) that belong in the future.

Hybrid identities are further explored by Tai (1999), who followed the narratives of 12 adult individuals who were *zainichi* (ethnic Koreans residing in Japan) or of mixed ethnicity as they transition from Japan to the United States. Like Y. Kanno, Tai utilised participants' narratives about themselves, which were collected from interviews as the main data. She found that the participants' identities were constructed through intersecting and contradictory discourses, allowing them or sometimes forcing them to occupy multiple subject positions. Tai explained that, in Japan, the participants presented themselves as "not Japanese" but at the same time, they emphasised their "Japanese-ness". By doing so, they constructed hybrid identities that successfully deconstructed the boundaries of what it means to be "Japanese". This provided them with a way of resisting the label of "other" that was imposed on them in that country. Their perception of identity and culture as fixed categories thus changed as they moved to the United States.

In addition, there is an emerging body of literature in Japan that deals with a similar cohort of students. For example Kawakami (Kawakami, 2007b) coined the term "Children Crossing Borders" to refer to "children who are moving beyond national, regional and linguistic borders" and who "are learning the language used in their host society as a second language as well as their first language that they use at home" (Kawakami, 2007a: 1). While the context of his study is much different as his focus is primarily on these students' acquisition of the language used in the host society (i.e. acquisition of Japanese in Japan), Kawakami's studies point to the ways in which these children cross spatial and linguistic borders, and how this results in the construction of hybrid identities that cannot be categorised under preconceived identity labels. His studies have raised a number of issues related to language policy and language education in Japan, as internationalisation increases the number of such bilingual and bicultural individuals. Indeed, in Japan there is an increased interest in the teaching of Japanese as a heritage language, with a journal established in 2003 entitled *Bogo keishōgo, bairingarū kyōiku kenkyū* [Studies in Mother Tongue, Heritage Language and Bilingual Education]. However, the multiplicity of language learners' identities is only recently beginning to be recognised in Japanese language education in Japan (Hatori,

2009).

The studies discussed above seem to suggest that, at times, individuals may exert agency in contesting and negotiating undesirable identities that are attributed to them. This process has been the central issue of some studies that explore identity negotiation (Doran, 2004; Giampapa, 2004; Kinginger, 2004; Pavlenko, 2004). For instance, Giampapa (2004), using Giddens' (1984) concept of "center" and "periphery", examined how three Italian-Canadian youths negotiated their identities in relation to the discourse on *italianita* or Italianness in various "spaces". She found that all three participants positioned themselves differently with regard to the notion of *italianita* and that "in different spaces and at different times, they challenge the undesirable imposed identities" (p. 215), and their ability to move between the "center" and "periphery" depended on their ability to foreground different aspects of their identities. It is also worth noting that she found that some identity options were indeed not negotiable and had to be downplayed at times.

In terms of how language is used as a tool for negotiation, Doran (2004) investigated the use of Verlan, a street language characterised by alteration of French and borrowings from Arabic, English and Romani, among ethnic youths living in disadvantaged neighbourhoods outside Paris. The qualitative data collected from participant interviews, observations and audio recordings of natural speech revealed that Verlan was used to negotiate a social universe distinct from the mainstream French society, which allowed the youth to occupy complex and hybrid identity options that recognised their multi-ethnic and working-class identities.

Language choice and its relationship to identity is also examined by Nishimura (1992), who conducted a case study which examined the language choice of Japanese/English bilingual Canadian second-generation immigrants. Nishimura examined three Canada-born second-generation Japanese and one naturalised Canadian second-generation Japanese as well as these individuals' interaction with herself. Through the analysis of the recording of two interactions and an interview conducted afterwards, Nishimura identified three types of bilingual speech used by the Canada-born second-generation Japanese in the interaction, 1) the basically English variety, 2) the basically Japanese

variety, and 3) the mixed variety. Which variety of speech they used depended on the identity or a combination of identities of the interlocutor(s). She found that the Canada-born second-generation Japanese use the basically Japanese variety with herself as they viewed her identity as that of a native Japanese speaker. In other words, the base language was Japanese with English nouns and discourse markers mixed in. On the other hand, the Canada-born second-generation Japanese spoke to each other in the basically English variety with sporadic uses of Japanese phrases. Nishimura argues that this mixture of Japanese phrases into English was an expression of the Canada-born second-generation speakers' Japanese identity and they were confirming their common background through the use of Japanese phrases. When there was a mixture of a Japanese native speaker, a naturalised Canadian second-generation Japanese and a Canada-born second-generation Japanese in the context, they spoke in the mixed variety. Nishimura argued that these findings showed that the Canada-born second-generation Japanese wanted to be in touch with the identities of both audiences and negotiated various identities depending on their interlocutors. Nishimura concluded that the relationship between language and identity is not static but dynamic and changes depending on the identities of the interlocutors. This study thus effectively highlights the function of language to index certain identities.

2.2.2 Identity and language learning in foreign language contexts

Another line of research on language and identity are the studies conducted in foreign language classrooms, in other words, in institutionalised settings. Thus, the participants are usually immigrant children and the studies are often concerned with their English language development. The number of studies in this area has been relatively small compared to that in naturalistic contexts, and they have tended to focus on the transformation of individuals as language learners (Block, 2007). As the studies are set in a classroom environment, many of them place emphasis on the construction and negotiation of identities between the language learner and the institutional context. For example, one of the early studies that focuses on identities and agency in foreign language contexts is McKay and Wong's (1996) longitudinal study which utilised the notion of investment to analyse the English learning experience of four Chinese immigrant students at an American high school. They observed that the students were

subject to various discourses simultaneously. They identified these discourses as: colonialist/racist discourse, model minority discourse, Chinese nationalist discourse, school discourse and gendered discourse. While some of these discourses placed the participants in certain favourable subject positions, others marginalised them from learning the language. Their findings showed that agency-enhancement and identity-enhancement were the central factors influencing a students' investment in English. The participants were engaged in complex negotiations with the discourses they were placed in to construct multiple, fluid, and often contradictory identities. It is interesting to note also that, at times, not investing in learning English was a way for some students to preserve positive identities.

As McKay and Wong's (1996) study showed, there are discourses and practices within the language classroom that influence language learners' identities in particular ways. These aspects are explored by Toohey (2000) and Miller (2004), both of which are longitudinal studies situated within ESL (English as a Second Language) classrooms. Toohey's (2000) ethnographic study utilised the notion of communities of practice to examine six children in an ESL class over a three-year period from kindergarten to Year Two. Her observations supported the idea that identities are produced through interaction with the various overlapping communities of practice. While some researchers emphasise the ability of individuals to exert agency and construct their own identities, Toohey's findings showed that, to a large extent, community practices determine an individual's identity. She observed that, "the specific practices of their classrooms produced the focal children as specific kinds of students, with the identity 'ESL learners' as a more or less important marker" (p. 125). At times, these labelling practices of the classrooms blocked students' access to opportunities for developing their language.

Similar to Toohey's (2000) study mentioned above, Miller (2004) used the concept of "audibility" (Miller, 2000) and "voice" (Giroux, 1992) to examine migrant students in Australia and the politics of speaking in class. To this end, she followed the transition of 10 high school students of non-English speaking backgrounds from ESL courses to the mainstream classroom. She conducted a discourse analysis of data collected from semi-structured interviews, diaries, focus groups, observations, and other informal

interactions. Her findings suggested that while schools as “sites of representation” provided ample situations for immigrant children to interact with native speakers, these opportunities were not equal among students. Indeed, English played a central factor in determining a student’s ability to participate in a discourse. In other words, English ability determined the ability to have a voice, and this correlated with audibility. She noted that the focal students’ use of English was limited to formal interactions with teachers and with peers during group activities. Furthermore, another factor that determined audibility was the ability of students to “sound right”. Visible difference or ethnicity was also a salient factor affecting language learning and the negotiation of identity, with some students explaining that English native speakers were reluctant to talk to them because of their black hair. These Asian students had little access to the opportunities to use English and were, as a result, marginalised in the classroom. These two studies showed that identities of language learners were inevitably influenced by specific community practices of the language classroom. In addition, they showed that language and language proficiency were prominent factors that influenced a student’s ability to claim a voice and negotiate more favourable identity options.

However, language learners are not only complicit in the practices, ideologies and discourses of the classroom. Canagarajah’s (1993) critical ethnography of Sri Lankan English classrooms suggest that, at times, the students may resist the practices imposed on them by the institution. For example, the Tamil students whom Canagarajah examined actively resisted collaborative approaches to teaching and insisted on teacher-centred approaches in which learning was a product rather than a process. Moreover, these students seemed to oppose the “alien discourses behind the language and textbook” (p. 617), which clashed with the representation of their own “Tamil” identities.

A slightly different perspective is taken up by Duff and Uchida (1997) who focus on the social identities of English teachers in Japan. Through a six-month ethnographic case study at a language school in the Kansai region of Japan, they examined how the identities of four teachers (two Japanese and two Americans) were negotiated and transformed over time, and how that influenced their teaching practices. The data was collected by means of a teacher/student questionnaire, journal entries, audio and visual

recordings, and interviews. As regards identity, they found that all teachers' identities were constructed along a biographical/professional basis (i.e. past learning experiences, past teaching experiences and cross-cultural experiences) and a more immediate contextual basis (i.e. teaching material, classroom culture and institutional culture). It is worth noting, however, that there were instances in which there was a contradiction between self-proclaimed beliefs and identities and what actually went on in the classroom.

These studies in the foreign language context highlight the influence of the dominant ideologies, discourses and the practices of the classrooms on an individual's identity positions. At times, students actively show resistance to these structuring influences and attempt to change the conditions of the classrooms they engage in. Thus, language classrooms are not insulated from the outside world, but rather a site of cultural politics whereby "different versions of the world are battled over" (Pennycook, 2001: 128). Pennycook (2001) further contends that "the cultural struggle in classrooms is not reducible to one between ideologies of the dominant and dominated but rather to a whole circulation of different ideas, cultural forms, ways of thinking, being, and speaking" (p. 128). Identities in language classrooms thus emerge through this interaction between the individual and the social structure in which they participate, and through the negotiation between the actors in these fields.

In this chapter, I have examined some of the studies on heritage language education that have been conducted to date and surveyed key studies on language and identity. It seems that the large number of these studies on heritage learners have focused primarily on the students' language ability. While there have also been some studies that explore these students' identities and their relationship to language development, empirical inquiries into the complexity of their identities have been relatively few. The number is even fewer when it comes to studies that examine Japanese heritage learners. Moreover, these studies on heritage learners' identities could certainly benefit from the valuable insights provided by the studies on language and identity, above, that pursue poststructural approaches. Taking this gap in the research on heritage language learners/background speakers into consideration, this study will examine the Japanese heritage learners' identities and how they are negotiated in Japanese language classes

vis-à-vis their peers as well as the multiple discourses, norms and ideologies found in these classrooms.

CHAPTER 3: Theoretical and conceptual frameworks

This chapter outlines the main theoretical framework and the concepts utilised in this study. More specifically, this study will apply the framework for examining the negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts proposed by Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004) as the overarching theoretical approach, while the notions of language expertise, affiliation and inheritance proposed by Rampton (1990) and later expanded on by Leung, Harris and Rampton (1997) will be applied when discussing an individual's relationship to a language. In addition, Bourdieu's (Bourdieu, 1977b) notion of *habitus*, *field* and capital will be discussed as a framework for examining how the structural forces and power relations within the classroom influence the students' identities. These approaches and concepts will be utilised as a starting point for investigating how Japanese heritage learners' identities are negotiated in their lives as well as in Japanese language classes, and also for examining the interests that are pursued through such negotiations.

3.1 Language expertise, language inheritance and language affiliation

Firstly, the notions of language expertise, affiliation, and inheritance (Leung, Harris and Rampton, 1997; Rampton, 1990), introduced above, are useful for examining how individuals from diverse backgrounds construct their relationships to the languages in their repertoire. These concepts arose in the UK from the need in TESOL (Teaching English as a Second or Other Language) to reconceptualise the notion of "native speaker" for these bilingual learners in the classrooms. These bilingual learners, like background speakers and heritage learners, are students "at various stages of learning English as a second or additional language for studying purposes and who have at least some knowledge and skills in another language or languages already" (Leung, et al., 1997: 544). It was long believed in TESOL that bilingual learners were "native speakers" of their ethnic language and that they had strong affiliations to the language and culture that they were exposed to at home. That is, a strong one-to-one correspondence was assumed between one's ethnicity and language. This led many researchers to conceptualise bilingual learners as English learners who were social and linguistic outsiders who all had similar needs and identities. However, Leung et al.

(1997) explain that classroom realities suggested otherwise. For example, some bilingual learners were not proficient in the language that was used, or may have been used at home. Others felt very little affiliation to their home language and culture regardless of their degree of expertise in it. As such, there was a great deal of diversity in the ways that individuals with ethnic backgrounds constructed their relationships with the languages in his/her repertoire. They argued that in a highly complex society, fixed categories of languages, ethnicities and social identities were no longer applicable to individuals. Citing Hall (1992a), Leung et al. (1997) explain that:

Members of minority groups are not simple inheritors of fixed identities, ethnicities, cultures, and languages but are instead engaged in a continual collective and individual process of making, remaking, and negotiating these elements, thereby constantly constructing dynamic new ethnicities. (p.547)

Therefore, what Leung et al. (1997) suggest is the replacement of the terms “native speaker” and “mother tongue” with the notions of language expertise, language affiliation, and language inheritance, and extending them to all of the languages in an individual’s repertoire. Firstly, language expertise refers to an individual’s ability or proficiency in each of the languages. An individual may have varying degrees of expertise in their home language and in English. Some bilingual students may disclaim expertise in their home language, while others may possess very high proficiency. Consequently, this concept does not make a distinction between one’s “native” language and the second language, and allows researchers to view both languages equally.

Secondly, language affiliation refers to the “attachment or identification that one feels for a language whether or not they nominally belong to the social group customarily associated with it” (Leung, et al., 1997: 555). This provides a more flexible way of viewing an individual’s orientation to a language that does not consider ethnic background as a marker of affiliation. For instance, a Japanese background speaker born in Japan to Japanese parents but who is now living in Australia may have very weak affiliation to Japanese, even though they have a high proficiency in it, and state that English is his/her preferred language. This aspect is particularly connected to one’s identity. Miller (2003) explains that the “language we are affiliated to reflects how we

wish to speak, but also how we are positioned to speak and how we are heard” (p.43).

Thirdly, language inheritance refers to the way in which individuals are born into a language tradition that is prominent in the family or community. This is regardless of whether they claim expertise in, or affiliation to that language. This notion thus questions the one-to-one correspondence between one’s ethnicity and language. For example, Japanese background speakers born in Australia may feel a strong affiliation to Japanese but feel that they do not inherit it automatically. Instead they may feel like an outsider with regard to it. The difference between inheritance and affiliation is that while the former occurs within ethnic boundaries, the latter occurs across these boundaries.

Block (2006) calls the above-described concepts of language expertise, affiliation and inheritance an individual’s “language identity” and defines it as “the assumed and/or attributed relationship between one’s sense of self and a means of communication which might be known as a language (e.g. English) a dialect (Geordie) or a sociolect (e.g. football-speak)” (p. 36). Block’s definition slightly expands the original definitions by including both one’s self-ascribed relationship and the attributed relationship by others. While Rampton (1990) originally did not conceptualise the notions of expertise, affiliation and inheritance as a framework per se, it nonetheless suggests a useful way of breaking down an individual’s relationships to the languages in his/her repertoire into three components, so each can be examined independently. Importantly, it does not assume any fixed link between an individual’s identity, ethnicity and his/her expertise, affiliation and inheritance as has often tended to be the case in the past. Thus, individuals construct their language identities from these three elements and these may vary greatly from person to person. In this study, I will utilise these notions of expertise, affiliation and inheritance and apply them to Japanese heritage learners in an attempt to examine how these components contribute to the construction and negotiation of the learners’ identities, including language identities.

3.2 Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts

Rampton's concepts and his work on "language crossing" (Rampton, 1995, 1996) seem to suggest that individuals have varying degrees of agency in contesting fixed identities and categories that are attributed to them, including "Japanese", "Australian", "ESL" and "native-speaker". However, this is not to say that individuals always succeed in contesting these labels. For instance, even if one considers him/herself to be affiliated to English, others may still perceive him/her as being affiliated to another language. The same thing may occur with inheritance. In other words, while individuals can exert agency in determining their own expertise, affiliation and inheritance, the three notions must be successfully negotiated with others as well. By displacing the term "native speakers", what Rampton's concepts and the study by Leung et al. highlight is that there is a constant element of negotiation that accompanies the notions of expertise, affiliation and inheritance. Negotiation may thus occur within oneself and with others, and it is the process by which expertise, affiliation and inheritance are thereby shaped.

As mentioned above, the framework for the negotiation of identities in multicultural contexts outlined by Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004) will also be applied here as an overarching theoretical framework to frame the whole study. This framework will be utilised in order to examine how the three components of expertise, affiliation and inheritance may shift and change depending on the context and how they may affect one's sense of identification. According to Pavlenko and Blackledge's (2004) framework, identities are constructed through negotiation, and this can be analysed by using the concept of "positioning" (Davies & Harré, 1990; Harré & van Langenhove, 1999). They define this concept as "all discursive practices which may position individuals in particular ways or allow individuals to position themselves" (p. 20). There are two aspects to this concept: interactive positioning which is the process where one individual places another, and reflexive positioning which is the process of positioning oneself. To give an example in relation to Rampton's (1990) concepts, teachers and researchers labelling minority students as "native speakers" is a type of interactive positioning, while learners' self-perceived affiliation is a type of reflexive positioning. By viewing the notions of expertise, affiliation and inheritance as part of a process of negotiation in which others are involved instead of something that is fixed

for life, my study can examine the process of change that Japanese heritage learners' self-representation undergoes, depending on the classroom and individuals they are interacting with. Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004) note that negotiation may occur within oneself through texts and that it does not require two physical parties. This observation is of particular relevance because it may allow interpreting and translation tasks to prompt individuals to be aware of the identity positions they bring to the text lead to various kinds of noticing and a raised awareness about their languages.

In addition, Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004) state that identities constructed through negotiation have five elements that are important in their theoretical framework. These are: 1) location within particular discourses and ideologies of language; 2) embeddedness within the relationships of power; 3) multiplicity, fragmentation and hybridity; 4) the imagined nature of new identities and 5) location within particular narratives. In their view, individuals construct identities by using the language available to them at any given time and, on the other hand, identities guide the way an individual may use language. In addition, the framework also emphasises the fact that identities must be viewed in their entirety. This gives rise to the necessity to examine Japanese heritage learners from multiple perspectives, including their histories and their interactions with others. Furthermore, Pavlenko and Blackledge's framework emphasises the importance of narratives as a means of bringing coherence to these multiple identities and this has methodological implications that will be discussed in the following chapter. In sum, Pavlenko and Blackledge's framework for analysing the negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts "privileges a dynamic view of identities, with individuals continuously involved in production of selves, positioning of others, revision of identity narratives, and creation of new ones which valorise new modes of being and belonging" (p.19).

3.3 *Field, habitus* and capital

In the overarching framework suggested by Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004) above, how identity negotiations occur within power relations and discourses may require further elaboration as it is relevant to the students' negotiation of identities in the classroom. Here, the French sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu's (1977b, 1986) theoretical

concepts of *field*, *habitus* and capital may be particularly useful. Bourdieu conceptualised these concepts to help explain the structural nature of schools in (re)producing class inequalities and educational attainment. In comparing the different educational attainment of students from different social classes, Bourdieu explained that the reason for the different levels of outcome was not due to an innate ability or deficit of intelligence that the working-class students possessed but that institutions such as schools valued and legitimatised certain types of cultural and social capital only possessed by upper or middle class families who were able to transmit them to their children.

According to Bourdieu (1977), all interactions take place in *fields* (or “*champ*” in French), which are “semi autonomous, structured social spaces characterised by discourse and social activity” (Carrington & Luke, 1997: 100). *Fields* such as the home, school and communities are not fixed social spaces with fixed boundaries. They may intersect and influence each other in a process of continuous reconstruction. Within these *fields*, individuals and institutions are positioned depending on the amount and composition of capital they possess and the type of capital that is valued in that particular *field*. Bourdieu defines four main types of capital that individuals may possess. The types of capital are shown in the Table 1 below:

Table 1: Types of capital (Carrington and Luke, 1997: 102)

Symbolic Capital		
Institutionally recognised and legitimated authority and entitlement requisite for the exchange and conversion of Cultural, Economic and Social Capital		
Cultural Capital	Embodied Capital	Knowledges, skills, dispositions, linguistic practices and representational resources of the bodily habitus
	Objectified Capital	Cultural goods, texts, material objects and media physically transmissible to others
	Institutional Capital	Academic qualifications, awards, professional certificates and credentials
Economic Capital		Material goods and resources directly convertible into money
Social Capital		Access to cultural and subcultural institutions, social relations and practices

Firstly, economic capital refers to anything that is “immediately and directly convertible into money” (Bourdieu, 1986: 243). Secondly cultural capital refers to any type of capital that may take time to acquire. This can further be broken down into three sub-types, embodied capital, objectified capital and institutional capital. Embodied capital may be a set of skills, knowledge of language (i.e. linguistic capital), dispositions or aspirations that are embodied by individuals. Cultural capital may also take the form of objectified capital, which is “material objects and media such as writing, paintings, monuments, instruments” and is “transmissible in its materiality” (Bourdieu, 1986: 19). Additionally, cultural capital can also be institutional which means that it is provided to individuals by authorised social institutions. Examples of this would include academic qualifications, professional certificates and credentials. Thirdly, social capital refers to an individual’s social networks, both real and virtual, and the potential benefits that one can accrue from being a part of that particular group. Bourdieu further contends that these forms of capital are, under certain conditions, convertible. For instance, a degree from a highly prestigious university (i.e. institutional cultural capital) may lead to a high-paying job (i.e. cultural and economic capital), which in turn may lead to networks with colleagues (i.e. social capital) that may further one’s social or economic position.

In order to utilise and convert these forms of capital, Bourdieu (1986) explains that one needs symbolic capital, which determines the uptake of the above-mentioned forms of capital. Symbolic capital refers to “the social phenomenon of prestige, status and reputation which accompanies the accumulation and recognition of other forms of capital” (Carrington and Luke, 1997: 103). That is, for an individual’s cultural capital to be deemed of value, an individual must possess the standing or social position to be recognised by others as legitimate holders of that capital. In this regard, symbolic capital “acts to facilitate the utilisation and efficiency of other forms of capital” (Carrington and Luke, 1997: 103).

As individuals accumulate a wide range of capital through their trajectories across various fields, they form what Bourdieu calls a *habitus*, in other words:

[A] set of dispositions acquired throughout their lives through psychic and physical embodiment, and is a “distinctive, class, culture-based and

engendered way of ‘seeing’, ‘being’ ‘occupying space’ and ‘participating in history’ (Carrington and Luke, 1997: 101).

Nash (1999) defines *habitus* as an “embodiment of objective structure” (p. 184). This is explored in detail by Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) who explain the nature of a *habitus* in the following excerpt:

[T]he strategy-generating principle enabling agents to cope with unforeseen and ever-changing situations [...] a system of lasting and transposable dispositions which, integrating past experiences, functions at every moment as a matrix of perceptions, appreciations and actions and makes possible the achievement of infinitely diversified tasks. (p. 18)

A more concise definition is given by James (2011) in the following excerpt:

It is really a way of talking about the embodiment of previous social fields, whereby individuals acquire and carry ways of thinking and being and doing from one place to another. It is about how past social structures get into present action and how current actions confirm or reshape current structures. (p. 2)

As such, possessing the embodiment of capital, or *habitus*, that fits with the expectations and the value given to them in a particular *field* is a prerequisite for the effective deployment and conversion of capital. However, as the expectations and value of a certain type of capital is *field* dependant, the same combination of capital may yield different social positions depending on the *field* one participates in.

For Bourdieu, linguistic competence then is not an inherent property of the individual, but depends on whether one has an embodiment of capital (i.e. *habitus*) that is valued in that particular *field*. That is to say, it is not only about what one says or the grammatical or lexical accuracy of one’s utterances, but about how one is positioned by others and by the power structure of the *field* that determines what is “legitimate” and what is not. He argues that it is the “power to impose reception” (Bourdieu, 1977: 648) or the

legitimacy of the speaker that is central to the notion of linguistic competence.

Asides from providing us with a tool-kit to discuss the internal mechanisms of power that operate within particular social spaces like the classroom, an important insight that Bourdieu points to is the relational nature of identities and values. Thus in terms of this study, it may be important to acknowledge that students may be positioned by others and position themselves differently depending on the *fields* they participate in, including their homes, second language classes and the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject. While one's embodied capital and his/her way of talking may be seen as legitimate in one *field*, this may not always be the case when he or she enters a different *field* where the type of Japanese that may be deemed valuable may be different. This lack of fit between the *habitus* and *field* may result in a student being marginalised and attributed identity positions with less legitimacy in some contexts. I will utilise these concepts above in an attempt to examine Japanese heritage learners from various perspectives and account for the diversity that exists within this group of language learners.

CHAPTER 4: Methodology

In outlining the research design of this study, I will describe the overall approach taken and the backgrounds of the participants involved. This will be followed by a detailed explanation of the actual data collection procedures. In addition, this chapter will discuss in detail my reasons for utilising these particular data collection procedures, the theoretical issues involved and the strengths and limitations of the methods employed.

4.1 Overall approach

Since the 1980s, studies on the relationship between language and identity have increasingly turned to qualitative ethnographic methods in an attempt to shed light on “real language” used in specific contexts, rather than relying exclusively on quantitative data that was often de-contextualised (Joseph, 2004). However, as discussed in the previous chapter, some studies of heritage learners and their identities have tended to be quantitative ones that rely on scales and questionnaires to measure the degree of ethnic orientation or attitudes towards the heritage language. In other studies, much of the focus has been on the experiences of community groups, especially in relation to language shift and maintenance across generations (for example, Clyne, 1970; Clyne, 1991; Clyne & Kipp, 1996; Fishman, 1991). In contrast, the number of studies that take a qualitative approach to examining the experiences and identities of individual heritage learners, especially Japanese heritage learners in Australia, has been relatively small, as mentioned above. This study aims to take a qualitative case study approach, in order to fill this gap, and to provide an in-depth account of Japanese background speakers’ identities and some of their language learning experiences.

Considering the research questions outlined in Chapter 1, and in light of the fact that an important component of identity is what “kind of person” (Gee, 2000) one perceives himself or herself to be, obtaining first person accounts from the participants was of utmost importance to the research design. Thus, the decision to conduct a qualitative case study was made early in the study as it is “an excellent method for obtaining a thick description of a complex social issue embedded within a cultural context” (Dörnyei, 2007: 155). Moreover, it would allow me to document the “emic perspective”

(Mackey & Gass, 2005: 163) of the participants, in other words, the meanings and interpretations they attach to their experiences (Dörnyei, 2007; Hammersley, 1992; Silverman, 2000). By adopting such a participant-oriented perspective, it is possible to account for the multiple, contradictory and shifting nature of identities and that may not be easy to identify from the utilisation of quantitative means.

In addition, from the perspective of participant recruitment, the case study approach was best suited here as it can yield rich data with a limited number of participants (Nunan, 1992). Indeed, while the number of Japanese heritage learners is growing, the population is relatively small in total and locating them in language classrooms and recruiting a large number of participants would have been very challenging. In total, as I will discuss in detail below, seven students from a Japanese for Background Speakers' subject, which was administered by an Australian university, participated in this study.

The limitations of having a small number of participants, namely the issues of representativeness and generalisability, were something that I had to keep in mind throughout the research. The aim of this research was not to provide a generalised view of Japanese heritage learners, but to gain an understanding of their individual experiences, and how the participants in this study constructed their relationships with English and Japanese. Duff (1990, 2006) claims that case studies have generated detailed accounts of the processes and/or accounts of language learning for a variety of subjects, and analysis of four to six focal students can yield significant results, even when considering the possible attrition of participants to three or four. In fact, with a multiple or collective case study, multiple accounts can be examined and compared, and therefore have satisfactory face validity (Dörnyei, 2007). Dörnyei further contends that it is "uniquely capable of documenting and analysing the situated, contextual influences on language acquisition and use, as well as the subtle variations in learner and teacher identities that emerge during the language learning/teaching process" (p. 154). Indeed, ethnographic studies and case-studies with a small number of participants have yielded significant results in the literature on language, identity and language learning, with participants ranging from teachers, returnees, students on study-abroad, immigrant women, and so on (Block, 2006; Duff & Uchida, 1997; Y. Kanno, 2000, 2003; Kinginger, 2004; Miller, 2003; Norton, 2000; Wong-Fillmore, 1979). This study thus

adopts this approach in order to conduct a nuanced investigation of individual Japanese heritage learners.

Within the case study, semi structured interviews were utilised and the data derived from it comprised a large part of the data set, which is reported here. However, to gain a more holistic understanding of Japanese heritage learners and to critically examine the interview data, “triangulation” (Burns, 1990; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004; Silverman, 2000) was conducted through the recording of translation and interpreting activities, and the collection of language use diaries and homework tasks conducted in the aforementioned Japanese for Background Speakers’ subject. In addition, interviews were conducted with the teachers of this subject.

4.2 Participants

As mentioned above, data collection and participant recruitment were conducted through a special Japanese for Background Speakers’ subject offered at the Australian university where this research was undertaken. This subject was established in 2010 to cater for these language learners who have home-backgrounds in Japanese. The Japanese program within the university established it in an effort to address the increasing number of heritage learners enrolling in advanced-level Japanese subjects, a situation described by Yoshimitsu (2008), as noted above. Moreover, it was an attempt to provide appropriate instruction to students who have been difficult to place in the existing language classrooms because of their prior exposure to Japanese at home, and provide an environment in which heritage learners can interact and study with peers from similar backgrounds and further develop their Japanese competence. The subject was offered to two groups of students. Firstly, it was available to excelling Year 12 students who have already completed their secondary school Japanese study at the Year 11 level, but who wished to pursue further “Extension study” (a more detailed explanation of the terminology will be provided in Chapter 6). Upon successful completion of the subject, additional tertiary entrance scores were awarded to these Year 12 students. Secondly, the subject was available to university students, regardless of their year. Secondary-level and university students were able to enrol in the class provided that they met the following criteria:

1. They have a home background in Japanese or have completed two or more years of formal education in Japan;
2. They have not completed a substantial amount of their education in Japan and have not taken, are not currently taking, or are not eligible to take VCE LOTE (Languages Other Than English) Japanese first language stream units 3 and 4. (A more detailed explanation of the terminology and Victorian education system is provided in Section 6.1 and Section 7.1)

As the above criteria show, the subject targeted language learners who were neither so-called “native speakers” nor beginners who were learning the language as a second or additional language. However, the criteria described above was rather broad, and potentially included those who may not have home-backgrounds but who have lived for an extended period of time in Japan, or have the prerequisite high linguistic proficiency. As a result, the students’ bilingual abilities as well as their backgrounds varied considerably. Nevertheless, 17 out of the 18 students enrolled in this subject between 2010 and 2011 had a Japanese home-background in relation to one or both parents being Japanese.

The site of the study was chosen for a number of reasons. Firstly, it allowed me to recruit participants who were roughly in the same age group and with home-backgrounds in Japanese. It also allowed me to recruit students who had the previous experience of studying in Japanese second language classrooms as well as the Japanese for Background Speakers’ subject they were enrolled in at the time of recruitment. Thus, I was able to compare their accounts of both classes in order to examine the students’ identity negotiation in both of these environments vis-à-vis different groups of peers. Furthermore, the rather broad prerequisite allowed for a diversity of student backgrounds, and ensured that I could recruit various types of background speakers, albeit a small number overall.

Secondly, the site allowed me to gather data in an environment that provided me with the opportunity to examine the interactions, the language use and identity negotiations

between heritage learners that may not be observable in typical foreign language classrooms. In addition, a focus on the role that this Japanese for Background Speakers' subject had on the language learning experiences of these students allowed me to differentiate this study from previous studies that tended to focus on heritage learners in typical foreign language classrooms.

I initially approached the students in August 2010, but due to the relatively small class size at the time, I was only successful in recruiting one participant, and undertook a pilot study utilising the framework outlined in Chapter 3 above. The data from this participant is not included in this study, as the objective of the pilot study was to gain an initial understanding of some of the themes related to identity to pursue in this study. The following year, in 2011, I approached the new class and was successful in recruiting seven participants who became the focus of this study. Of the seven participants, six were male and one was a female student. Six out of the seven students were Year 12 secondary students and one was a third-year university student. Their ages varied between 17 and 20 years of age. Since some of these students were under 18 years of age, I also obtained the permission of their parents before conducting any data collection. Table 2 below shows the participants' family backgrounds. Pseudonyms have been used for the purpose of anonymity.

Table 2: Participants' family backgrounds

	Age	Sex	Father's background	Mother's background	Siblings	Age of Migration
Yuta	20	M	Japanese	Japanese	OB (23)	-
Takeshi	18	M	Australian	Japanese	YB (16)	-
John	17	M	Australian	Japanese	YB (14)	3
Chika	17	F	Japanese	Japanese		3
Anthony	18	M	Australian	Japanese	YS (16)	8
Fumiya	18	M	Japanese	Japanese		9
Teru	17	M	Chinese (Taiwan)	Chinese (Hong Kong)	YS (16,15)	11

YB = Younger brother, YS = Younger sister, OB = Older brother, OS = Older sister

With the exception of Teru, all participants had an ethnic Japanese background. However, according to the aforementioned definition by Draper and Hick's (2000), Teru,

too, could be considered a heritage learner as he has had an extended experience of living and studying in Japan. Takeshi and Anthony were from mixed marriages where the father was an Australian and the mother was Japanese. There was also diversity with regard to the age of immigration, as shown in Table 2 above. The educational backgrounds of the participants are shown in Table 3 below:

Table 3: Participants' educational backgrounds

	Primary school	Secondary school	Tertiary education	Education in Japan	Japanese Saturday School
Yuta	Australia	Australia	Australia	-	-
Takeshi	Australia	Australia	-	-	10 years (age 4-14)
John	Australia	Australia	-	-	8 years (age 6-14)
Chika	Australia	Australia	-	-	13 years (age 3-17)
Anthony	Japan (years 1-3) Australia (years 2-6)	Australia	-	3 years	6 years (age 9-15)
Fumiya	Japan (years 1-2) Samoa (years 2-3) Australia (years 3-6)	Australia	-	2 years	3 months (age 8)
Teru	Chinese school in Japan (years 1-3) Japan (years 4-5) Australia (year 6)	Australia	-	5 years	5 years (age 12-17)

As Table 3 shows, Anthony, Fumiya and Teru have received some formal primary school level education in Japan, whereas the other participants have received all of their education in Australia. As regards their secondary school education, it should be noted that, in addition to the above, all participants completed the Victorian Certificate of

Education (VCE) Japanese Second Language subject at the Year 11 level. Furthermore, with the exception of Yuta, all participants attended the Japanese Saturday School for varying lengths of time. Chika, for instance, attended the Japanese Saturday School the longest and completed it at 17 years of age. On the other hand, Fumiya, only attended it for 3 months at the age of 8 years.

How representative these seven participants were of the Japanese heritage learner population was an issue that I needed to consider, as students enrolled in this subject may be more motivated to study the language than those who decide not to, or those who decided to enrol in lower level Japanese subjects, if at all. Moreover, because these students, especially the Year 12 students, also enrolled in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject as an "Extension study" subject for excelling students at the secondary school level, it can be expected that these students possessed relatively high academic competence overall. Thus, from the outset, the recruitment may have excluded Japanese heritage learners who were not proficient enough in Japanese to take the subject or those who did not self-identify as a heritage learner. It is also possible that there are other students of Japanese background living in Australia who have very limited receptive but no productive competence in Japanese at all. Moreover, it is also likely that the spoken and written competence of the students who were recruited for this study may vary considerably. That is to say, the recruitment criteria applied in this study may thus have favoured those with higher motivations and higher spoken Japanese competence. However, as Table 3 above shows, I was still able to recruit students with very different backgrounds in terms of education and family background, even if they fall into a higher group in terms of their Japanese language proficiency. In fact, I believe that the choice to recruit from this subject was beneficial as these students were more likely to be conscious of their bilingual backgrounds and were thus able to articulate various issues during the interviews.

4.3 Data collection

4.3.1 Semi-structured interviews

A large portion of the data used in this study derives from a set of semi-interviews with

the participants, as noted above. As Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004) suggest, semi-structured interviews best suits the framework outlined in Chapter 3, as these can elicit information regarding the interviewees' attitudes and emotions and reflect the participants' voices, opinions and beliefs through a participant-relevant and participant-oriented perspective. In total, two semi-structured interviews were conducted with each participant, with the exception of John who was interviewed only once due to time limitations. The interviews lasted anywhere between 30 to 60 minutes and were held in open spaces, including classrooms, cafes and library spaces in the university where this research was undertaken.

The main purpose of the first semi-structured interview was to gain initial background information about the participants. This included information regarding their family, educational background, social networks in Australia/Japan, language use, frequency of visits to Japan, use of computer mediated communication, and so on. Also, prior to the actual interview, each participant was asked to record his/her English and Japanese use for a week in a diary template provided by the researcher (see Appendix 1). The information gathered from the diary was used as a springboard in the first interview to elicit additional information regarding the participants' language use in their daily lives, including who they communicated with, in which language and how frequently they engaged in various literacy practices in and outside the school setting. Participants were informed before the interview that they may speak in either English or Japanese language, and that they could switch between the languages as they preferred. Interestingly, all participants decided to use Japanese as the base language, though it needs to be acknowledged that when initiating communication with them, I myself employed Japanese.

Asides from a simple "interview guide" (Dörnyei, 2007: 137) (see Appendix 2) that sets out the initial questions to be asked and ensured that all topics were covered, the conversation was allowed to proceed rather freely, and the interview was conducted in a way that gave the participants more control in terms of the choice of topics and the flow of the conversation. Each interview usually began with talk about the students' school or day, which helped create rapport between the researcher and the student. I tried to facilitate open discussion and the participants were invited to elaborate on certain points

they felt were important to them. The interview was audio-recorded using a digital recorder and later transcribed for analysis.

The second interview was conducted a month after the first interview, when the preliminary coding was completed and recurring themes were identified. On this occasion, a more specific interview guide was created to suit each participant. This second interview was more focused and served two purposes. The first objective was to gain information about how students perceive their languages and identities, and their narratives about their participation in the VCE Japanese Second Language subject at school and the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject that they were enrolled in at the time of the interview. The second objective was to collect their narratives or "life stories" and to gain an understanding of the participants' language learning experiences, with a particular focus on the notions of language expertise, affiliation, and inheritance, as outlined by Leung, Harris and Rampton (1997), described above. These narratives provided information regarding how each participant constructed and negotiated and brought coherence to his or her identities, as well as the values they had embodied throughout their lives. Moreover, the examination of the students' narratives also allowed my study to frame identity as a process rather than a fixed product, which is in line with the poststructuralist tradition.

While recognising the strengths of semi-interviews in eliciting information about how the participants perceive themselves, their experiences and their languages, as Yin (1994) suggests, the data should be viewed as verbal reports. That is, participants may be "prone to bias, poor recall, and poor or inaccurate articulation" (p. 85). Indeed, the degree to which interview data correspond with real events is a concern raised by numerous researchers (for an in-depth discussion see Block, 1995, 2000). For example, Block (2000) points out that accounts from interviewees may not always be "representational" of real events but "presentational" of how the interviewee constructs the relationship between him/her and the interviewer. Moreover, Block explains that interviewees may adopt voices, which to a certain degree is bound by what is appropriate to say in a given context in a given community. This voice may also change during the course of the interview depending on how interviewees position themselves and how they are positioned by certain questions. Furthermore, interview data needs to

be critically examined as they are co-constructed through the interaction between the researcher and the participant (Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004). When viewed in this light, interview data utilised in the research can be difficult to interpret as participants may represent themselves in certain ways vis-à-vis the researcher and the questions asked, and construct themselves differently depending on how they perceive the interviewer, the relationship with the interviewer, the questions and the purpose of the interview. In sum, while the accounts given to me by the participants through the semi-structured interview certainly provide insights into their identities and how they are negotiated, the data should not be viewed as direct or “true” accounts, but as certain “acts of representation” (Harris, 2006). Therefore, the researcher thus needs to analyse what inferences can be made from such accounts (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983).

4.3.2 Recording of translation and interpreting tasks

To examine the interaction of Japanese heritage learners amongst themselves and with the teacher, and also to observe how they actually utilise their bilingual resources in the classroom context, I conducted two audio-recordings of in-class dialogue interpreting tasks as well as in-class translation tasks, conducted on different days. These translation and interpreting tasks allowed me to examine the participants’ actual written and oral performance in both Japanese and English because the tasks required the students to actively use both languages in order to mediate between two speakers or texts.

In the translation tasks, the students were asked to translate two passages, one from Japanese into English and the other from English into Japanese. The English text was a newspaper article of approximately 60 words in length, and the Japanese text was an excerpt from a Japanese non-fiction book and approximately 100 characters in length text. After the participants finished the translation tasks, they discussed as a class the issues they encountered and anything they noticed in the process. This discussion was video-recorded and the finished translations were also collected for analysis.

In the interpreting tasks, students were asked to act as interpreters for dialogue scenarios involving a situation in Australia between a Japanese speaker and an English speaker. More specifically, the students were required to interpret either a scenario involving a

doctor and a patient or a scenario involving a teacher and a parent. Prior to the activity, only the topics of the dialogues were given to the students acting as the interpreter and, therefore, it required them to spontaneously interpret utterances into Japanese or English. The interpreting performances of each of the participants were video-recorded and utilised in the next phase of the data collection. A more detailed explanation of the relevant texts and tasks will be provided in Chapter 8, which discusses how the students utilise their bilingual resources in translation and interpreting activities.

4.3.3 Stimulated recall interviews

Since a large part of the translating and interpreting processes are invisible, in total, two stimulated recall interviews, or follow-up interviews, were conducted with each participant: one after the translation task and one after the interpreting task. The main aim of these interviews was to elicit information regarding the internal processes and strategies that the participants utilised during the translation and interpreting tasks (Gass & Mackey, 2000, 2007; Neustupný, 1990). Firstly, the stimulated recall interviews of the translation tasks were conducted using the participants' translation of the above-mentioned texts. I went through each section of the translation with the participants in order to trigger comments on how they engaged with the task and any issues they encountered in the process. Secondly, the stimulated recall interviews of the interpreting tasks were conducted in a similar way by playing back the video-recordings of the participants' actual interpreting performance. I invited the participants to comment on how they engaged with the task, including what they were thinking, why they utilised a certain strategy, which language direction they felt more comfortable with, and so on.

While all measures were taken to conduct the stimulated recall interviews as soon as possible after the actual tasks to minimise the information loss (Dörnyei, 2007), due to time constraints, there were time delays anywhere between one to four days between the activity and the actual stimulated recall interview, which may have had an influence on the data. These interviews were also recorded, transcribed and analysed in conjunction with the data from the semi-structured interviews to examine the students' perception of their Japanese and English and how they utilised their bilingual resources to engage in the task.

CHAPTER 5: Participants' histories and their language identities

This chapter presents the participants' self-reported profiles, histories and language identities in order to set the context for the analysis found in the subsequent chapters. The descriptions will focus on all seven students who were enrolled in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject in 2011 and who participated in this study: Anthony, Takeshi, Chika, Fumiya, Teru, Yuta and John. The aims of this chapter are two-fold. Firstly, I aim to illustrate the diversity of the participants' experiences and language identities. Secondly, I will also draw together the commonalities in the narratives, focusing particularly on the value placed on the Japanese language in the homes of the participants.

5.1 Students' narratives

The narratives of the students below are based on data derived from the set of semi-structured interviews conducted with the participants. As mentioned in the previous chapter, with the exception of John who was interviewed only once, all of the other students were interviewed twice about their personal histories and perception of their languages. Also, as described above, it is important to acknowledge that the data should not be seen uncritically as views into the students' minds and experiences but rather as acts of representations (Harris, 2006). In particular, my role as an interviewer – a staff member of the university – and the institutional setting in which the interviews were conducted may have had an influence on the participants' accounts. Nevertheless, the following accounts suffice to show the diversity in the way the students chose to present their experiences, and the shifting and negotiated nature of their language identities that may not be visible when the students are simply labelled as “heritage learners”.

5.1.1 Anthony

Profile and educational background

Anthony was 18 years old at the time of this study and was born in Japan to an Australian father and a Japanese mother. He had a younger sister who was 16 years old.

Anthony grew up in the outer suburbs of Tokyo and according to him, he was a normal Japanese boy. The first language he learned to speak was Japanese, which he used to communicate with his Japanese mother and younger sister. However, Anthony could not recall how he used to communicate with his father who spoke very little Japanese.

In Japan, Anthony was exposed to English from an early age. He had visited Australia a number of times and had attended a social group with his mother to learn English while living in Japan. Anthony recalled that these attempts to teach him English were unsuccessful, and thus it was not until he moved to Australia at the age of eight years and entered the second year of a local primary school that he began speaking English. Although Anthony had opportunities to continue speaking Japanese with his mother and his grandfather who would come to visit and stay for three months at a time, as he spent more and more time in an English-speaking environment, English quickly became his dominant language and the language of communication not only with his father, but with his sister as well.

As a result, the maintenance of Anthony's Japanese became an important agenda for his mother. She was particularly strict with a Japanese-only rule at home and would not respond whenever Anthony or his sister talked to her in English. She also enrolled Anthony in the Japanese Saturday School at the age of nine years. Anthony recalled that he was not keen on studying Japanese while his friends were out enjoying their Saturdays, but he complied with his mother's request and continued to attend until the age of 15 years. Looking back, however, he felt that it allowed him to make other good friends with whom he was still maintaining contact. It was during this period that he was exposed to Japanese popular culture including *manga*, or Japanese comic books, which were often circulated around the Japanese Saturday School class during break-time. However, since most of his friends there were children of sojourning families, they returned to Japan and Anthony eventually lost interest in *manga* and other forms of Japanese popular culture.

Anthony's friends at his secondary school were mostly English speakers, who perceived him as an Australian. At the time of the interview, he had three close Japanese friends from the Japanese Saturday School who had returned to Japan with whom he

maintained contact with using social networking sites such as Facebook. Anthony visited them every time he travelled on holiday to Japan. When they met, these friends would tell him that his Japanese had gotten worse, but Anthony did not seem to mind. Anthony enjoyed visiting Tokyo once every year and especially loved the food and the wide variety of products sold in vending machines. Although Anthony held a fondness for his Japanese hometown and felt some attachment to it, he had no plans to move to Japan or to study there. He excelled in mathematics and science and hoped to become an engineer like his father and continue to live in Melbourne in the future.

Language identity and ethnic identification

Anthony identified his stronger language as English, commenting that it was “完璧” (*perfect*) and that he had a wider range of vocabulary in this language. However, he also claimed confidence in his Japanese expertise, commenting that he had no problems reading and could recognise a wide range of *kanji* – a result of reading the newspaper everyday with his mother ever since he stopped attending the Japanese Saturday School. Besides from his reading, Anthony was particularly confident with his Japanese pronunciation, commenting “発音が良いのが良いと思う、発音は大丈夫だと思います、発音が良いと、なんか、すごい、すごく考えが違う” (*I think it's good that my pronunciation is good, I don't think there's any problems with my pronunciation, when your pronunciation is good, like, it's very, very different how others think of you*). Speaking Japanese fluently and with good pronunciation seemed to be particularly important for Anthony. He described his father who could not speak Japanese, despite living there for 10 years, as “結構ダサイ” (*pretty uncool*).

However, despite his sense of expertise in spoken Japanese, Anthony preferred to speak and write in English. Even when his bilingual friends in Japan messaged him online in Japanese, Anthony would always return these messages in English. Anthony explained that this was because it felt “unnatural” and that it “doesn't sound like me” when he spoke or wrote in Japanese. As a matter of fact, he expressed his lack of affiliation to Japanese, commenting that he did not like Japanese:

(Extract 5-1)

土曜校の子とか、あとこのクラスの子とか日本が好き、うちの妹も日本のドラマとか好きなんですよ、日本に行くのとか、うちの妹留学したり、僕はあんまり日本語が好きじゃなくて、日本のドラマもあんまり興味なくて、なので、本当に日本語を勉強して欲しいって

The kids at the Japanese Saturday School, and the kids in this class ((the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject)) like Japan, my sister likes Japanese TV dramas too, and going to Japan, my sister has even been on an exchange too, I don't like Japanese that much, I'm not too interested in Japanese TV dramas either, so, [my mother] really wants me to study Japanese

Anthony's preference for English seemed to coincide with his self-perceived ethnic identification. Anthony reported that while he was definitely both Australian and Japanese, he identified more strongly with the former. He enjoyed playing Australian football, which was one of his great passions. Referring to his preference for wearing T-shirts and shorts, Anthony explained that he dressed like an Australian too. He explained that his identification as an Australian was probably because he spent his formative years in Australia:

(Extract 5-2)

8歳からずっと、8歳から18歳まで一番学ぶっていうか、自分をアイデンティティーを、あの見つけるっていうのか、見つけるときなので、そのときずっとオーストラリアに住んでたから、ぼくがずっと日本に住んでたら日本人だったと思いますよ、たぶん、けど、ふざけてるところがオーストラリア人だと思います

From when I was eight years old, from eight all the way to when I was 18, the period when you learn most, when you find your identity so to speak, I spent all of that time living in Australia, If I had lived all that time in Japan, I think I would have been a Japanese, maybe, but I'm always joking around and that's Australian

While Anthony liked to joke around, which for him was a prerequisite for being

Australian, he did feel that there was a Japanese side to his personality that set him apart from his local Australian friends at school. He commented that there were more “lazy people” in Australia and explained that he was quite the opposite, and in that sense a Japanese:

(Extract 5-3)

あと、ディターミネーションって、すごい、ちゃんとやる、最後までやるって感じ、その、あの、フットボールあんまりうまくないんですが、練習すっごい好きで、いつもいつも、毎週毎週行ってる人はあまりいないので、僕だけ、あと、去年数学のファーザーマスって、あの、数学 VCE でやって、テストの前に、過去のテストを 20 枚とかやったり、そういうのあんまりいないんですよ、僕の学校、すごい、そういうの日本人だと思います

Also, a lot of, determination. I don't give up and do things to the end, um, well, I'm not too good at [Australian] football, but I love to practice, and I'm always always doing it, there's not many people that go [to practice] every single week, only me, and, last year in maths, I did "Further Maths", um, for the VCE mathematic subjects, and before the test, I'd practice by doing 20 past exams, and there's not many people like that around, in my school, that's very, I think I'm Japanese in that regard

However, he did not fully identify with the work ethic of Japanese people, commenting that they were too workaholic. This was an impression he had formed after observing his uncle who would visit him in Australia and rush back to work in Japan after a few days. This image of Japanese people seemed to be the reason he did not want to work or to live in Japan explaining “週に 6 回とか仕事して、11 時に帰ったり、そういうのがしたくないので、それ仕事しすぎだと思うのが嫌いですね、日本、絶対、they work too much” (*Work 6 times a week, and coming home at 11 o'clock. I don't want to do that sort of thing, I think that's just over-working and I don't like that, Japan, definitely, they work too much*).

Despite such negative impressions of Japan, Anthony felt that maintaining his Japanese

was important for his future, describing Japanese as a “ビジネスというかライフスキル” (*business or rather a life skill*). This did not mean that he wanted to improve his Japanese; he was content if he could maintain his current competence. Competing for points with other students, he said, was not of interest to him:

(Extract 5-4)

使い続けたいですね、けど、点数の争いなんて興味ない、あの、それと比べて数学とかすごいプライドがあるんですよ、点数が良くなるように、フットボールも、けど、日本語はそんな、あの、どうでもいいって言うか、勉強はちゃんと、うん、忘れたくないけど、別に、あの、今の、今ぐらいしゃべればそれでいいと思いますね、僕は、僕は、それでいいと思います、他の人はもっと日本に、毅君とかは、日本に行って仕事とか、日本の大学で勉強したいとか、他の子もそうだと思います、日本に戻りたいとか

I'd like to keep using it ((Japanese)), but I'm not interested in competing for points, um, but in comparison I have a lot of pride when it comes to maths and stuff, so I can get better points, same for football, but not that much in Japanese, um, it's like I don't care at all, although I do want to keep studying, yeah, I don't want to forget, but you know, um, I'm, I'm happy if I could speak as good as I am speaking now, I, I think that's okay for me, the other people [in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject] want to go to Japan, for example Takeshi wants to go to Japan and work, or study at a Japanese university, I think it's the same with the other kids, they want to go back to Japan

For Anthony, improving his football skills seemed to be much more important than competing for points in Japanese. Thus, as the above narrative demonstrates, Anthony showed a complex pattern of linguistic and ethnic identification. While Anthony preferred to speak in English and identified primarily as an Australian, he also felt a sense of obligation to maintain his Japanese, perhaps stemming from his sense of inheritance and also his mother's attitudes towards his Japanese language development.

5.1.2 Takeshi

Profile and educational background

Takeshi was born in Australia to a Japanese mother and an Australian father, and was 18 years old at the time of this study and had a younger brother who was 16 years of age. Takeshi first learned to speak Japanese, but grew up in a limited bilingual environment because his father spoke very little Japanese. However, unlike Anthony who recalled very little about this period in his life, Takeshi seemed to remember quite vividly that growing up bilingually was a confusing experience. Takeshi recalled that in the prep year at primary school, when he first interacted with monolingual English-speaking peers, he tried to speak to them in Japanese, not knowing why in the world they did not understand him. At the time, Takeshi thought that everyone spoke both Japanese and English.

As he entered primary school and began learning English, he started to mix Japanese and English to communicate with his father. He reported that it was not until the age of five or six years that he was able to get a good command of using and alternating between both languages. Eventually he began to speak only in English to his father and to his brother whom he considered more Australian than himself. However, he spoke to his mother only in Japanese.

Takeshi's mother wanted Takeshi to maintain his Japanese so he could communicate with relatives in Japan. She enrolled Takeshi in the Japanese Saturday School at the age of four years. Although Takeshi had difficulty adjusting to the environment at first, sometimes resisting to go at all, he reluctantly continued attending the school until the age of 15 years, when he quit to concentrate on his secondary school study. At the Japanese Saturday School, he began taking an interest in Japanese pop culture and became an avid fan of Japanese *manga*, *anime* (i.e. Japanese animated cartoons), TV dramas and music. He especially loved *manga* and this remained unchanged at the time of the interview. His *manga* collection numbered more than 500 books. While Takeshi's visits to Japan had been sporadic when he was younger, as he grew older, he started visiting approximately once every two years. Every time he went, Takeshi would visit

his relatives and former classmates from the Japanese Saturday School who had returned to Japan. The year before the interview, Takeshi made his first trip to Japan alone and experienced living with a homestay family for five days. According to him, this was to test out his Japanese ability, commenting “やっぱり自分の日本語力を日本で試したいという思いで一人で行って、その時は、日本の親戚とはもう会ったから、会う必要が無い、一人で通用できるか” (*The reason was that I wanted to test out my Japanese language ability in Japan and that's why I went alone, that time, I'd already seen my relatives [in a previous visit], so I didn't have to visit them, I wanted to see if I could make it on my own*).

Growing up, Takeshi had some Japanese acquaintances both from his local primary and secondary school and from the Japanese Saturday School, but most of his friends were English-speaking peers of multilingual and multiethnic backgrounds, whom Takeshi referred to as “国際人” (*global individuals*). Influenced by these friends, he also had an interest in Korean and Chinese pop music, and often went to Karaoke with friends to sing Japanese and Korean pop songs.

In terms of Takeshi's future aspirations, he was interested in the sciences, especially physics, and wanted to study engineering at university and eventually work as an engineer. While he vaguely hoped to work in Japan, he was not decided about where he wanted to work or what he wanted to do. He said that his father probably wanted him to stay in Australia, but would not object if Takeshi wanted to live in Japan.

Language identity and ethnic identification

Despite growing up in Australia and having no formal education in Japan, Takeshi claimed a strong sense of expertise in Japanese and perceived it as his stronger language, making frequent references to his inheritance of “日本人の血” (*Japanese blood*). Like Anthony, Takeshi displayed confidence in his ability to converse in Japanese. Recalling his most recent visit to Japan and his experience with his host family, Takeshi explained that he had no trouble communicating with them in Japanese:

(Extract 5-5)

いや、あの、何も思いませんでした、小さい頃から二つの言葉で育ってきたから、言葉自体はちゃんと自信を持って理解できたし会話もできたから、分からない時は少なかった、みんな簡単にしてくれた
Well, I didn't think too much about it, I grew up with two languages from when I was little, I could confidently understand the language itself, there were only a few instances when I couldn't understand, and everyone spoke to me using simple language

This evaluation of his stronger language seemed to be shared by his mother who was perplexed as to why Takeshi was stronger in Japanese, despite growing up in Australia. However, Takeshi seemed quite confident that this was normal and was due to his exposure to the language and his strong sense of affiliation to it. He explained:

(Extract 5-6)

日本語が強いっていても、日本人ほどじゃないから、たぶん書くのも、書くのと読むのと、それができるのはマンガ読んでたからと、話すのはたぶんアニメを見てたから、で、僕、英語の本とか読まないし、会話は友達の間でしかないから、日本語使ってる使う方が多い、聞き取りも話すのも読むのも書くのも多いから、日本語が強いのは別におかしくないと思うから、こっちでぼくがやってること次第
Even though I say that my Japanese is stronger, it's not as strong as a Japanese person, but probably the reason I can write, write and read, is because I've read a lot of manga, the reason I can speak is because I've watched a lot of anime, and, I don't read English books, and I only converse [in English] with friends, so I use Japanese more often, listening, speaking, reading, writing I do more often in Japanese, so I don't think it's odd that I'm better at Japanese, it all depends on what I'm doing here

While recognising that he did not have the same level of expertise as Japanese people, Takeshi seemed to be saying that, although he had received all of his formal schooling in an English-speaking environment, his linguistic expertise was not determined by where he was or which language he was educated in, but rather by his affiliation to the

language and perhaps more so, his investment in it.

However, his sense of language expertise was sometimes not shared by others. Perhaps because of his appearance or surname, language expertise was something he needed to negotiate, particularly vis-à-vis other Japanese speakers. Recalling his most recent visit to Japan, Takeshi explained that at first his host family spoke to him in simple Japanese or “foreigner talk”. However, he proved them wrong by speaking Japanese with confidence. He explained:

(Extract 5-7)

僕は外見的には日本人じゃないんで、普通に外国人だと思われてたんですけど、ちゃんと日本語を話してみたら、ちゃんと会話ができるようになって

My appearance doesn't look Japanese, so they ((the host family)) thought I was a foreigner, but when I spoke Japanese properly to them, we were able to talk normally

On the other hand, Takeshi seemed to present his expertise in English as being relatively lower, and at times displayed some uncertainty about his ability in it. When asked why this was the case, he answered:

(Extract 5-8)

わからないです、たぶん、僕が小さい時から日本語が先に習ったから、その理由で、日本人の、中身が日本人が膨らんだとか、オーストラリア人だけではない、オーストラリア人のように考えができないから、オーストラリア人ほどできないから、その理由で、英語の文とか、その色々な内容が、テーマとかそういうのが分からない時が多い、エッセイとか書いてる時も、シンプルな文とかしか書けないから、複雑なアナラシスとかできないから、で、もっと複雑にしろってコメントがいっぱい来るんで

I don't know, probably because I learned Japanese first when I was small, so that's the reason, Japanese, the Japanese person inside me expanded, I'm not only Australian because I can't think like an Australian person, I can't think

as much as an Australian person, so for that reason, [when I read] English sentences, there's times that I don't understand the many meanings, the theme and things like that, when I'm writing essays [in English], I can only write simple sentences, I can't do complex analysis, and, I get a lot of comments [from the teacher] to make it more complex

Takeshi seemed to place an emphasis on the language he first learned to speak, explaining that the Japanese person inside of him had also grown as he became more competent in the language. Contrastively, he felt that his English was not on a par with Australians and that he was not able to think like an Australian. Yet, on other occasions in the interview, Takeshi would present himself as an Australian commenting “日本のパスポートもあるから、日本とオーストラリアの、日本人でもオーストラリア人でもあるけど、中身はオーストラリア人だと思う” (*I also have a Japanese passport, a Japanese one and an Australian one, so I'm both Japanese and Australian but I think I'm Australian inside*). In this regard, Takeshi at times seemed to show ambivalent affiliation to both Japan and Australia.

This duality and the ability to switch between identifying as a Japanese and as an Australia (or both) seemed to be an important part of Takeshi's ethnic identification. Indeed, he reported that at school his “white” Australian friends saw him as an Australian and his “Asian” friends saw him as a Japanese, although both groups called him by his anglicised name. Thus, Takeshi explained that he identified himself as “ハーフ” (*mixed ethnicity*). He held both a Japanese and an Australian passport. Although the Japanese government does not permit dual citizenship, he explained that he could not say for certain which one he would choose in the future when he reached 20 years of age, when Japanese laws would require him to choose one over the other within two years from that day. For the time being, he explained that he wanted to renew his Japanese passport and hope that, before it expired, the Japanese legislation will change to allow dual citizenship.

5.1.3 Chika

Profile and educational background

Chika was 17 years of age at the time of study and was born in Japan as the only child of Japanese parents. Thus, the first language she learned to speak was Japanese and she recalled that she was a very talkative girl who would talk like a “machine-gun” in Kansai dialect. She immigrated to Australia at the age of three years and entered the prep year at a local primary school. While her parents considered enrolling Chika in a school with a large number of Japanese families, they disliked the close-knit Japanese community at the school and its distinct atmosphere, and chose a school without any Japanese students. There, Chika naturally learned to speak English. However, unlike Anthony and Takeshi’s accounts in which Japanese maintenance was an important agenda for the family, Chika reported that during primary school the emphasis of her parents was on her acquisition of English. This resulted in a period when she was reluctant to speak Japanese. Furthermore, she reported that her parents would not allow her to mix both languages.

Chika attended the Japanese Saturday School from the age of four years and continued to attend for 13 years until 17 years of age. She seemed to greatly enjoy going there every Saturday, commenting “土曜校、たくさん、本当に思いでたくさんあるんですよ、あたしにとって土曜校はすごい楽しいところだったんで、毎週毎週楽しみにしていて、あの、土曜校の宿題もぜんぜん嫌いじゃなかったんです” (*Saturday School, a lot, I have a lot of memories from there, Saturday School was for me a very fun place, I was looking forward to it every week, um, I didn’t mind doing the homework from Saturday School either*). Since she was usually the only Japanese student in her local school environment, the Japanese Saturday School was an important opportunity to develop her connection with Japanese-speaking peers of the same age. Thus, during her childhood, Chika explained that she was always surrounded by Japanese friends. Most of them were children of sojourning families and Chika was always the one to see them return to Japan, which saddened her. However, she continued to maintain contact with them through the Internet, often chatting with them on Instant Messenger or through Facebook in more recent years. Moreover, Chika’s

mother maintained close contact with relatives in Japan through Skype video-chat and Chika would usually participate in these weekly conversations.

Chika was passionate about reading. She had always liked reading English books, but at the time of the interview Chika had also started taking an interest in Japanese novels. Her bookshelf consisted of English classics such as Jane Austin as well as Japanese novels set in the *Edo* period (17th and 18th century). Her preference for music was also a mixture of both Japanese and English. While she preferred to hum along to English songs on the radio, her iPod was reserved for Japanese songs, with occasional Korean and Chinese pop songs mixed in – an influence from her Asian friends at school. Her favourite Japanese band was called “One Ok Rock”. She particularly liked the fact that the lead-vocal was bilingual and sang both in Japanese and English. Chika was also up to date with the latest Japanese dramas that she viewed online. She claimed that in the Japanese for Background Speakers’ subject, with the exception of Takeshi, she was the one who was most deeply immersed in Japanese dramas, books, magazines and music.

On the weekends, Chika attended an extra-curricular class in biology and hoped to study medicine at university, but she was also interested in veterinary science. Furthermore, she worked part-time at KUMON, a Japanese preparatory school with branches around the world, where she taught English and mathematics. Her future aspiration was to become a doctor in Melbourne and she hoped to use Japanese to cater for recently-arrived Japanese clients.

Language identity and ethnic identification

Chika reported that her stronger language overall was English, commenting “バランス、うーん、英語の方が大きいんじゃないかな” (*balance, umm, I think English would be bigger*). However, she explained that both languages were usually mixed inside her head:

(Extract 5-9)

私の頭って変で、あの、英語でエッセイを書いてる時に、なぜか日本

語で良い言葉が出てくるんですよ、それを、一生懸命、あれ英語でなんだっけ、と思って通訳していて、で日本語の作文を書いていると必ず良い言葉が英語で出てくるんですよ、すごく面倒くさい脳で、いつもそうなんです、昔から

My mind is funny, um, when I'm writing an essay in English, for some reason good words come out in Japanese, so I have to think "what is that in English" and do my best to translate it, and when I'm writing essays in Japanese good words always come out in English, so it takes double the effort for my brain, it's always been like that, from a long time ago

On the other hand, Chika's accounts show that her language expertise in Japanese was something that she needed to negotiate and establish with others. While Takeshi did not have language expertise attributed to him by Japanese people, Chika reported that she was perceived by Japanese speakers as having a high level of expertise in Japanese, and she always felt the need to meet these expectations:

(Extract 5-10)

でも、やっぱり外見が日本人で、しゃべっても普通に日本人だったりするじゃないですか、だから、もっと、あの、相手に、もっとすごい、良い日本語を期待されてるような気がするんですよ、だから、それが出来なかったら中途半端な大人になりたくないなと思って

But, my appearance is Japanese, and even when I speak I'm a regular Japanese person, so more, um, other people, I feel that they expect a far better Japanese from me, so [I'm studying Japanese] because I don't want to be unable to do that and end up becoming an adult who can't speak properly

As such, it was her appearance and relatively high competence that seemed to make others assume that Chika was perhaps more competent than she actually was. Thus, from the fear of being marginalised as someone who cannot speak Japanese properly, she was especially reluctant to speak Japanese in situations that required the use of honorifics, commenting “勝手に自分で緊張しちゃうだけなんですけど、なんか、もっと敬語で、もっとキレイな日本語で話さなければならぬ気持ちになっち

やうんです” (*It’s just that I personally get nervous, like, I can’t help but feel that I need to speak with more honorifics, that I have to speak much better Japanese*).

However, despite the awkwardness she occasionally felt when conversing with Japanese people, Chika identified herself as a Japanese. She explained:

(Extract 5-11)

でも、考え方は、考え方はたぶん日本人よりしてると思います、あの、両親から教わった事がすべて日本語だったり、日本人として普通の事を教えてもらったので、なんか、考え方は日本人の方が近いと思います

But, the way I think, the way I think is probably leaning towards Japanese people, um, everything I learned from my parents was in Japanese, and they taught me normal things as a Japanese person, so, I think the way I think is closer to a Japanese person

It seemed that for Chika, being “Japanese” was something that was passed down to her from her parents who also taught her distinctly Japanese “ways of thinking”. Similarly, Chika felt a strong sense of inheritance towards her Japanese, explaining that it was thanks to her parents that she was quite competent in the language. Thus she reported that she felt others perceived her as a “normal Japanese daughter”:

(Extract 5-12)

はい、だから今までは、えっと、結構うまい、結構日本語は話せたので、ああ、日本人だ、先生からかはわからないんですけど、あの、あの、親の知り合いとかの方からは、あの、普通に日本人の娘として見られていたと思います、全然、何も違う接し方が無かったです

Yes, so up until now, um, I could, I could speak quite well in Japanese, so people would think “oh, she’s Japanese”, I’m not sure if the teachers [in the Japanese for Background Speakers’ subject] think that way, um, um, but with my parents’ friends, um, I think they saw me as a normal Japanese daughter, they didn’t treat me any differently

At the same time, Chika also felt a sense of ambivalence towards her attachment to Japan. She felt more at ease living in Australia and although she loved to visit Japan on holiday, whenever she stayed too long in the country, she would feel overwhelmed by a sense of loneliness that she claimed made her cry.

Chika held a Japanese passport and permanent residency in Australia. As university entrance loomed closer, she was considering applying for Australian citizenship, as it would be more advantageous to enrol at an Australian university as a domestic student. However, while she understood the practical benefits of obtaining Australian citizenship, Chika was reluctant to do this because it meant that she would need to forfeit her Japanese citizenship. She commented that her nationality as a Japanese was an important part of who she was, explaining “やっぱり、たぶん、私は国籍だけで日本と繋がってるんで、それを失ったら本当に日本とつながりが消える気がして、国籍は日本の方がいいなと思います” (*After all, I think, I'm connected to Japan only with my nationality, so if I lost that it would feel like my connection with Japan has really disappeared, so I want my nationality to be Japanese*).

5.1.4 Fumiya

Profile and educational background

Fumiya was 18 years old at the time of study and born in Japan to Japanese parents. He was the only child in the family and the first language he learned to speak was Japanese. When he was eight years old and after completing Year 2, Fumiya moved to Samoa with his mother who was an English teacher. He immigrated to Australia at the age of nine (Year 3), again due to his mother's work, and entered a local primary school. He also began attending the Japanese Saturday School, but quit shortly after a semester because he did not want to go to school on Saturdays. His mother did not object to this and accepted Fumiya's decision. Looking back, he later regretted this and said that it would have been better if his mother had forced him to attend.

After about a year in Australia, as Fumiya began learning English, it became the language of communication with his parents. However, contrary to the cases examined

above, the use of English at home was actually promoted because one of the aims of immigrating to Australia was so that Fumiya could learn English and become bilingual. Thus, Fumiya's dominant language became English and he went through a period where he distanced himself from speaking or learning Japanese:

(Extract 5-13)

まあ、英語に慣れて、で、日本語しゃべらなかつたのは、たぶん、そのときは日本語嫌いではなくて避けてたんじゃないですかね、あの、まあ、土曜校にも行ってないし、だんだん下手になってきてるみたい
に感じて、だったらもう英語だけでいいや、みたいな

Well, I got used to English, and, the reason I didn't speak English was probably, at the time, it wasn't that I disliked Japanese, but that I was avoiding it, um, well, I wasn't attending the Japanese Saturday School and I felt I was getting worse [in Japanese], so I thought in that case I'm fine with English only

It seemed to remain this way until Fumiya entered upper secondary school and became friends with Teru (see 5.1.5 below) and another Japanese student. After interacting with them in Japanese, Fumiya recalled that he discovered that it was much more “fun” speaking in Japanese. He commented:

(Extract 5-14)

日本人の友達となんか、なんかのきっかけで日本語しゃべって、あ、こっちのほうが楽しいなって、なんか日本語でしゃべるのが本当に楽しいなって感じたんで、勉強しようと思ったんです

With Japanese friends, for some reason we started speaking in Japanese, and I thought, “oh, it's much more fun this way”, like I thought that it was really fun speaking in Japanese, that's why I decided to study it

Perhaps, Fumiya's sense of “fun” came from the ability to engage with Japanese popular culture and the ability to use Japanese as a way of communicating exclusively with his Japanese friends in an English-speaking environment:

(Extract 5-15)

例えば、なんか、友達といて、電車のなかでしゃべるときとか、英語でしゃべったら全員に聞かれるじゃないですか、でも日本語だったらその人か日本人の人にしかわからないから

For example, like, when I'm with friends, when we're speaking in the train, if we speak in English everyone would hear it, but if it was in Japanese, only my friends or other Japanese people would understand

Although a large part of Fumiya's network of friends were still English-speakers, meeting Teru and befriending more Japanese friends through him became a turning point in his language use at home. He reported that he began speaking Japanese to his mother, and even began writing letters and corresponding with his grandmother who lived in Japan. Fumiya travelled to Japan with his mother once every year and had always had a keen interest in Japanese popular culture, including the latest Japanese manga, anime, TV dramas and pop music, which he followed on the Internet. Influenced by his local friends at secondary school, he also enjoyed Korean pop music.

Fumiya was interested in commerce and accounting. He wanted to go on an exchange program to Japan when he entered university, but his mother thought this to be awkward and amusing, as he would be a "Japanese" exchange student experiencing a homestay in Japan. While he was undecided about where he wanted to live in the future, he was interested in working for Japanese companies, if such an opportunity arose. This was one reason he wanted to keep studying Japanese.

Language identity and ethnic identification

At the time of the interview, Fumiya reported that he felt that in all aspects English was his stronger language, commenting “日本語だとたまにつまったりなんか、言葉が出てこなかったりするんですけど、英語のときはそれが無いっていうか、少ないですね” (*In Japanese, there are times when I'm speaking in Japanese that I get stuck and words don't come out, but in English that doesn't happen, or happens less*). On the other hand, he seemed to feel that his expertise in Japanese was relatively weaker. He

explained: “日本語も、僕は漢字とか苦手ですし、別にうまいと思いませんし、話すときは、まあ、普通だと思ってますけど、日本人として普通、書くときは日本人以下じゃないかなって” (*In Japanese, kanji isn't exactly my strength, I don't really think I'm good, when I speak, well, I think I'm normal, normal for a Japanese person, when I write, it's probably worse than a Japanese person*). However, Fumiya did appear to perceive his Japanese as part of his inheritance as a “Japanese” individual, which led to a sense of obligation to improve it, stating that “日本生まれで、一応日本で8年ぐらいいたんで、日本語ちゃんとしゃべる、読み書きできるようにならないとだめかなと思って” (*I was born in Japan, after all I was there for eight years, I think I need to be able to speak it properly and become able to read and write*).

Despite claiming that English was his dominant language and feeling more comfortable speaking it, Fumiya showed a strong sense of affiliation to Japanese, commenting that he liked Japanese a lot. He further went on to explain, “日本語でしゃべってるほうが、なんか楽しいんですよ、どんな時も” (*It's more fun when I'm speaking in Japanese, all the time*) and that this was because Japanese allowed him to enjoy Japanese TV comedy shows, which only “Japanese people” could understand.

Furthermore, this sense of inheritance and affiliation to Japanese seemed to be reflected in his sense of ethnic identification. In the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject, when he was asked which nationality he was, he answered that he was “Japanese” because he held a Japanese passport. Despite his English-centred life, he had no plans of obtaining Australian citizenship, explaining “日本生まれですし、オーストラリアのパスポート取っちゃったら自分はもうオーストラリア人になってしまうって感じてるから” (*I was born in Japan, so if I obtained an Australian passport, I feel like I'll become an Australian*). When asked why this was the case, he responded that he preferred to be associated with the positive, diligent image that being “Japanese” indexed to English speakers.

5.1.5 Teru

Teru was 17 years old at the time of study and was born in Japan to a Chinese mother from mainland China and a Chinese father from Taiwan. He had two sisters, aged 15

and 16 years of age. While he did not have a heritage link to Japanese, his grandfather had been in the Japanese army during the Second World War and thus spoke some Japanese. Teru recalled, albeit with uncertainty, that the first language he learned was Japanese. However, because his grandmother from his mother's side had come to live with him in Japan when he was in kindergarten, he was also exposed to Chinese and at that time could understand some Chinese conversations, but could not speak too well himself.

As he reached primary school level, he enrolled in a Chinese School in Tokyo, which was taught in both Japanese and Chinese. It was there that he began studying Chinese as a second language. As a result, he recalled that he became quite fluent in Chinese. His parents could also understand both Chinese and Japanese and would converse using both languages, but tended towards Chinese. When he was in his third year at the Chinese School, his parents began contemplating enrolling Teru in a Japanese secondary school. To prepare for this, the family moved from Tokyo to Kanagawa Prefecture and Teru enrolled in a local Japanese-medium school.

For Teru, the Chinese School had been an environment that allowed him to play down his consciousness of his ethnic and linguistic background. He recalled:

(Extract 5-16)

中華学校通っているときは、みんななんか、みんなじゃないんですけど、日本人の子も沢山いて、僕みたいに中国人みたいな感じで日本語しかしゃべれない子もたくさんいたんですよ、だからその中ではもうオーストラリアみたいに考えなくてよかったんですよ、似てる人がたくさんいたから、だけど、こう現地校に行って、そこで全然問題は無かったんですけど、なんか、例えば何人って訊かれたら、気まずいっていうか、なんか、はい、なんか、なんだろう、うーん、うーん、はい、その中国人、日本人って分けるのは、なんか、難しかったです
When I was attending the Chinese School, all of them, well, not all of them exactly, but there were a lot of Japanese kids, and there were others like me who were Chinese but could only speak Japanese, so when I was amongst them I didn't have to think about it ((his ethnicity)) just like in Australia,

because there were a lot of people like me, but when I went to a local [Japanese] school, well there weren't any issues, but, if I was asked what my ethnicity was, I felt awkward, like, yes, um, I don't know, um, um, yeah, it was difficult making a distinction between Chinese and Japanese

Although Teru did not have any bad experiences due to his Chinese background, moving to a local Japanese school required some adjustments, particularly because he could not help but be conscious of the fact that he was different from his peers. Teru recalled that he wanted to conceal his Chinese background and become “Japanese”:

(Extract 5-17)

日本に住んでる時はできるだけなんか、みんなに中国人だっていうこと知らせたくはありませんでした、なんか、逆になんか、みんなと一緒にになりたいっていうか、こう、なんていうのかな、はい、そのできるだけ、中国人ってことは教えないようにしてました、最初の方は、でも、まあ時間が経てば普通に知って別に問題なかったんですけど
When I was living in Japan, I did the best I could to not tell anyone that I was Chinese, like, instead, I wanted to become like everyone else, so, I'm not sure how to say it, yeah, so in the beginning, I did my best not to tell anyone that I was Chinese, but as time went by people knew but there weren't any problems

He continued his study at the Japanese school until the middle of Year 5 when he immigrated to Australia with his mother. However, Teru's father stayed behind in Japan due to work commitments. The main purpose of this transition was to provide Teru with an education in English. His parents had decided to try out this arrangement for three years and, if it did not work out, to move back to Japan.

Teru's move to Australia became a critical turning point in his language development. His temporary separation from his father, his lack of contact with Chinese speakers and his acquisition of English led to a rapid attrition of his Chinese. However, his parents did not seem to mind this and even seemed to welcome Teru's acquisition of English instead. Teru gradually began speaking English at home with his sisters and with his mother, who was fluent in English because she graduated from an English-medium

university in Japan. Teru reported that within the first six months in Australia he forgot a large number of *kanji* and the ability to write in Japanese. It was not until recently that Teru began to make a conscious effort to communicate in Japanese with his sisters, commenting that the reason was “正直、自分が後悔したことを妹には後悔して欲しくないっていうか、まあ、中国語で後悔したから、今、日本語では絶対後悔したくない” (*To be honest, I don't want my sisters to feel the same regret that I felt, well, I regretted it with my Chinese, so now I don't want them to have regrets about their Japanese*).

However, as Teru began attending the Japanese Saturday School from Years 6 to 11, his Japanese started to come back. Moreover, he had maintained steady contact with Japan where his father lived. He would return once every two or three years and every time he visited, he would come back to Australia with Japanese workbooks, which he worked on in his spare time. At the time of the interview, Teru attended the same secondary school as Fumiya and spent time mainly with him and another Japanese friend. In such a context, he seemed to switch fluidly between Japanese and English. Teru reported that when they were talking about Japanese topics, they would speak in Japanese, but if the conversation shifted to an English topic, their language would also switch to English.

Teru's use of the Internet and other media was mainly in Japanese. He used Facebook and Skype to communicate with friends from the Japanese Saturday School who had returned to Japan and also with other friends elsewhere in the world. He was knowledgeable about Internet technology and read Yahoo Japan news, tweeted in Japanese on Twitter and watched Ustream, a Japanese video-streaming website. Japanese comedy was particularly his favourite, but he would also watch Japanese dramas and TV shows through the Internet.

At the time of the interview, Teru hoped to study accounting at university and work for multinational financial institutions that would allow him to travel and work in different places around the world. Teru felt an attachment to Japan and wanted to work there, given the opportunity. He felt that he did not want to confine himself to Australia and was keen to learn new things and expose himself to new environments. He explained:

(Extract 5-18)

将来は、日本でも住みたいんですけど、なんか、正直もっと、この前言ったように、刺激があるっていうか、なんか、こう、日本からオーストラリアに来たときみたいに、新しいことが学べる場所っていうか、日本だけだと、なんか、絶対いつか、なんか、染まりたくないですある場所で、オーストラリアでも、なんか、違う場所でもやっていきたいです

In the future, I want to live in Japan, but to be honest, as I said last time, it's the stimulation, like, um, like when I came to Australia from Japan, [I want to go to] places where I can learn new things, if it's only Japan, like, I definitely know that, um, I don't want to be complacent with just one place, even Australia, like, I want to be able to live in different places

Language identity and ethnic identification

At the time of the interview, Teru only had limited receptive competence in Chinese and reported that his strongest language was Japanese. He felt that his English was much weaker in comparison, particularly in writing, because he lacked the vocabulary to express himself fully. This sense of lack of expertise in English relative to his English-speaking peers seemed to strengthen the importance to him of Japanese and his affiliation to that language. In the following extract, Teru explained the significance of maintaining and developing his Japanese competence:

(Extract 5-19)

正直すごく重要だと思います、たぶん、英語だと、そこらへんの人と比べたらたぶん、絶対低めのほうなんですよ、だから、なんて言うの、どっかで特徴活かして、こう差つけたいみたいな、違う意味での、そしたらなんか楽しいと思うし、今まで、とにかく続けたいです

Honestly, I think it's very important, my guess is, in English, if I compare myself to ordinary people around me, my English is definitely on the lower side, so, I'm not sure how to say this, I want to make use of my strengths and differentiate myself, in another way, I think it'll be more fun that way, [I've continued studying] up to now, so I want to continue

For Teru, his knowledge of Japanese was a distinct strength that he perceived would allow him to make up for his lack of competence in English and gain an edge in the academic competition at school.

However, despite claiming a sense of expertise and affiliation to Japanese, Teru felt that he could not claim inheritance of Japanese or claim an ethnic identification as a Japanese individual. At the same time, neither did he feel that he could legitimately call himself a Chinese, because he could not speak the language. He commented that “正直俺、何人かわかんないんですよ” (*To be honest, I don't know what my ethnicity is*) and explained as follows:

(Extract 5-20)

例えば、日本のことバカにされたら怒るし、中国のことバカにされたら怒るみたいな、で、なんか、どっちもプライド持ってるっていうか、なんか本当おかしいですよ、なんか、こう、例えば、中国人と日本人がケンカしたら、もうなんか顔入れたくないみたいな、いや、なんか、本当意味不明です、なんか中国行って、中国語しゃべれない中国人だと知ったら、逆にそれは、中国行って、で、中国語しゃべれないじゃないですか、何語しゃべれるのって訊かれる時に、俺日本語って答えるんですよ、そしたら、逆になんか、それはおじいさんたちの前で言うのと、絶対変な目で見られるんですよ、それで、なんて言うんだらう、それはなんか中国人としてみてくれないみたいな、彼らは、で、オーストラリアじゃなくて、日本に行くと、俺名前が「テル」なんですけど、名字が「リ」だからもう中国人なんですよ、それで、例えば何人って訊かれたら、もう中国人として答えるしか無いし、パスポートも台湾だから、だから、オーストラリアに来たことによって、オーストラリア人じゃなくてもいいし、違う、台湾、中国人じゃなくてもいいし、日本人じゃなくてもいいみたいな感じになったんですよ、オーストラリアに来て、だから、そう言う意味では楽になったというか、こうオーストラリア差別がないから、そこまで、はい、なんか、ある意味楽になりました、なんかそこまで考えなくていいっていうか、自分

の立場を

For example, I'd get angry if someone made fun of Japan and I'd also get angry if someone made fun of China, so, like, I have pride in both, so it's really weird, like, if for example, a Chinese person was fighting with a Japanese person, I wouldn't want to stick my nose into that, um, like, I know it really doesn't make sense, if I go to China and people found that I was a Chinese that couldn't speak Chinese, so when I go to China and I can't speak Chinese, so they ask me "what language do you speak?" so I answer that I speak Japanese, and then there, if I say that in front of the elderly men, they all look at me funny, so, how should I say it, it's like they don't accept me as a Chinese, and when I go to Australia, I mean Japan, my name is Teru, but my surname is Lee, and for example if I was asked "what's your ethnicity?", I have no choice but to answer Chinese, and my passport is even from Taiwan, so when I came to Australia, I felt that I didn't have to be Australian, Taiwanese or Chinese, not even Japanese, I felt that way when I came to Australia, so in that sense, it made me feel much more at ease, there's not too much racism here, so it was a load off my back, I didn't have to think too much about it, about where I stand

The above extract highlights the complexity of Teru's language identity and ethnic identification. For Teru, being attributed language inheritance of Chinese by other Chinese individuals and also by Japanese individuals was inevitable due to his name. In the case of the former, he could not meet such expectations because he lacked the language expertise to do so. In the case of the latter, Teru felt a sense of powerlessness because he felt that it potentially made him a less legitimate speaker of Japanese. In both these cases, other-attributed language identities had a strong influence that could function to marginalise him. Thus for Teru, moving to Australia had a positive influence on his self-perception because he felt he did not have to choose whether he was Japanese or Chinese.

Teru held a passport from Taiwan, but also held permanent residency in Australia as well as a visa from Japan. He did not want an Australian passport because it would mean that he would need to forfeit his Japanese visa. On the other hand, he felt that

keeping his passport from Taiwan would be meaningless because he could not speak Chinese. At the time of the interview, Teru was leaning towards obtaining a Japanese passport. However, he was hard-pressed to decide because he felt he was Chinese, Japanese and Australian and at the same time none of them. He felt that the best option would be if there was a passport “right in between”. He elaborated as follows:

(Extract 5-21)

えっと、正直俺、何人かわかんないんですよ、こう中国語はしゃべれない中国人でもあるし、日本人ではない日本人なのかな、わからない、日本語がしゃべれるというか、それも、なんか、オーストラリアでももう何年間か住んでるから、まあ、英語となんか日本語がど真ん中にあるんですよ、レベル的に、そろそろオーギーにもなっているのかなって思います、だから、わかりません、どんなパスポートとっていいか、なんか、どっか真ん中にあったらそれとりたいです

Honestly, I don't know what my ethnicity is, I'm a Chinese who can't speak Chinese, I'm not a Japanese either, or am I, I don't know, I can speak Japanese, but then I've lived in Australia now for a number of years, um, my English and Japanese are right in the middle, level-wise, and I think I've become more "Aussie", so, I don't know, I don't know which passport to choose, if there was one right in the middle, I'd choose that

As the extract above suggests, for students like Teru who feel a sense of affiliation to multiple nations or ethnicities, legislations that require individuals to identify with a single nation or ethnicity may lead to a sense of confusion.

5.1.6 Yuta

Profile and educational background

Yuta was 20 years old at the time of study and a third-year student at university. He enrolled in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject together with the other participants in 2011, as it was also available to university students with home-backgrounds. Yuta was born in Australia to Japanese parents and had a brother who was

three years older than himself. The first language Yuta learned to speak was Japanese, which he spoke at home with his parents until he entered the prep year. The sudden exposure to an English-speaking environment had been a shocking experience for Yuta. He recalled:

(Extract 5-22)

よく母にいつも言われるのが、幼稚園の間の先生に何か言われても反応しない、たぶん、自分が話せなかったからだと思うんですけど、こう、あの、例えば佑太とか言われても、反応しないで、やってることをずっと夢中にしてるから、先生には耳が聞こえんじゃないかって注意されて、一応医者に行ったら全然オッケーだって

What my mother always tells me is that, when I was in prep year, I wouldn't respond even when the teacher was talking to me, it was probably because I couldn't speak [English], for example, um, even if the teacher said "Yuta", no response, I'd keep doing what I was engaged in, so the teacher warned [my parents] that there was something wrong with my ears, so we went to the doctor but everything was fine

In primary school, Yuta enrolled in an ESL class and after one or two years was able to move into a regular class. Although Yuta gradually began to speak English, he recalled that his mother had been very strict about speaking only Japanese at home. He suspected that his mother's strictness with regard to the Japanese-only rule at home was to make up for Yuta not going to the Japanese Saturday School. However, it was Yuta's parents themselves who did not want to enrol him. They had not wanted to bring him up in an environment with Japanese sojourning families whom they felt were over-protective, "helicopter" parents. Thus, Yuta's first formal exposure to a Japanese language class was at primary school, which offered Japanese as one of the LOTE classes. While Yuta contemplated taking French, which was the other option, he opted to take Japanese. He continued to study it into secondary school.

Asides from his study at school, Yuta was exposed to Japanese at his father's Japanese restaurant, which in the late 1990s was patronised by Japanese businessmen. From time to time, Yuta helped out waiting tables and it was there that he learned to distinguish

between polite *keigo* (i.e. Japanese honorifics) and what he called “汚い言葉” (*rough language*). However, besides from these opportunities and his use of Japanese at home, Yuta had very little contact with Japanese speakers. His friends at school consisted mostly of English-speakers. He also read the news and listened to English songs on his iPod.

As he entered university, Yuta's older brother moved back to Japan to work and became an important connection for him. His brother would send Yuta newly released CDs of popular Japanese bands. He would also record variety shows, burn them onto DVD and would send them to Yuta regularly. Yuta watched these almost every night and maintained contact with his brother using Skype. Yuta also visited Japan once every two years, which he greatly enjoyed. Although he reported feeling like a tourist and evaluated Tokyo as being too crowded and polluted, he loved to shop and watch TV there. On his last visit, he had the opportunity to travel by himself on the bullet train to Osaka, Kyoto, Hiroshima and Kyushu.

At the time of the interview, Yuta was a third-year university student undertaking research in chemistry. He was contemplating doing a PhD in the future and wanted to become a scientist. He felt that his bilingual ability in Japanese and English would be a distinct advantage as a scientist. He thought that his Japanese may assist him in obtaining a job in Japanese laboratories, and that his English may allow him to publish in English academic journals. While he had no immediate plans to live in Japan because of its high rent and lack of space, he felt that Australia's job market was limited and was thus contemplating pursuing his career in the US or in Europe.

Language identity and ethnic identification

Yuta identified English as his more dominant language. However, like Chika and Takeshi, Yuta seemed to be confident in his bilingual ability and commented that he rarely utilised both languages mixed together. His ability to switch between the languages and to deal comfortably with both Japanese and English-speaking situations seemed to be an important part of his self-identification. When he was asked which

language he preferred to speak in, he playfully commented that “この間、その同じ質問友達に聞かれたんですけど、冗談半分で、他の人に、こう、頭の中読まれたくないときは、日本語で考えるって言っちゃいました” (*The other day, my friend asked me the same question, and I said half jokingly that when I don't want other people to read my mind, I think in Japanese*).

Despite his confidence in Japanese, Yuta was concerned that his Japanese would become worse if he stopped studying. He particularly felt that his lexical knowledge in the field of science was lacking in Japanese. He commented:

(Extract 5-23)

その日本語でボキャブラリー、単語が不自由な時は、その特に、その科学的なことを話し始めると、あの、日本で科学の勉強をしていない分、この単語が出てこない、あの、だからもし日本で留学して勉強するとしたら、やっぱ結構勉強すると思います、でも、今の分では別にあんまりそういう風にはまだ考えてない

I feel that my Japanese vocabulary or terminology is lacking especially when I start speaking about scientific things, um, I haven't studied science in Japan, so the terminologies don't come out, um, so if I were to study overseas in Japan, I'd have to study quite hard, but, for the time being, I haven't thought about that too much

Furthermore, Yuta felt that although he could read quite a lot of *kanji*, he was not able to write them. Thus, his main motivation for learning Japanese was to consolidate his *kanji* knowledge as well as his ability to conduct research in Japanese in the future. This was because Yuta envisaged the possibility of working for Japanese laboratories, where the knowledge of scientific terminology in Japanese would be crucial to his success. Thus he felt that to work globally, it was important that he himself made an effort to consolidate his Japanese language skills. He explained:

(Extract 5-24)

日本でやっぱあんまり英語力が強い国じゃない、そっちにいったら英語

でこうやって言うんだよって行ってもきょとんてされたり、英語わかんないって言われる恐れがあるので、自分から勉強して学んで行かなきゃなって、今週授業で見た、ユニクロと楽天の公用語化と同じような考えで、もっと外に向かって行くんだったら、自分から強化しなきゃなって感覚ですね

After all, Japan isn't a country that's strong in English, so if I go there and tell them "this is how you say it in English", they'll just look at me and tell me that they don't understand English, so I think I need to keep studying [Japanese], like what we discussed in this week's class (Japanese for Background Speakers' subject), it's the same as how Uniqlo and Rakuten (Japanese multinational companies) are making English the official language of business, if you want to go out into the world, I feel that you need to take the initiative to strengthen yourself

As Yuta expressed above, he took a rather pragmatic and an instrumental approach to his study of Japanese, which he felt was an important resource that he could potentially utilise in his future career. However, similar to Chika and Fumiya who also had two Japanese parents, the expectations that other people placed on Yuta's Japanese expertise and inheritance seemed to influence his motivation for studying the language. He explained:

(Extract 5-25)

やっぱ、日本人であるってことを見られるじゃないですか、名前とか見て、こう、国籍とか見られたら、日本人て、こう書いてあるので、その時に日本語が話せないと言ってしまったら、なんか、見下ろされちゃうんじゃないのかなってやっぱ思うので、やっぱ、こう、日本人であることで日本語話せなきゃいけないと思います

After all, they look at me as a "Japanese" when they look at my name or my nationality, it says "Japanese", and if I were to tell them that I couldn't speak Japanese, like, I think I'd be looked down on, you know, I think that if you're, Japanese you need to be able to speak Japanese

Thus, while Yuta primarily identified himself as an Australian, he seemed to be aware

that he could not escape the fact that he could be perceived as a Japanese due to his name, nationality and appearance. He thus felt that he needed to meet the expectations resulting from the attribution of Japanese expertise and inheritance in order to prevent marginalisation as an incomplete, less legitimate speaker of Japanese. However, Yuta also admitted that he himself attributed these expectations to other Japanese speakers in Australia. Being a competent Japanese speaker himself, he felt that those who could not speak Japanese properly, despite having “Japanese blood”, were unfortunate:

(Extract 5-26)

結構あると思います、実際自分からも、こう、ああ、あんた日本人の血をもってるのになんで日本語話せないんだって思う時もあります、こう、こっち生徒の方とかで、親が日本語話させたくなかった、で、そういう理由で日本語ができないとかでしたら、なんでなんだろうって思ったりはします

It actually happens quite often, I think “why do you have Japanese blood but can’t speak Japanese”, like students here ((Australia)), some of them can’t speak Japanese because their parents didn’t allow them to speak it, and if that’s the case, I really have to question why they ((the parents)) let that happen

However, despite this sense of obligation to learn Japanese for his future, Yuta also recognised that the instrumentality of Japanese itself in the Australian job market was limited. So for him, it seemed the Japanese was mainly important in so far as it was part of his bilingual repertoire. On the other hand, Yuta felt that English expertise held more importance for him in the future:

(Extract 5-27)

でも日本語と英語両方ともできるのはもっと有利だと思います、こう、日本の研究の、こう、ペーパーとかってやっぱ日本語で出版されるのが多いので、その日本で研究した中で英語で出版出来たらもっと世界中で見られる、それ、プラス、やっぱ、英語が一番、あの、もっとも多い、その、科学とかみかける、英語で書くのが普通、英語で書くの

が標準なので、英語ができるってことは、向こう、日本に行ったとしたらすごいプラスになると思います

If you could speak both Japanese and English, it would be more advantageous, for example, Japanese research papers are most of the time published in Japanese, but if you do research in Japan and can publish in English, it'll be read by more people around the world, plus, English is the number one language you see in the sciences, writing in English, writing in English is the standard, so I think the fact that you know English is, over there, in Japan, a big advantage

In terms of his ethnic identification and nationality, Yuta presented himself as an Australian. He explained as follows:

(Extract 5-28)

今、オーストラリア人って意識が強いですね、こう、オーストラリア人、典型的なオーストラリア人の好きなもんとか好きですし、フットボール以外は、あんま見ない、嫌いって訊かれたら、嫌いじゃないって答えるけれど、好きって訊かれたら、あんま好きじゃないって言う、どっちでもない、でもクリケットとか好きですし、オーストラリアデーのイベントとか、えーと、オーストラリア人の生活にあこがれていますが、国籍が 22 ンときに、ドゥアルシチズンシップ認められない、日本側は認めないんで、どっちかを捨てなきゃいけないんで、たぶん日本人の国籍をとっというて、オーストラリアの国籍を捨てる形になると思います

Now, I feel more strongly that I'm an Australian, I like things that typical Australians like, well I don't watch too much asides from [Australian] football, but if someone were to ask me whether I don't like [the other sports], I'd tell them that no, I don't dislike it, but if they were to ask me whether I like it, I'd say that I don't care too much about it, it's neither, but I like cricket and Australia Day events, I admire the Australian lifestyle, but when I'm 22 years old, because the Japanese-side doesn't allow dual citizenship, I need to throw away one of them, in that case, I'll probably keep my Japanese citizenship and throw away the Australian one

When Yuta was queried as to whether there was a contradiction in identifying as an Australian and deciding to retain his Japanese passport (which would make his nationality Japanese), he responded that “そんなオーストラリア人の証明できる確定はないけど、心の中でオーストラリア人だからそれでいいんじゃないのかなって” (*I can't say for certain that I'll be able to prove myself as an Australia, but if I feel that I'm an Australian in my heart, I think that's all that matters*). Furthermore, he took a pragmatic approach to his choice of nationality, commenting that his decision above was because the legislation made it was far easier to become Australian than to become Japanese.

5.1.7 John

As mentioned above, although John participated in this research, he was only interviewed once about his profile and background due to unforeseen circumstances. That is to say, during the data collection phase of this study, John broke his leg playing soccer and was not available to be interviewed. By the time he recovered, John was busy studying for his university entrance exams for the other subjects at his secondary school and thus could only find time for one interview. Therefore, due to the limited amount of data collected, the description below will focus primarily on John's self-reported language identity.

John was 17 years old at the time of study and was born in Japan to a Japanese mother and an Australian father. He had a brother who was 14 years of age. John immigrated to Australia at the age of three years and entered a local primary school. He also began attending the Japanese Saturday School from the first year of primary school and continued to attend until the end of Year eight. John was friends with Anthony (See 5.1.1 above) since childhood, but had limited contact with other Japanese-speaking peers.

John felt that his English was much stronger than his Japanese, commenting that this was probably because he had not seriously studied Japanese outside of attending the Japanese Saturday School. His literacy practices were mainly in English, and thus John

admitted that he would have no clue what was written in a Japanese newspaper. He explained that his mother wanted him to be more engaged with his study of Japanese and watch more Japanese TV shows to help improve his Japanese. John usually did as he was told and watched such TV programs from time to time, but did not know whether it was helping him improve or not.

John felt that his brother who was attending the Japanese Saturday School was much more competent than himself in writing Japanese, although he felt he had the edge when it came to speaking in the language. While John had frequently read Japanese *manga* when he was in primary school, he explained that he was no longer interested in them. However, regardless of his lack of exposure to Japanese, John felt that he did not want to stop learning Japanese altogether, explaining “習いたいと思います、日本の文化とか、色々、歴史とかも、日本のことをもっと習いたいと思います” (*I'd like to study it, Japanese culture and things like that, also its history, I want to know more about Japan*). He felt that Japanese was an important part of his linguistic and cultural inheritance commenting, “自分の、授業で話すんですけど、アイデンティティーとか、日本は僕のアイデンティティーに入ってると思うから、もっと日本のことを勉強したいと思ってるんです” (*We talk about ourselves in class ((Japanese for Background Speakers' subject)), things like our identity, Japan is a part of my identity, so I want to learn more about it*). Indeed, while John felt that he was “Australian”, he also wanted to be “Japanese”. He explained as follows:

(Extract 5-29)

僕はもっとオーストラリア人なんですけど、日本人にもなりたと思います、どっちとも欲しいんです、だから、日本語もずっとちゃんと話せるようにしたいと思います、子供とかも、ええ、できたら育ったら日本語もしゃべってほしいんです

I'm more of an Australian, but I also want to become Japanese, I want both of them, so I want to become able to speak Japanese properly, if I were to have children, um, I want them to grow up being able to speak Japanese

Thus, John's learning of Japanese was partly influenced by his sense of inheriting Japanese and was closely connected to his desire to “become Japanese”. At the time of

the interview, John wanted to study business and was contemplating applying to study in the United States.

5.2 The value of Japanese as a form of capital

The narratives of the participants described briefly above reveal the significant diversity in the way the students presented their experiences, language identities and ethnic identifications. Indeed, as Leung et al. (1997) point out, the students in this study were not simply inheritors of fixed ethnic categories or languages. On the contrary, they seemed to be constructing “new ethnicities” (Hall, 1992a; Harris, 2006) through the dynamic negotiation of their expertise, affiliation and inheritance with others. At the same time, the stories also revealed certain similarities in the value placed on Japanese in the homes of the participants. Therefore, in this section, I will bring together the above narratives in order to illustrate the complexity of the students’ language identities and highlight the value of Japanese as a form of capital.

It can be observed that the students’ Japanese and English learning trajectories were not always linear. The students’ expertise and interest in the Japanese language appeared to have waxed and waned throughout their lives, influenced by multiple factors including their migration to Australia, parental expectations, participation in friendship groups, exposure to Japanese language media and objectified cultural capital (books, *manga*, *anime* and music) and so on. In addition, the students’ reported sense of expertise in the language was not equally distributed amongst the different modalities and social situations, showing the truncated nature of their bilingual repertoire (Blommaert, 2010). Moreover, one’s sense of expertise in a language did not necessarily equate to an affiliation to the language. For instance, as Fumiya’s narrative suggests, although he felt that English was his stronger language in all aspects, he reported that he felt a closer affiliation to Japanese, claiming that it was much more “fun” speaking in Japanese.

Furthermore, at times, the students’ expertise was not simply about how competent they felt in the language, but about how they were positioned by others (Blommaert, Collins, & Slembrouck, 2005), particularly in relation to their linguistic inheritance. For instance, students like Chika, Fumiya and Yuta, who were identifiable as Japanese due to their

names and appearances, were sometimes presumed by others to have inherited the Japanese language and, by extension, expected to be experts in it too. However, these high expectations, at times, were at odds with the students' self-perceived lack of expertise, resulting in their timidity at speaking Japanese for fear of giving themselves away as less legitimate speakers. On the other hand, students like Takeshi who were not immediately identifiable as Japanese were sometimes not attributed language inheritance and were spoken to in foreigner talk. In Takeshi's case, this did not coincide with his self-perceived high expertise and confidence in Japanese, which resulted in the need for him to first negotiate and establish his legitimacy as a Japanese speaker.

In addition, the notion of inheritance is further complicated by the presence of students like Teru who did not have "Japanese blood" *per se* and did not necessarily inherit the language in the conventional sense of the word. However, Teru nonetheless felt the strongest attachment to the Japanese language, suggesting the possibility of the emergence of a new linguistic inheritance that is not defined by one's heritage connections, but through strong affiliations to the language. That is to say, Teru's story shows that it is possible for language affiliation and inheritance to cut cross ethnic boundaries (Rampton, 1990).

From a more trans-local perspective, another theme that appeared to be salient in the students' accounts was the issue of citizenship and the tension between territorised and de-territorised identities (Vertovec, 2001). For example, in Yuta's case, his ethnic identification as an Australian was not necessarily connected to his choice of nationality. Indeed, Yuta claimed that he would rather keep his Japanese citizenship because he saw very little benefit in being an Australian citizen. He claimed that being Australian was not defined by citizenship in a nation-state, but by how one chose to identify himself. In this regard, Yuta may have showed signs of a de-territorised identity. On the other hand, for some students like Chika and Fumiya, one's nationality as defined by the nation-state was an important part of who they were. Both students commented that being a Japanese as legitimated by their citizenship was something they were emotionally attached to. In this regard, territorially-defined identities were also an important part of the students' self-perception. It seems that these accounts show the students' predicament of having to choose one nationality over the other, when their daily lives

were defined by both English and Japanese, and their connections to both Australia and Japan.

However, despite the differences in the students' accounts examined above, there were also similarities in the value attached by the students to the Japanese language in their homes. Firstly, it appeared that Japanese was valued in the homes of the students for its convertibility into social capital. As Takeshi commented, the reason that his parents wanted him to study Japanese was because “日本人の家族と話せなかったりするの
は嫌だと思ったから、ちゃんと日本に住んでいる親戚とかに会話ができるよう
に” (*they didn't want me to be unable to speak to Japanese relatives, so they told me to
learn Japanese so that I can speak with relatives in Japan*). Furthermore, for the
students themselves, it was an important tool for maintaining their connections to Japan
and with relatives and friends who lived there. As Anthony commented, “お母さんと
話すとか、あと、あの、日本に、あの、ホリデーに行く、毎年行ってるから、
それもあるし” (*to speak with my Mum, and because I go to Japan on holiday every
year, so that's part of it*).

Secondly, for some of the parents, Japanese appeared to be in itself a form of cultural capital and a part of the students' heritage, which needed to be maintained and developed. At times, it seemed that the very act of studying Japanese was a culturally meaningful practice. As Anthony explained in Extract 5-1 above, for his mother, learning Japanese may have been equivalent to other cultural practices related to Japan like watching Japanese TV dramas or going to Japan. In other words, it seemed that Anthony's mother perceived Anthony's study of Japanese as a means of making up for the cultural exposure and cultural capital that he would have obtained had he lived in Japan.

Thirdly, and perhaps most important to the chapters that will follow, the data also strongly suggested that there was a considerable amount of value placed on being able to utilise Japanese and English. Thus, the importance of the students' bilingual development seemed to be a recurring theme in the students' narratives. For example, Fumiya explained that when he immigrated to Australia and began speaking English to

his mother, she did not seem to mind this change. He claimed that she said “なんか、バイリンガルの方が良いつて” (*well she said it's better to be bilingual*) and allowed Fumiya to continue speaking English at home.

Similarly, Teru also mentioned that his mother had emphasised his English when he first immigrated to Australia, but as university entrance and his career pathway began to emerge as an issue, she began telling him to make an effort with both English and Japanese:

(Extract 5-30)

こっちに来て、まあ、英語がんばりなさい、でも日本語もがんばりなさいみたいな、両方ががんばってほしいみたいです、でも最近、逆に英語より日本語の方ががんばってほしいみたいな、大学の勉強も始めたし、あの、もう、真剣に、こう、なんか社会に、なんていうんだろう、もうなんか、日本の現地の子みたいにしゃべれるようになりなさい、書けるようになりなさい、なってほしいみたいな気持ちは現れました
When we came here, well, she said do your best with English, but also study Japanese hard, I think she wanted me to study both very hard, but recently, it's changed and she wants me to work on my Japanese more so than my English, because I've started studying for university and, um, now, seriously, um, I have to consider going out into society, and how should I say it, it's like, she wants me to speak and write like the kids in Japan, that sort of feeling has come out

Thus, it was particularly the perceived value of English and Japanese bilingualism that seemed to underlie Teru's mother's investment in her son's Japanese. Anthony also reported that while he was growing up, his father had often mentioned the benefits of being able to speak Japanese in an English workplace environment:

(Extract 5-31)

けどメソッドの方がもっと得意で、だからエンジニアとか、そういうの、で、そういうのやると、そういう仕事に入ると、職業に入ると、

日本語は使えるといいってうちのお父さんとかよく言っているので
But I'm better at Methods ((short for “Mathematical Methods”, a secondary school Mathematics subject which is a non-compulsory prerequisite for tertiary study in Victoria)), *so [I want to be] an engineer, or something like that, and, in those sorts of jobs, when you enter those professions, my Dad always tells me that Japanese is useful*

In Anthony's view, it was not so much how competent one was as a bilingual, but the very fact of being able to speak Japanese in addition to English that seemed to hold importance:

(Extract 5-32)

うちのお父さん、すごい関係ない仕事してるんですが、車ので、いつも、ABC ((日本の大手自動車会社)) の人と話して、うちのお父さん全然話せないんですけど、その日本人がオーストラリアに来て、誰もしゃべれなくてうちのお父さんがちょっとだけ使えて、それですっごい、それが、あの、日本人が好きらしいんですよ、あまりしゃべれないからオーストラリア人は、だからそういうのもいいな

My Dad's job is totally unrelated [to Japanese], working with cars, and he always speaks with people from the ABC automobile company ((a major Japanese automobile company)), and even though my Dad can't speak [Japanese] at all, those Japanese people come to Australia and no one can speak Japanese, but my Dad can speak just a little bit, so they really, the Japanese people love that, especially because Australians usually can't speak [Japanese], so I'd like to be like that too

In this regard, being able to speak Japanese and English provided the speaker with a favourable reputation and status, or, in other words, symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1977). Thus, it is possible to observe that the value of Japanese lay not only in its convertibility into cultural or social capital, but also in its convertibility into symbolic capital and the distinction that it accrued vis-à-vis monolinguals.

5.3 Conclusion

In this chapter, through the presentation of students' narratives, I have illustrated the complexity and the negotiated nature of the students' language identities. The students' accounts show the complicated network of languages, resources and people connecting these students to both Australia and Japan and to other parts of the world. A growing body of literature on transnationalism (see for example, Blommaert, 2008, 2010; Blommaert & Rampton, 2011; Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; Rouse, 1991, 1995; Vertovec, 1999; Vertovec, 2007) suggest the complex ways in which migrants move between linguistic, cultural and geographical borders, maintaining ties to multiple "homes". In doing so, they acquire, and at times consciously select linguistic and cultural repertoire that influences the construction of de-territorised or "transnational(ised) identities" (Vertovec, 2001: 578). Indeed, the students' lives, which were defined by a belonging to multiple communities that transgressed national boundaries, certainly seem to show signs of such identities.

It was also revealed that the value placed on Japanese in the homes of the participants were cut across by both local as well as trans-local influences. On the local or trans-local scale, Japanese was important precisely as a cultural capital and as a means of maintaining social capital with family, relatives and friends both in Japan, Australia and elsewhere in the world. Moreover, the *field* of home was not insulated from the influences of globalisation and other forces operating at the trans-local or transnational scale level. That is to say, in some cases, Japanese was important because of the symbolic value that bilingualism held in the students' careers and futures. In this regard, as Blommaert (2010) points out, there seems to be competing "polycentric" forces at work in the students' accounts: on the one hand, the importance of Japanese as a "heritage" and on the other, the value of Japanese as a commodity in the global market (Blackledge & Creese, 2011). This tension and "polycentricity" will be examined further in the following chapters.

CHAPTER 6: Claiming legitimacy in second language classrooms

In this chapter, I will focus on the narratives of five students, Anthony, Chika, Fumiya, Takeshi and Teru, who were in Year 12 at the time of study and examine their engagement in the Japanese Second Language classes that they completed in Year 11 at their respective secondary schools. More specifically, I will examine the students' accounts of their identity negotiation in the Japanese Second Language classes vis-à-vis foreign language learners as well as with the teachers, and explore how the participants navigated the power structure of the classroom to pursue multiple interests.

6.1 Japanese linguistic resources as potential capital

In the state of Victoria, where this research was undertaken, eligibility for tertiary entrance is determined by the students' performance in what is commonly known as the VCE (Victorian Certificate of Education) subjects, briefly mentioned in 4.2 above, which students undertake in Years 11 and 12 at their respective secondary schools. The scores of these subjects go towards the students' ATAR (Australian Tertiary Admission Ranking) score, which then determines the students' eligibility for entering their desired universities and faculties. Students were required to undertake compulsory English-related VCE subjects and also choose from a wide range of other elective VCE subjects (for example, Accounting, Economics, Chemistry, Biology, as well as LOTE subjects, to name a few) depending on their interests and pathways. Moreover, each subject is comprised of four "units": units 1 and 2 were typically completed at the Year 11 level and units 3 and 4 at the Year 12 level. However, at some schools, high-achieving students were permitted to take units 3 and 4 at the Year 11 level, thus allowing them to complete the VCE requirements early, and these students may have the option of going on to pursue additional Higher Education "Extension study" when they are in Year 12 if such subjects are available. This, in turn, provided the students with additional points towards their ATAR score and credit towards the students' undergraduate qualification when they enter university.

For the students in this study, and for students in general, Years 11 and Year 12 were therefore especially critical periods in their education as the subject choices and the

scores from these subjects directly influenced their pathway post-Year 12. Indeed, as Anthony reported, VCE scores and academic performance was a dominant part of the students' lives and was often the topic of conversation in and out of school. Indeed, as reported by *The Age*, a local Melbourne newspaper, there was a tendency for students and their parents to choose subjects, not based on the students' interests, but upon which subjects would allow them to maximise their tertiary entrances scores (Milburn, 2011). For heritage learners who already had a background in a language, in some cases, taking the LOTE subject of their heritage language, allowed them to gain good marks and gain an edge over their peers.

The opportunity and the pressure to obtain good tertiary entrance scores described above certainly seemed to be felt by the participants in this study. While the long-term development of bilingual skills was on the agenda of the students, as observed in the previous chapter, all of these students reported that in the year previous to this study (i.e. when the students were in Year 11), they enrolled in the VCE Japanese Second Language subject, the “easier” of the two levels of Japanese language subjects available to them at the time, and opted to complete units 3 and 4 when they were in Year 11, as mentioned above. For instance, in the following extract, Chika commented on the reason she chose Japanese as one of her VCE subjects when she was in Year 11:

(Extract 6-1)

それまで VCE のことなんか考えた事がなかったんで、いきなり何の科目をとるんだろうとか思い始めると、日本語とる事が得かかもしれないって言われて、とってみようかなって思ったんです

Until then, I hadn't even thought about VCE, and all of a sudden when I had to choose which subjects to take, I was told that it would be advantageous to take Japanese, so that's why I decided to take it

Chika claimed that up until tertiary entrance scores became an issue, enrolling in a Japanese language class was something she had not considered. However, in Year 11, when considering which subject would allow her to maximise her score, she came to the decision that enrolling in a Japanese language subject would be most beneficial to her. It was particularly the Japanese Second Language subject that she decided to enrol in:

(Extract 6-2)

- Chika: はい、去年日本語をとりました
Yes, I took Japanese last year [in Year 11]
- Interviewer: それはセカンドランゲージ、ファーストランゲージ
Was that the first language or the second language subject?
- Chika: セカンドです、はい、あの学校には行ったこと無い
んでセカンドでした
Second, I've never been to school [in Japan] so I took second
- Interviewer: ファーストは学校に行かなきゃいけないの？
So you had to have gone to school [in Japan] to take first?
- Chika: はい、えーと、あ、とることもできるんですけど、
点数的にはセカンド受けた方が得なんで
Yes, well, oh, you don't have to, but it's better point-wise to take second

As Chika mentioned above, the eligibility criteria for enrolling in the Japanese Second Language subject was considerably generous, designating only that students were eligible “if they have had up to seven years of education in a school where Japanese is the medium of instruction”(Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority, 2013c). Therefore, as Tables 2 and 3 above show, all of the participants in this study fell under this criteria and could enrol in the Japanese Second Language subject and study together with other foreign language learners. While these students also had the option of opting to enrol in the VCE Japanese First Language subject, which targeted students who “have spent some time as a resident and/or have had significant experience of studying Japanese in a country in which Japanese is a major language of communication” (Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority, 2013b: 8), there were no point incentives for enrolling in the more difficult of the two subjects.

Furthermore, in Chika’s retrospective accounts, we can observe her awareness towards her Japanese linguistic resources as potential “capital” (Bourdieu, 1977) which could be

utilised to gain a high tertiary entrance score. Likewise, Teru explained “まあ、とろうと思ったのは高い点がとれると思ったから一つですし” (*well, one of the reasons for taking the [Japanese Second Language] subject was because I thought I could get a high score*). For Chika and for all of the students in this study, Japanese linguistic resources were something that was utilised mainly in their homes, where it functioned to maintain connections with friends or relatives. However, as they entered the upper level of secondary school, the participants may have begun to re-evaluate the value of their linguistic resources and may have become aware of the possibility for utilising it as a potential capital for gaining tangible returns. As it was the first time that many of the students participated in a formal Japanese language class conducted in the Australian educational setting, it offered them, perhaps for the first time, a *field* in which their Japanese linguistic resources were deployable and convertible into other valuable forms of capital, including tertiary entrance scores.

6.2 Reflexivity towards “composition” and “volume” of capital

As anticipated by the participants themselves, the Japanese Second Language subject did not pose much of a challenge in terms of the level of language proficiency required, as evidenced by all of the participants’ comments that they learned very little and were able to gain relatively high scores in the subject. However, it is possible to observe in the participants’ accounts that moving into this new environment may have led to an increased consciousness towards their own linguistic resources as a potential capital which can be drawn on to gain other forms of valued capital. According to Reay’s (2004) explanation, “as individuals find themselves in different fields or in different parts of the same field, it gives rise to consciousness and reflexivity” (p.437).

Indeed, it is possible to observe subtle signs of such “reflexivity” in the way the participants viewed their Japanese linguistic resources and how they position themselves in the social space relative to other students at school. For instance, this can be observed in the following extract by Anthony who commented on his experiences in the Japanese Second Language subject:

(Extract 6-3)

- Anthony: セカンドランゲージ、いや、とても簡単でした
[Japanese] Second Language, well, it was very easy
- Interviewer: 簡単だったんだ
so it was easy?
- Anthony: なんにもしませんでした、なんにも勉強、僕勉強あんまりしないんですよ、で、VCE 去年やって、なんにもしない、すごいよかったです、あの、なんにもやらないで、とてもラッキーだと思いますよ、日本語があって、VCE で
I didn't do anything, I didn't study at all for it, I really don't study in general, and, I did VCE [Japanese Second Language] last year, but I didn't do anything, it was very nice, um, not doing anything, and I think I was lucky that Japanese was one of the VCE subjects
- Interviewer: どういう意味で
what do you mean?
- Anthony: あの、点数が、あの、良い点数をもらって、何もしないで、良い点数が
um, the score, um, get a good score, not doing anything and getting a good score

As can be observed from the above extract, Anthony's main motivation for enrolling in the Japanese Second Language subject was to obtain a high tertiary entrance score. However, his acknowledgement that he was "lucky" that Japanese was one of the VCE subjects is especially meaningful in that it also showed signs of Anthony's reflexivity towards his linguistic resources. Firstly, Anthony felt that he was "lucky" because of the opportunity to use his linguistic resources to obtain a good score without exerting any effort. If Japanese had not been available, he would have had to choose another subject in which much more "labor-time" (Calhoun, 1993: 67) would have been required but which may have yielded a much smaller return. Secondly, Anthony's comment suggests that Japanese was one out of a number of VCE subjects that he contemplated choosing, and it happened to be a subject in which he could make use of his readily available

resources. His choice was therefore based on his self-assessment of the relative value and volume of his linguistic resources compared to the value and volume of his other embodied cultural resources (for example, knowledge of mathematics, history, science or so on). In this regard, he demonstrated reflexivity with regard to “the composition of capital that he detains” (Wacquant, 2006). Furthermore, by observing his situation as “lucky”, Anthony was in effect distancing himself from and objectifying his situation for self-evaluation, which suggests a degree of reflexivity and consciousness towards the position he occupied relative to his peers.

Another instance of reflexivity can be observed in the following extract from Teru who explained how he recently began to perceive the value of his Japanese linguistic resources:

(Extract 6-4)

「日本語は」正直すごく重要だと思います、たぶん、英語だと、そこらへんの人と比べたらたぶん、絶対低めのほうなんです、だから、なんて言うの、どっかで特徴活かして、こう差つけたいみたいな、違う意味での、そしたらなんか楽しいと思うし、今まで、とにかく続けたいです

To tell you the truth it's ((Japanese)) very important, I think, my English is probably worse compared to ordinary people around me, that's why, how should I say it, I want to make use of my strength and I want to differentiate myself, in another way, I think it would be more fun that way, so I just want to continue [studying Japanese]

Teru's comment that he wanted to make use of his strength to differentiate himself from his peers suggests that he felt that he could utilise his Japanese linguistic resources as a capital to make up for his losses in English and gain an edge in the competition for academic success. Thus, Teru's choice to enrol in the Japanese Second Language subject was not only based on the choice between the Japanese First Language or the Japanese Second Language subject, but also on his reflexive attempt to position himself relative to his peers with regard to the “overall volume” of capital that he possessed.

These facets of reflexivity examined above, “composition of capital” (c.f. Anthony) and “overall volume” (c.f. Teru), are the two coordinates by “which individuals, groups, or institutions chart themselves in social space” (Wacquant, 2006: 7). Thus, it is possible to see signs of conscious and reflexive attempts by the participants to evaluate the resources they possessed and position themselves in the Japanese Second Language subjects, as well as in the *field* of secondary school education.

6.3 Fitting in as a legitimate “second language learner”

As examined in the previous section, some of the participants actively sought to utilise their linguistic resources as potential capital that could be converted into cultural capital in the secondary school education environment. However, the participants’ pursuits could potentially be perceived negatively by peers and teachers in the Japanese Second Language classrooms. As reported by de Kretser and Spence-Brown (2010), heritage learners were susceptible to the criticism that they were “Japanese first language speakers” with an “unfair” advantage who were enrolled in the subject with the motive to gain good marks. To counter such attitudes, the participants may have felt the need to somehow justify to peers and teachers the fact that they were entitled to be in the Japanese Second Language subject and that they did not have an “unfair” advantage. In other words, the participants may have needed to first obtain the “prestige, status, and reputation” (Carrington and Luke, 1997:103), or symbolic capital, which would allow them to be perceived as legitimate members of the classroom. Only then could their linguistic resources be recognised and become deployable as capital in the classroom.

Bourdieu (1977b) contends that such symbolic capital can be obtained by projecting a “habitus objectively fitted to the objective structures” (p. 214), in other words, by “fitting-in” (or by giving the illusion of “fitting-in”) to a particular field. In the case of Fumiya and Chika, this was achieved by strategically downplaying their language expertise and inheritance in order to position themselves as “second language learners”. For example, while discussing the topic of VCE subjects and secondary school classes, Fumiya explained:

(Extract 6-5)

- Fumiya: 一応、あの、僕の first language はたぶん英語だと思います
Well, I think my first language is probably English
- Interviewer あ、first language は英語なんだ、それはなんでそうやって感じるの
Oh, your first language is English, why do you feel that way?
- Fumiya: ああ、ESL っていうあるじゃないですか、English Second Language っていう、7 年以上こっちにいたらそれできないんですよ、だから僕それできないんで、まあ、英語が first language なんだなって
Um, you know there's ESL, which stands for English Second Language, if you've been here ((Australia)) for more than seven years, you can't take it, and I can't take it, so I think English is my first language

According to Fumiya, his first language was English because he was not an “ESL” (English as a Second Language learner) as defined by the criteria set by the Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority. By making this statement, he seemed to be implicitly stating to the researcher that Japanese was indeed his second language and that he did not have expertise equivalent to a “first language speaker”. To support this claim, he further commented, “日本語だとたまにつまったりなんか、言葉が出てこなかったりするんですけど、英語のときはそれが無いっていうか、少ないですね” (*In Japanese I get stuck sometimes, sometimes words don't come out, but in English, that doesn't happen, or happens less*). By emphasising his lack of spoken expertise in Japanese relative to his spoken expertise in English, he thus seemed to be disclaiming language inheritance of Japanese and disaligning the presumed connection between his ethnicity and his language.

A similar self-positioning can be observed in Chika's comments in Extract 6-3 above, which was also given when discussing the topic of VCE subjects. In this extract, Chika explained that she enrolled specifically in the Japanese Second Language subject to gain

high marks for her tertiary entrance score, but was quick to add “あの、学校には行ったこと無いんでセカンドでした” (*um, [I took the] second [language subject] because I’ve never been to school [in Japan]*). Chika made this statement even before the researcher asked her why she chose to enrol in the Japanese Second Language rather than the Japanese First Language subject. Like Fumiya, Chika seemed to be justifying her enrolment in the Japanese Second Language subject by claiming that she was, in fact, a “second language learner” according to the eligibility criteria set by the Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority (i.e. lack of formal education in Japan).

It is certainly possible that both Fumiya and Chika actually perceived Japanese to be their second or less proficient language. However, both participants seemed to adopt the position of “second language learner” most noticeably when they discussed their enrolment in the Japanese Second Language subject. Moreover, their disclaiming of language expertise and inheritance contradicted their claim for language expertise and language inheritance, which could be found elsewhere in the interview and as described in Chapter 5 above. Chika, for example, commented in a later interview that she was a “普通に日本人の娘” (*a normal Japanese girl*). She further explained that “やっぱり外見が日本人で、しゃべっても普通に日本人だったりするじゃないですか” (*after all, my appearance is Japanese, and also when I speak I’m a normal Japanese*) and self-assessed her spoken Japanese as “結構うまい、結構日本語は話せたので” (*quite good, I could speak Japanese quite well*). Similarly, Fumiya also commented earlier in the interview that “話すときは、まあ、普通だと思ってますけど、日本人として普通” (*when I speak, well, I think it’s normal, normal for a Japanese*), and reported that the Japanese Second Language subject was too easy, commenting “ものすごく簡単だったでしたね、なんか、自分の作文を覚えてれば100点取れるみたいな、トピック1週間前に教えてくれて、それを書くだけなんです” (*[it] was very easy, like, if you can memorise your essay you get 100 points, they tell you the topic one week in advance, and you just write that*). Therefore, it can be observed that both participants recognised that their oral and written Japanese expertise surpassed that of a “second language learner” as defined by the eligibility criteria mentioned above, but nevertheless they sometimes adopted this position, as seen in Extracts 6-3 and 6-6 above.

One possible interpretation for this contradiction is that the disclaiming of language expertise and inheritance in Extracts 6-3 and 6-6 were attempts by the participants to position themselves as “second language learners” and accommodate themselves, or fit into the Japanese Second Language classes. In fact, fitting in may have been a necessity if they wanted to have their linguistic capital recognised as a resource that could be utilised effectively in these classrooms. This point is further illustrated in the following extract by Chika, in which she recalled how she was initially perceived as a “Japanese” (i.e. “first language speaker”) and critically assessed in classroom activities. She explained:

(Extract 6-6)

日本人だからこそ、もっと厳しく、日本人だからこそ VCE の日本語でわかっていないことがたくさんあるから、だから、あの、作文とかでもゼロ点とか 0 (れい) 点とか、いっぱいもらったんですよ
Because [the teacher thought] I was Japanese, [he was] much stricter, [he said] because I was Japanese there was a lot about the VCE Japanese that I didn't know about, so in things like essays, I got zeros, I got a lot of zeros

The reason Chika received scores of zero in her assignments was not because she did not have the appropriate linguistic resources, but because we can detect in her report the fact that her linguistic resources (presumably her fluency and pronunciation being key indexes) were perceived by her teacher as that of a “日本人” (*Japanese person*), which did not conform to “VCE の日本語” (*VCE Japanese*). In other words, Chika was not perceived as a legitimate member of the classroom and, consequently, her linguistic resources were not recognised as capital by the teacher for whom Japanese was a second language. In order to resist being marginalised in this way, the strategy that Chika took was to disclaim her language expertise and inheritance in order to conform to being worthy of a legitimate position in the classroom. This can be observed in the following extract:

(Extract 6-7)

確かに日本語として時々変な文章の構成とかあったりしたんですけど、

それは VCE の日本語だから、また違うなと思って習ってました
*There were times when thing like the sentence structure [taught in the
Japanese Second Language class] was awkward Japanese, but that's VCE
Japanese, I thought it was different and learned it*

Chika recognised that the grammar taught in class was at times unnatural, but she did not point this out and instead learned it without questioning the teacher. What this conformity (or the illusion of conformity) yielded for Chika was the “prestige, reputation and status” or symbolic capital as a legitimate “second language learner”, which allowed her to justify her enrolment in the Japanese Second Language classroom, to herself, to the teacher and to the researcher whom she knew was a university staff member and a language teacher at that university. Chika was thus able to gain the legitimacy, and with it the power to utilise her linguistic resources as capital that could be deployed in the classroom. As a result, regardless of her initial struggle to gain good marks in the classroom setting (see Extract 6-6), Chika was able to obtain a score of 50 in the final evaluation of the Japanese Second Language subject, which was the maximum score possible in any given subject.

The acquisition of legitimacy is a key concept in Bourdieu's (1977) “Theory of Practice”. He states that those in a legitimate position as defined by the field are able to exercise power without being perceived by others as exercising power. That is to say, fitting in and the symbolic capital (i.e. legitimacy) resulting from it allow one's interested action to be “misrecognized” as legitimate (or disinterested) action. Swartz (1997) explains:

Symbolic practices deflect attention from the interested character of practices and thereby contribute to their enactment as disinterested pursuits [...]
Activities and resources gain in symbolic power, or legitimacy, to the extent that they become separated from underlying material interests and hence go misrecognized as representing disinterested forms of activities and resources.
(p. 90)

This was indeed observable in Chika's accounts. Her linguistic capital and its use

gained legitimacy and symbolic power after she managed to fit in to the class as a “second language learner”. It is interesting to note that regardless of obtaining a score of 50, which was presumably higher than all of her peers, Chika did not seem to be perceived by her classmates as having an “unfair” advantage. For example:

(Extract 6-8)

- Chika: クラスメイトも普通に接してくれました、あの、上手だねとか言うんですけど、でもそんなに全然違う扱いとかも受けなかったし、クラスメイトもすごくみんながんばっていて、あの、すごく点数良くて、あの、模擬試験とかではクラスメイトのほうが私よりいい点数とるんですよ
- My classmates interacted with me normally, they said “you’re good [at Japanese]”, but I didn’t get treated very differently, my classmates were also studying very hard too, they had very good scores and they even scored better than me in the mock exams and other exams*
- Interviewer: なるほど
- I see*
- Chika: だから、全然そういうのは、へん、嫌な思いもしなかったし、あの、クラスメイトもあまり嫌な思いしていないと思います
- So, I didn’t have bad experiences and I don’t think my classmates had bad experiences either*

Based on her account, Chika appeared to have been perceived by her classmates as being on the same level, if not lower in terms of language expertise. She was perceived as someone who was merely good, which allowed her to be treated normally. As a result, her peers did not seem to perceive her as having an “unfair” advantage, as suggested in her comment in Extract 6-8 above. Chika’s emphasis that her classmates were studying very hard too seemed to be a statement to the researcher that her performance in class was not because of her language inheritance but because she too had made an effort and studied diligently. From Chika’s comments above, it is possible to observe the extent to

which Chika was able to exercise symbolic power in portraying herself as a real second language learner and by doing so have her pursuits “misrecognized” as driven by sincere desires for language development, when in actuality it was guided by underlying interests, including high marks. From this perspective, Chika was not only submitting herself to the norms of the classroom, but also actively taking advantage of them. Playing down her language expertise and inheritance was actually empowering for Chika as it gave her legitimacy and access to meaningful participation in the classroom. As contradictory as it may seem, she appeared to adjust herself to fit in to the power structure in the classroom in order to construct difference with her peers through her language expertise.

6.4 Standing out as a “Japanese”

In the above section it was possible to observe that Chika and Fumiya strategically utilised their identities to gain legitimacy in the classroom and acquired the benefits that resulted from this conformity. However, Takeshi and Anthony strategically utilised their language identities in a much different way. They, in fact, did not seem to make conscious efforts to play down their language expertise. Instead, they claimed a strong sense of language expertise and inheritance in relation to their teachers, peers and to the researcher. For example, Takeshi actually seemed to claim that Japanese was his stronger language when discussing his enrolment in the Japanese Second Language subject stating, “あ、Japanese は、日本語は終わって、点数は 45、で、scaling で 50 に上がって、今、英語、僕は英語が一番苦手なんで、授業で英語でいい成績がとったことがない” (*Oh, Japanese is, I’ve finished Japanese, my score was 45, and after scaling it went up to 50 ((All subject scores are scaled so that the resultant study scores are comparable across different studies)), now it’s English, my worst subject is English, because I’ve never received a good score in English*). Here, Takeshi seemed to be making the implicit statement that he perceived his Japanese to be his relatively stronger language. Moreover, Takeshi’s claim above seemed to be a way of self-justifying his poor performance in English by providing an explanation for why that may be the case.

Takeshi reported that in the Japanese Second Language class, he used to actively

demonstrate his language expertise in Japanese by assisting his peers. He stated, “友達のほとんどが日本語を勉強しているから、手伝ってあげている” (*most of my friends are studying Japanese, so I’m helping them*). At times, he even seemed to show off his language ability in class, which resulted in his nickname becoming “神様” (“*God*”):

(Extract 6-9)

- Takeshi: 個人的に、みんなに、みんなと同じじゃない、自分だけが違う、自分だけがみんなと違う言葉ができるとか、学校で日本語も教えられてるから、自分が日本人であることは、みんな、僕だけにとって有利であるから、日本語の勉強とか簡単にできるから、みんなから、なぜか神様ってなってて
Personally, I’m not the same as everyone, I’m the only one that’s different, I’m the only one that can use another language, since Japanese is taught at my school, the fact that I’m Japanese, everyone, it’s an advantage only for me because I can study Japanese easily, for some reason, everyone calls me “kamisama” [“God”]
- Interviewer: あはは、神様なの
Ahaha, “God”
- Takeshi: 日本語でわからない問題が一個もなかったから
Because there wasn’t a single question [in Japanese] I couldn’t answer
- Interviewer: ああ
oh
- Takeshi: はい、自分、僕が書くのは自然にあっているようになるから、僕は自分で神様だと思ってない、英語で成績が悪いから神様なわけがないと思ってる
Yes, whatever I wrote was naturally the correct answer, but I don’t think of myself as “God” because my English score is low, I can’t be “God”

While the nickname of “God” was most likely given to Takeshi in a playful fashion, it also seemed to convey a sense of respect for Takeshi’s language expertise and seemed to carry the connotation that his language expertise derived from natural or intrinsic abilities. Indeed, Takeshi explained that he was able to gain recognition in the Japanese Second Language classroom precisely because of his inheritance of “Japanese blood” from his Japanese mother:

(Extract 6-10)

日本語は、あの、日本人の血を引いてる、日本人の血を引いてるから
当然日本語ができると思われていて、それはあの、友達もしょうがない
と思っているんで、別に理解をしてくれますけど

*Japanese is, um, I have Japanese blood, because I have Japanese blood,
people think I’m naturally good at Japanese, and my friends think that can’t
be helped, and they actually show understanding towards me*

According to the above extract, Takeshi’s display of language expertise as a Japanese did little to undermine the legitimacy he received from his peers to be in the same class. They thought it was only natural that Takeshi excelled here, commenting that it cannot be helped that Takeshi out-performed them. Even the teacher of the class seemed to recognise Takeshi’s linguistic capital as a resource and evaluated it favourably, as suggested by Takeshi’s comment: “コメントもこまま続けてくださいみたいなものが多かったので、たぶん VCE のレベルでは大丈夫だったと思ってたと思います” (*the comments [from the teacher] were often “please continue as you are doing now”, so probably, [the teacher] thought that [my Japanese proficiency] was sufficient for the VCE level*). From these extracts, it can be observed that Takeshi did not need to play down his language expertise and inheritance in order to fit into the Japanese Second Language classroom, as did Chika. Indeed, it seemed that it went without saying that Takeshi was a legitimate member of the class. Furthermore, Takeshi seemed to have the power to utilise his language identity (i.e. expertise and inheritance) to project a different identity from his peers to stand out amongst classmates who were all foreign language learners.

A similar claiming of language expertise can be observed in the case of Anthony who

completed his Japanese Second Language subject through distance education due to the fact that it was not offered at his school and therefore he did not participate in a formal classroom setting with teachers and peers. Instead, he completed assignments at home and had weekly one-to-one conversations with the teacher over the phone. According to Anthony's account, the teacher's perception of his enrolment in the class seemed to have been favourable:

(Extract 6-11)

Anthony: そう、先生と勉強について話したり、学校について、とても、他の子はベーシックな質問で、どんな科目をしていますかって言って、そのリストを言ったりするのですが、そのとき僕すぐそれできたから、いろんな質問聞かれて、結構難しい質問とか聞かれてできたので

Yeah, I'd talk with the teacher about my studies, school, the other kids get very basic questions, like "what subject are you studying", and they'd usually give a list of things, but then I could do that very quickly, so I was asked a lot of questions, I was asked quite difficult questions

Interviewer: その先生はトニー君は何人だと

So what did the teacher think about your ethnicity?

Anthony: 知らないんですよ、あったことないから、最初に、だから、あの、その先生はたぶん、毎週、あの、100人ぐらい電話して、3人ぐらいしか日本人いない、だから、そのとき嬉しいんです、先生、そう思った、日本人と話せる、いつも、あの、お元気ですかとか言ってるばかりなのに

She didn't know, she hasn't met me, at the beginning, so, the teacher, every week, calls about 100 students and there's only three Japanese students, so she was happy when she called me, that's my impression, she can speak to a Japanese, she doesn't have to ask how are you and things like that

It appeared that the teacher perceived Anthony's participation positively, which allowed Anthony to actively display his language expertise as one of the three Japanese students whom the teacher enjoyed talking to. Anthony too seemed to be attributing his high performance to his language inheritance as a Japanese and utilising it as a source of distinction from non-background speaker peers whom he referred to as "the other kids". Interestingly, this extract was one of the few instances throughout the interviews in which Anthony attributed his language expertise to his sense of inheritance of Japanese from his Japanese mother. Rather, Anthony more often tended to portray himself as a second language learner and disclaimed language inheritance and expertise in Japanese. For instance, he assessed his language expertise in English to be much higher than his Japanese, stating: "僕本当に英語の方が簡単なんですよ、すごく簡単、日本語は、うん" (*for me English is really much easier, very easy, but Japanese is, yeah*). Moreover, in terms of ethnic affiliation, he frequently distanced himself from the position of a "Japanese" and identified more closely with being an "Australian". Thus, Anthony's open claim for ownership of Japanese in the extract above stands in contrast to his self-perception that could be found elsewhere in the data.

It can thus be observed that, unlike Chika and Fumiya who first needed to "fit in", Takeshi and Anthony held the legitimacy and power to openly claim expertise and inheritance, which allowed them to project a different identity from their peers. Here, the (non-)attribution of language inheritance seemed to have played a key role. It is perhaps not a coincidence that Chika and Fumiya were from families in which both parents were Japanese, while Takeshi and Anthony were from mixed marriages in which the father was an Australian and the mother was Japanese. Consequently, Chika may have been automatically attributed language inheritance by the teacher due to her name and appearance, which made her susceptible to being positioned as a first language speaker who did not fit in to the Japanese Second Language classroom (see Extract 6-6 above). Chika's teacher, who was a second language speaker of Japanese, may have felt it necessary to enforce the primacy of second language speakers in order to maintain his authority in the classroom. Within this power structure, Chika was placed in a subordinating position in which the identity position of Japanese was accessible, but was not desirable if she was to gain high marks. Thus, she needed to disclaim expertise and inheritance if she wanted to gain legitimacy and participate as a member of the

classroom. On the other hand, Anthony and Takeshi may not have had language inheritance attributed to them due to their mixed ethnicity, appearance and surnames. Their teachers, who were Japanese first language speakers, may have positioned Anthony and Takeshi as second language learners from the start. This was expressed in the following extract by Takeshi:

(Extract 6-12)

日本で育てられた高校生に比べて僕の日本語はまだ、その、日本人の日本語ではない、そのような考え持ってたかもしれないです、たぶんそうと思います、だと思います

My Japanese compared to that of a high school student who was raised in Japan still isn't, well, it's not at the same level as the Japanese used by Japanese people, I think he ((the teacher)) may have thought of it that way, I think that's probably it, I think

Although the teacher seemed to have perceived Takeshi's Japanese expertise to be relatively high, Takeshi felt that the teacher did not attribute language inheritance to him because he felt that the teacher perceived his Japanese expertise as not up to the level of a Japanese high school student raised there. Similarly, it seemed that Anthony's language expertise was higher than that expected by the teacher, resulting in praise from the teacher that he was “うまいですね、うまいですね” (*you're very good, very good*). While this comment was probably given with good intentions, it appeared to carry the underlying message that he was “very good” for a second language learner. This non-attribution of language inheritance may have thus allowed Takeshi and Anthony to automatically fit in as legitimate members of the Japanese Second Language classroom, without needing to play down their language expertise and inheritance. They were thus in a position of power that gave them the liberty to utilise their linguistic resources as a capital in order to perform well and project a different identity from their peers. However, from a different perspective, it is possible to say that not having language inheritance attributed to them meant that Takeshi and Anthony's backgrounds as a Japanese were being devalued by the teacher as not fully Japanese. When viewed in this light, in relation to a different set of norms or a “centre” of authority (Blommaert, 2010: 39) in which the legitimacy was placed on Japanese people, Takeshi and Anthony

were placed in a subordinating position that lacked legitimacy. Therefore, Takeshi and Anthony's repeated claiming of language expertise and inheritance examined thus far may have had two simultaneous functions: firstly, to project a different identity and gain distinction from peers in reference to a centre which placed legitimacy on second language learners, and secondly, to legitimatise their backgrounds as a Japanese and resist marginalisation in reference to a centre which placed legitimacy on being fully Japanese. The simultaneity of such investment will be examined in more depth in Chapter 7 below.

6.5 Caught in-between two “centres”

While in the cases examined so far, all of the participants were able to navigate the power structures of the classrooms by effectively utilising their language identities, not all of the participants were successful in this regard. This seemed to be the case with Teru, who spent the most number of years in Japan (10 years) and came from a family in which both parents were English-speaking Chinese nationals, as described above. Teru also enrolled in the Japanese Second Language subject one year previous to this study (i.e. when he was in Year 11) to gain a high score towards his tertiary entrance score. However, even though he chose to enrol in the Japanese Second Language subject, he resisted the position of a second language learner. Unlike Chika and Fumiya who strategically projected such an identity and seemed to be comfortable being positioned as such by teachers and peers, Teru reported that he resisted fitting in. For example:

(Extract 6-13)

でも、レベル的には、まあ、まあまあの場所、いや、その、ファーストランゲージの子とは、全然、よりは低いと思うんですけど、もし本当のセカンドランゲージと比べたら、全然上だと思うんですけどね、たぶん、VCE セカンドランゲージよりは全然上だと思ってます
But, level-wise, well, I'm at an okay level, no, well, [my Japanese level is] much lower compared to “first language”, but when compared with real second language [students], I think it's much higher, I think, [my Japanese level] is way higher than VCE [Japanese] Second Language

His reference to “real” second language students seemed to suggest that he did not consider himself a second language learner. He showed a strong resistance to being categorised as such and distanced himself from his peers whom he called “そこらへんのオージー” (*ordinary Aussies*). Teru expressed his sense of frustration for potentially being perceived by others as belonging to the same category with “はつきりしゃべれなくて、暗記してしゃべってる子達” (*kids who just memorise and talk and can't speak Japanese clearly*).

It is thus possible to observe that, similar to Takeshi and Anthony, Teru also sought to project a different identity from second language learners. However, while Takeshi and Anthony could emphasise their language inheritance as a Japanese to achieve this end, Teru did not, or could not, do so. He seemed hesitant to compare himself to first language speakers, commenting: “説明のうまさっていうか、とにかく、日本の常識って言うか、日本のことを知ってるっていうか、なんか時々付いて行けない場所があったりするんですよ” (*things like the ability to explain things, Japanese common sense, knowledge about Japan, sometimes there are places which I can't follow*). While Teru's perceived lack of cultural knowledge and language expertise may have been a factor that prevented him claiming language inheritance of Japanese, it appears that “ethnicity” as a secondary form of embodied capital was also a key factor. Bourdieu (1984) accords importance not only to the primary forms of capital (i.e. economic, cultural, social and symbolic capital), but also secondary factors including “gender, race or ethnicity, place of residence and age” (Swartz, 1997:154) that further stratify a certain social class (in a very broad sense of the word). He argues that “the volume and composition of capital give specific form and value to the determinations which the other factors (age, sex, place of residence, etc.) impose on practices” (Bourdieu, 1984 as cited in Swartz, 1997: 155).

While Takeshi and Anthony held embodied ethnic capital as a Japanese due to their mothers' ethnicity, Teru did not have access to this capital because both of his parents were Chinese. As seen in Extract 6-9 above, Takeshi could construct difference with second language learners precisely by emphasising his language inheritance, which derived from his ethnic capital (i.e. “Japanese blood”), even though he had not lived or

studied in Japan. On the other hand, although Teru spent 10 years in Japan and even had formal experience of schooling there, he could not (or felt he could not) claim inheritance of Japanese because of his perceived lack of an ethnic inheritance. Therefore, although Takeshi, Anthony and Teru all sought to construct difference with second language learners, the ability to do so by claiming language inheritance and thus the identity position of Japanese was not accessible to all of them.

In this regard, there seemed to be a hierarchy within this group of students, with Takeshi and Anthony possessing the symbolic capital and power to potentially gain legitimacy as a Japanese, and Teru who seemingly lacked the symbolic capital and power to do so. Indeed, Teru expressed his sense of powerlessness in not being able to access this identity position elsewhere in the interview. For example, as it can be observed in Extract 5-20 above, for Teru, his perceived lack of ethnicity as a Japanese prevented him from distinguishing himself in reference to second language learners, and also from fitting in and gaining legitimacy in reference to Japanese people. His comment above shows Teru's frustration at being unable to resist being positioned as a second language learner due to factors which were outside of his control. Teru's predicament was perhaps best summarised in his comment, “もし、日本で生まれたなら、もう少し日本のアイデンティティーを強調って言うか、出していきたいっていうか、なんか、はい” (*since I was born in Japan, I want to emphasise my identity from Japan a little bit more, put it out more, like yeah*). It seemed that implicit in Teru's word choice “日本のアイデンティティー” (literally, *identity from Japan*) was his consciousness towards his lack of ethnic capital that prevented him from projecting a “日本人のアイデンティティー” (*identity as a Japanese person*).

Therefore, perhaps the only choice left for Teru was to resist the position of second language learner through his language expertise. However, he was unsuccessful in obtaining a better score than his classmates, which left him with no choice but to submit to the position of second language learner. This led to a sense of confusion. He commented:

(Extract 6-14)

それが悔しくて、uni-japに入ったのも一つです、もうなんか、お母さんとも結構けんかして、で、その、去年先生だった土曜校の先生ともたくさん話して、どうしてその点数が取れなかったか、正直、絶対50は取れると思ったんですよ、すべてがパーフェクトだと思ったのに、よくわかりません、成績は41で止まっちゃって、ロースコアが41で、フミヤとも5点差があって、もうなんか、何を信じて良いかわかんなかったです

It was frustrating, and that's one of the reasons for taking uni-Jap ((short for "university Japanese", which refers to the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject at university)), I even had a lot of fights with my mother, and I talked a lot with my teacher who was also my Japanese Saturday School teacher, about why I couldn't get the score I wanted, to tell you the truth, I thought I could surely get a score of 50 [in the overall subject score for the VCE Japanese Second Language subject], I thought everything went perfectly, but I don't know, my score stopped at 41 ((out of a maximum of 50)), there was a five point difference with Fumiya, so like, I didn't know what to believe.

Teru's frustration seemed to come not only from his lack of success in gaining a high score, but also from his lack of success in determining the terms by which he entered and participated in the *field*. He was in effect caught in-between these two positions, and could not gain symbolic capital in reference to either centre.

6.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have examined the complex ways in which the participants in this study negotiated their identities in the Japanese Second Language subject. Although the students' initial motivation for enrolling in the subject seemed to be driven by an instrumental interest in high tertiary entrance scores, this is not to say that the participants' identities played only a marginal role in the Japanese Second Language classroom. While the identity strategies utilised by Chika and Fumiya, Takeshi and Anthony and Teru seemed to be different, they indeed shared underlying commonalities when examined within the power structure of the classroom. That is to say, regardless of

whether the identity strategy taken was the disclaiming or claiming of expertise and inheritance, it was possible to interpret all of these strategies as bids to claim legitimacy and acquire symbolic capital. This process of gaining legitimation was closely connected to gaining and facilitating access to a variety of interests, including high tertiary entrance scores, distinction from peers, participation in class, identity as a “Japanese”, and so on. In this regard, language identities were more than dispositions toward one’s languages but were “interest-oriented” strategies aimed at, perhaps unconsciously, “maximizing of material and symbolic profits” (Bourdieu, 1990: 16 as cited in Swartz, 1997: 67) that one is able to accrue in the field. Furthermore, it may be important to note here that although heritage learners have often been portrayed as illegitimate learners attempting to make use of “unfair” advantage to gain high marks (de Kretser and Spence-Brown, 2010), the analysis presented in this chapter has shown that the interests pursued by the students in the Japanese Second Language classrooms are indeed multifaceted.

Moreover, it was also possible to observe that the notion of legitimacy itself was a complex concept, with the participants being subject to not only one legitimate way of acting or thinking, but a multiplicity of centres which governed the norms and determined what was deemed legitimate. In the examples I illustrated above, there were at least two identifiable centres which influenced the identity strategies utilised by the participants. Firstly, at the local institutional level, there was a centre which placed legitimacy on second language speakers, and secondly, on a trans-local level, there was a centre that placed legitimacy on Japanese people. As Blommaert (2010) claims, when considering such “polycentricity” (Blommaert, 2010: 39) of the field, seemingly contradictory accounts of identities by the participants may not be “fragmented” accounts of identities that lack coherence. Instead, they were organised around multiple centres, both real and perceived, which the participants conformed to or resisted through the strategic use of their language identities. Identity strategies thus can be said to have occurred at the intersection of the field and the individual dispositions constructed through personal histories, and underlined by an element of competitiveness for legitimation and social distinction.

From a theoretical perspective, both of the above-mentioned centres appeared to be

underlined by a discourse that posited a “fixed” connection between language and its function as a marker of ethnicity. For instance, Chika was assumed at first to be a first language speaker because of her visible features and the linguistic resources she possessed, including pronunciation and fluency. On the other hand, Takeshi’s linguistic resources were given considerable legitimacy from his peers because the Japanese language was something that others felt he inherited by virtue of having “Japanese blood”. While such a discourse worked to the advantage of Takeshi and Anthony who appeared to have received considerable legitimacy to utilise their expertise, on the other hand, Chika and Fumiya were able to access their expertise only after they had disaligned the connection between their language and ethnicity by disclaiming their language inheritance. Furthermore, in Teru’s case, language inheritance (and by extension the identity position of Japanese) was not even accessible to him because of his perceived lack of an ethnic inheritance. In this regard, while all of the participants can be considered heritage learners, there was a hierarchical stratification of power within this group, with those who could determine the terms by which they participated in the classroom, and those who could not.

CHAPTER 7 Constructing difference in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject

In this chapter, I examine the students' accounts of their engagement in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject which was administered by the university, and will explore the identity negotiations in the class amongst the Japanese heritage learners. I will illustrate how the subject was a much different environment from the Japanese Second Language classroom examined in the previous chapter. Below, I will show how the students draw on their linguistic and cultural resources to position themselves and others, claim legitimacy and also attempt to construct difference in and outside of the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject. What the data appeared to strongly suggest was the students attempt to disalign any fixed connection between the Japanese language and ethnicity. Rather, they appeared to conceptualise their Japanese linguistic resources as a capital for social distinction and the construction of "transnational(ised) identities" (Vertovec, 2001).

7.1 Setting the context

As mentioned in the previous chapter (see 6.1), high achieving secondary school students could opt to complete a VCE subject during Year 11 and thus go on to do Higher Education study as Year 12 students, depending upon the availability of such a subject. These Higher Education subjects were often called "Extension study" and were offered by higher education institutions (i.e. universities), and both the content and assessment of these subjects were equivalent to a first-year university subject. Upon successful completion of an Extension study subject, students were able to gain additional points towards their tertiary entrance score and also receive credit towards an undergraduate qualification at the institution where the Extension study was undertaken (Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority, 2013a).

To enrol in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject which was one such Extension study subject, in addition to meeting the eligibility criteria mentioned in 4.2 above, students were required to undergo a placement test that consisted of a written test and an oral interview. Of the seven participants in this study, six students (Anthony,

Takeshi, John, Chika, Teru and Fumiya) enrolled in the course as Year 12 Extension study students, and one students (Yuta) enrolled as a third-year university student as noted above. All of these participants enrolled in 2011 and were classmates. The Japanese for Background Speakers' subject was taught by two female teachers (hereafter referred to as T1 and T2) who were staff members of the university and were ethnically Japanese but with extended experience of living in English-speaking countries.

For the students in this study, the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject seemed to be a considerably different environment from the Japanese Second Language classroom in two ways. Firstly, a major difference was the presence of peers who had Japanese backgrounds. Some students had two Japanese parents (for example, Chika, Yuta and Fumiya), while some had one (for example, Anthony, Takeshi and John), and one student had parents who had Chinese backgrounds (for example, Teru). Therefore, contrary to the Japanese Second Language classroom examined in the previous chapter, for some students, their Japanese backgrounds no longer provided them with the same legitimacy and distinction that it did in an environment where a majority of the peers were foreign language learners of Japanese.

Secondly, another equally significant change was that the level of competence expected from the students and which the subject aimed to further develop in them was much higher than which characterised the Japanese Second Language classroom. Interviews with the teachers revealed that they appeared to assume that the students who enrol in this subject should already have at least the oral competence on the par with “native speakers”. In the following extract, T1 commented that this was indeed the level of competence she looked for during the placement interviews:

(Extract 7-1)

高校生が受けるやつはもうこういう簡単なテストで、こう話がネイティブ並みに話せるかどうか、私たちの日本語が上手にできるか、あ、聞けるかどうかを見てるんですけど

The [placement] tests that the high school students take are these easy tests, and [we test] whether they can speak at the level of a native speaker, we see

whether they can understand our ((the two teachers of the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject)) Japanese well

T1's emphasis on the students' ability to understand the Japanese spoken by "us", by which she refers to herself and T2 both as teachers and also possibly as Japanese individuals suggests that the competence of Japanese people may have been a norm and a point of reference to which the students were compared against.

Furthermore, the curriculum and materials utilised in class also appeared to place the level of a "native speaker" as an implicit goal in terms of the students' literacy skills, which was presumed to be somewhat lower than their spoken competence. For instance, according to T2, the curriculum emphasised content-based instruction that utilised authentic materials that are typically read by Japanese people. The *kanji* the students were required to learn was based on *kyōyō kanji*, which was comprised of 1006 characters that appeared most often in such Japanese materials. In addition, a focus of one of the modules of the subject was given to "understand[ing] polite expressions and using them effectively in Japanese that suit formal contexts" – an ability that may be needed in complex social or business situations but which the students rarely utilised in Australia, as evidenced by their language use diaries.

What seemed to underlie the teachers' expectations was a perception that the Japanese language was an integral part of the students' heritage as Japanese individuals and that it comprised an important part of their bilingual repertoire. For instance, when the researcher queried T1 about the significance of teaching Japanese to this group of students, she answered:

(Extract 7-2)

生まれ持ったスキルっていうか、ラッキーなので、それが活かせるようにできる授業っていうか、日本語をなんかただスキル、読むスキル書くスキルだけで教えるんじゃないくて、これから自分が生きてく長い人生、大学終わった後も、クラスが終わった後も使えるツールになるようなものにできるように教えられればいいなと思います、せっかく

の、可能性のある人たちなので

It's ((Japanese)) a skill that they were born with, they are lucky after all, so I want the class to be a place where they can learn to make use of those skills, and I don't want to teach Japanese just as a skill, like reading skills, writing skills, but rather as a skill that they can use even after they finish university, after they finish the class, in the life that they live, in the long life that they have, they are, after all, people with a lot of potential

For T1, the consolidation of the students' competence was important precisely because Japanese was a skill that they were born with – a matter of inheritance of the students. Given this comment, perhaps the high expectations towards the students' Japanese competence were incorporated into the curriculum so that the students could develop the competence on the par with a Japanese individual. In addition, the development of the students' Japanese competence to the level of Japanese people was important also because of its potential values as a tool that could be utilised outside of the university setting and generally as a skill that could be used in their lives.

Indeed, the high expectations of the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject seemed to be supported by the students themselves, who reported that it was a welcomed challenge because the Japanese Second Language subject they completed previously was much too easy. Furthermore, the value placed on the students' inheritance of Japanese and the development of bilingual competence also seemed to reflect the expectations of the students and their parents (see 5.2 above).

However, a significant consequence of this change in the environment was that the hurdle for claiming inheritance of Japanese and/or claiming legitimacy as a speaker of Japanese was much higher than in the Japanese Second Language subject. For example, this can be observed in how T1 positioned the students in class. She evaluated both Chika and Takeshi's Japanese competence highly, stating “やっぱりタケシさんとチカさんは飛びぬけてできましたね、日本人と話してるような感じですね” (*obviously, Takeshi and Chika were a head above the other students, it was like talking to a Japanese person*). T1 further commented, “タケシさんは、こうなんか頭がいい

子って感じがする、まじめに見える、チカさんもきれいに書く、期待できる感じですね” (*Takeshi, he seems like a smart kid, he seems like a hard worker, Chika also has good handwriting, [she] seems very promising*). It is possible to observe that Chika and Takeshi’s resources, including pronunciation, fluency and handwriting were highly valued by the teacher. Moreover, for T1, these resources were not only signs of Chika and Takeshi’s academic capabilities as promising students, but also indexical of their ethnic identity and legitimacy as Japanese individuals.

While the above-described discourse seemed to legitimise students like Chika who held the linguistic and cultural resources that conformed to these Japanese norms, it also functioned to label some students who did not have the “right” linguistic and cultural resources as less legitimately Japanese. For instance, in the following extract, T1 commented on her evaluation of Anthony’s Japanese competence:

(Extract 7-3)

トニーさん、うんと、漢字は弱いんじゃないかと思ったんですけど、まあ字が汚いですからね、話しは、オーストラリア人っぽく話す子だなと、話し方と態度が、まじめな感じはしない

Tony, um, I thought his kanji was weak, well, because his handwriting is bad, in terms of speaking, he talks like an Australian, the way he talks and his attitude, doesn't seem like a hardworking student

In fact, Anthony’s Japanese linguistic resources – limited *kanji* knowledge, untidy handwriting, pronunciation and his particular ways of talking – were not only an indication of his lack of competence in Japanese but also indexical of his lack of legitimacy as a Japanese and thus the ascription of an identity position as an Australian. It is quite possible that T1’s evaluation was also enforced by the presence of students like Chika and Takeshi who did meet her expectations.

Therefore, it is possible to observe that the Japanese for Background Speakers’ subject was a stratified *field* where access to legitimacy as a speaker of Japanese was not equally distributed amongst the students. Firstly, as examined above, this may have been because of the teachers’ perception of the connection between Japanese and its

function as a marker of ethnicity. Secondly, as I will demonstrate below, this may have also been because of the varying levels of cultural capital the students brought to the classroom. Faced with this new environment, the students may have needed to re-evaluate their linguistic and cultural resources and re-consider how they positioned themselves vis-à-vis their peers and the norms of the classroom. Moreover, legitimacy may have needed to be locally negotiated with their peers in this setting. In the following sections, I will focus on the students' accounts of their participation in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject to analyse how they draw on their linguistic and cultural resources to position themselves and others in the class. Through the analysis, I will also examine the students' underlying interest in constructing difference inside and outside of the classroom.

7.2 Conceptualising Japanese as a “heritage”

As observed in T1's comments above, Chika seemed to possess the linguistic and cultural resources (i.e. *habitus*) to enable her to fit into the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject. In addition, relative to her peers, Chika held the most cultural resources often associated with Japanese individuals, including name, place of birth, parents' ethnicity, language of the home and appearance. She had also spent the most number of years attending the Japanese Saturday School and thus had the most exposure to a formal Japanese-speaking classroom environment.

Perhaps due to the legitimacy that Chika's linguistic and cultural resources received from the teachers, when reporting her experience in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject, she herself appeared to actively position herself as a Japanese and commented that she surely hoped that the teachers perceived her that way too. As I will illustrate below, she even seemed to claim inheritance of the Japanese language. Considering that Chika reported that she disclaimed her language inheritance and downplayed her expertise in the Japanese Second Language subject, which she completed a year prior to entering this subject, this was a considerably different position she adopted in this subsequent class.

Indeed, Chika reported that in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject, she

openly talked about her sociocultural knowledge of Japan, explaining that she was often engaged in “日本人っぽい話” (*Japanese-like topics*) and that she was most up-to-date amongst her peers with Japanese dramas, books, magazines and music. In the interview, when Chika was commenting on her study in the Japanese for Background Speakers’ subject, she explained to the researcher that she was so Japanese-like because of her parents’ ethnicity, explaining that “それも親の影響があって、あたしの親がすごく普通に日本人なので、結構その娘も普通に日本人の考え方をもち、日本人の常識があるっていう見方が” (*that’s my parents’ influence, my parents are really normal Japanese people, so as a daughter, I have Japanese ways of thinking, and have common sense that Japanese people have*). Chika thus seemed to attribute her “ways of thinking” to her ethnically Japanese parents.

In addition, when the researcher queried Chika about her performance in the Japanese for Background Speakers’ subject, she attributed this to her home language and her parents’ diligent effort to teach her Japanese, explaining, “父と話してて、あのあたしが何で日本語話せるかって話をしてたんですけど、それで、両親が言ってたのは、あたしが小学生、小学校の間、お父さんが毎晩毎晩日本の絵本を読んでくれたんです、寝る前に” (*I was talking to my Dad, and we were talking about why I can speak Japanese, and what my parents said was, when I was in primary school, during primary school, my Dad would read children’s books to me every night before I went to sleep*). In the above excerpt, the Japanese language thus appeared to be conceptualised as something that Chika inherited from her parents.

In the excerpts above, Chika appeared to be making a strong connection between her linguistic resources and her ethnicity and thus conceptualising them as an integral part of her inheritance as a Japanese individual. Her heritage was evidence of the quality of her linguistic resources, and conversely the quality of her linguistic resources was thanks to her inheritance of Japanese. Japanese ways of thinking and common sense, too, were cultural resources that she felt she acquired from her home environment and from her parents who were born in Japan and ethnically normal Japanese people.

Chika’s claim to inheritance and the legitimacy of her linguistic resources seemed to provide Chika with additional respect from her peers (i.e. symbolic capital). As the

following comments by Teru shows, this was not only because Chika's linguistic resources conformed to "native speaker" or Japanese norms. It seemed that the very fact that Chika was born to Japanese parents (and thus perceived to have inherited Japanese) provided her with added symbolic capital. As Teru commented:

(Extract 7-4)

チカとかも、チカはもう信じられないです、頭良すぎです、あれは、もう、頭良すぎっていうか、もう正直、オーストラリア生まれじゃないんですけど、幼稚園でこっちにきて、あれだけできるっていうがもうなんかおかしいです、まあ、親が両方日本人で、だからの部分もあると思うんですけど

Chika, I can't believe Chika, she's too smart, she's really too smart, to be honest, she's not born in Australia and came here during prep year, but to be that good is just unbelievable, well, her parents are both Japanese, that's probably part of the reason

While Teru felt that it was unbelievable that Chika's Japanese expertise was so high despite not being educated in Japan, he seemed to accept this explanation that it was probably because Chika's parents were Japanese. The fact that Chika inherited Japanese from her parents seemed to add a sense of unquestionable legitimacy to her linguistic resources that made it impossible for Teru to contest. For him, inheritance seemed to be much more important than going to school there, particularly because Teru may have felt that it was something he could not claim, due to his Chinese parents. For Chika, it thus seemed that inheritance of Japanese was indeed claimable in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject. It may have been advantageous to make such a claim as it provided her with the legitimacy and the profit of distinction from her peers, as already indicated. This was a significant change in the identity position that she adopted when compared to her accounts of the Japanese Second Language subject. It is probably reasonable to claim that this change may have been invoked by her participation in a *field* where her linguistic and cultural resources were deemed to be valuable assets by the teachers, peers and the curriculum.

In addition, it appeared that Chika actively seemed to emphasise her inheritance not

only as a way of claiming legitimacy as a speaker of Japanese but also as a way for her to differentiate herself from her peers whom she may have felt were less legitimate inheritors of Japanese. For instance, in the following extract, Chika reported on her evaluation of John, who had one Japanese parent and whom she may have perceived as a less competent speaker of Japanese:

(Extract 7-5)

うーん、例えば、ジョン君とかは外見が結構、あの、純日本人じゃないじゃないですか、だから、ジョン君がもし、私と同じような、なんかちょっと中途半端な日本語話しても、なんか、相手は許してくれるような気がするんですけど、私が話せなかったら、ちょっと変な日本人って扱いを受けたら悲しいなと思ってもっと良い日本語が話せたらいいなって思います

For instance, John, his appearance isn't purely Japanese, so even if John speaks mediocre Japanese like me, I think people would forgive him. But if I couldn't speak, I'd get treated like a weird Japanese and that would be sad, that's why I want to speak better Japanese

In the above extract, Chika seemed to accord less legitimacy to John and his linguistic resources on the basis of not being a “pure Japanese”, and explaining that it could not be helped that his Japanese linguistic competence did not conform to Japanese norms. At the same time, Chika also seemed to be saying that it was precisely because she inherited Japanese that she was expected to be better than John. While the extract above may be a reflection of the expectations other Japanese speakers placed on Chika, it could also be interpreted as Chika's claim to inheritance and her attempt to construct difference with her peers.

A similar case can be observed in Yuta's evaluation of John and Anthony's competence in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject. In the extract below, Yuta, who had two Japanese parents, seemed to make a strong connection between one's competence in Japanese and one's ethnicity as a Japanese individual. When the researcher asked him how he perceived his peers' Japanese competence, he answered as follows:

(Extract 7-6)

上手だと思います、特に、ハーフの子たちは、やっぱ家では常に英語で話してるとかおっしゃてるので、それでもそれなりに日本語が上手だなって感心します、でも、あの、訛りのある人もいますけど、それは仕方がないかなって、ジョン君と、トニー君は、少し英語なまりですけど、まあ、そんな気になるほどじゃないですし、他の外国人から見たら、あ、キレイな日本語しゃべってるなって思われる

I think it's ((the other students' Japanese)) good, especially, the "mixed-ethnicity" kids, they say that they speak English at home, but regardless of that they can speak Japanese quite well and I'm impressed by that, but, um, some of them pronounce things differently, but that can't be helped, John, Anthony, they have an English-sounding pronunciation, but, well, it's not too noticeable, compared to other foreigners, I think they speak good Japanese

Yuta felt that while the “ハーフ” (*mixed-ethnicity*) students like Anthony and John were indeed competent speakers of Japanese, they spoke with a pronunciation that deviated from standard Japanese norms. Such a deviation was perceived as indexical of Anthony and John's lack of legitimacy as a Japanese and, conversely, their lack of inheritance as individuals who did not have two Japanese parents and who did not use Japanese at home were reasons why they did not speak good Japanese. Yuta thus “adequated” (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005: 599) them to foreigners and implicitly labelled them as less legitimate inheritors of Japanese. Similar to Chika's comments in Extract 7-5 above, Yuta also seemed to be implicitly claiming inheritance and differentiating himself from his peers who had mixed-ethnic backgrounds.

7.3 Proving one's legitimacy

As was observed in the previous sections, there seemed to be an underlining discourse that Japanese was an inheritance or heritage and an inseparable part of one's ethnicity. That is to say, there appeared to be a fixed connection between the Japanese language and its function as a marker of ethnicity. In order to position themselves as Japanese individuals, students may have needed to demonstrate that their linguistic resources conformed to Japanese norms and also show that they possessed the cultural resources

to claim inheritance of Japanese. While Chika and Yuta could align themselves to this discourse to construct legitimacy and differentiate themselves from their peers, it seemed to have posed challenges to students like Takeshi and Teru who possessed the linguistic resources but did not possess the same amount of cultural resources relative to Chika and Yuta. For example, in Takeshi's case, while he had attended Japanese Saturday School and his competence was quite high, as attested by the teachers' evaluation of his performance in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject, he had an Australian father, had never lived in Japan and did not speak only in Japanese at home. These factors and the presence of students like Chika and Yuta may have made Takeshi feel that he was less entitled to claim inheritance of Japanese.

As a result, while Takeshi could comfortably claim inheritance of Japanese and an identity as a Japanese individual in the Japanese Second Language class by emphasising his Japanese blood (see Extract 6-10), he appeared not to (or unable to) make such references to this inheritance when talking about the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject. Instead, it appeared to become increasingly important for him to make extra effort to demonstrate the quality of his linguistic capital as a means of showing that he was entitled to be in the class. For Takeshi, legitimacy was no longer something inherent and granted to him by virtue of having Japanese blood, but appeared to become something he had to negotiate and prove to his peers through other means.

Takeshi's accounts of his participation in the subject certainly appeared to be marked by a strong consciousness towards demonstrating his linguistic expertise and sociocultural knowledge of Japan to his peers and teachers. For Takeshi, the weekly *kanji* quizzes and the weekly short essays that the students were required to submit to the online discussion board provided him with visible ways of displaying his competence to the class. Takeshi was highly conscious of the score he received in these activities and often asked the teachers in clear hearing of the other students in class about his score, to which the teacher sometimes obligingly answered. Therefore the other students in the class knew that Takeshi consistently scored quite high in the tests. Takeshi appeared to take pride in his Japanese competence and sometimes this seemed to verge on over-confidence. In some cases, he even seemed to challenge the marks that the teachers gave him. In the following extract, Takeshi recalled how he queried the teacher about

why he received a certain mark in the *kanji* tests and weekly short essays, which was lower than what he had expected and which he felt was unjustified:

(Extract 7-7)

漢字クイズの点数は18、19ぐらい、20点満点、で、間違ってるのがちっちゃいところって、先生に言われるんです、あとは、オンラインディスカッションも、あの、先週は減点、どこが減点、なんで減点されてるのか、ちょっと話し合ったんですけど、それは、返してもらう時に、そのポイントとか多い方が減点されてるから、僕、家帰って全部読んだらあんまりポイントついてないから、減点されてないと思う

My scores for the kanji quizzes are about 18, 19, out of 20 full marks, and the teacher tells me it's very small things that I get wrong, and also in the online discussion boards, last week, I had points taken off and I talked a little with the teacher about where I was marked down and why I was marked down, that's because when she returned it to me, the more corrections there are, the more points you get marked down, so I went home and read it again and there weren't too many corrections in it, so I don't think I should have been marked down so much

These classroom activities and accompanying marks seemed to provide Takeshi with a measurable and comparable way of displaying his competence to his peers and, by challenging and consulting the teacher about his marks, he appeared to construct himself as a very engaged and capable student. Furthermore, Takeshi reported that he noticed that he read faster than the other students. He commented:

(Extract 7-8)

あの授業中で音読するところが多いんですけど、僕はびっくりしたのは、その、読むのが僕は、意外と遅かったと思ってるんですよ [...] 普通に読んでたんで、まあ、みんなよりは少しは早いなと思ったんだけど、みんなに気づかれるほど早いとは思ってませんでした

We often read out loud in class, and what surprised me was that, I thought I read rather slowly [...] because I was reading as I usually do, well I noticed I

read a little faster than everyone, but I didn't think it was so fast that the others would take notice

While it is possible that Takeshi genuinely noticed his ability to read faster than his peers, it also appeared that the reading activities were an opportunity for him to routinely display his competent reading ability. Considering that Takeshi invested very little time and effort in the subject at home, as attested by the teachers' comments, Takeshi may have been more conscious of the impression that his performance gave to the other students, perhaps more so than actually developing his Japanese competence. It is possible to observe Takeshi's investment in the assessment criteria and the norms of the classroom in attempts to negotiate legitimacy using his expertise vis-à-vis the students and teachers and "sediment" (Butler, 1993 as cited in Otsuji, 2008) throughout the semester his identity as a legitimate Japanese speaker.

A similar investment in proving one's legitimacy through expertise can be observed in Teru's accounts. He too may have felt that he could not claim the same level of inheritance as a Japanese individual in the sense that the other students like Chika and Yuta could. Even though he had spent the most number of years in Japan (10 years) and had formal schooling there, he commented somewhat apologetically at the first interview that “日本の血がないんで” (*I don't have Japanese blood*). His parents were both Chinese nationals and the language of the home was English-dominant. Perhaps for this reason, Teru may have been reluctant to claim inheritance of Japanese in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject vis-à-vis his peers who all had some Japanese ethnic background. Thus, similar to Takeshi, Teru appeared to invest a considerable amount of time and effort demonstrating his expertise to his peers and teachers, particularly in the written modality. Perhaps this was to make up for his perceived lack of inheritance as a Japanese individual. His writing skills and the weekly short essays on the online discussion board were particularly important opportunities that provided him with a means of claiming legitimacy in the class. When the researcher asked Teru about the noticeable amount of effort he invested in the online discussion board essays, he commented that this was a conscious investment:

(Extract 7-9)

今回の、例えば、なんか言うのも嫌なんですけど、このモジュールっていうか、毎週作文書く、書いてて、書いてるときも、みんな 500 字だけで止まるときは、絶対 1000 文字以上書くみたいな、そういう意識しています

This time, for example, I feel bad saying this, in this module, we write a short essay every week, we're writing it, when I'm writing it, where everyone stops at 500 characters, I make sure to write 1000 characters, I make a conscious effort to do that

The fact that the essays were posted online and visible to everyone was particularly important. Indeed, Teru made a considerable effort in writing the essay to display that he could in fact write more and perhaps better than his peers. When the researcher asked him about why he made such an effort, he responded, “もう頑張って、こう、まあ、僕は、なんか証明したいです、41 の生徒じゃないぞって” (*to work hard, and, like, I wanted to prove that I am not a student that gets a score of 41 [in the final evaluation of the VCE Japanese Second Language subject]*). Teru seemed to be aware that if he did not demonstrate the quality of his linguistic resources, he could potentially be seen as a “student that gets a score of 41”, in other words, a second language learner who was out of place in a class with peers with a Japanese heritage background. Moreover, it may be significant that his comparison appeared to be vis-à-vis Chika, whom he felt was Japanese, commenting, “たぶん、一番証明させたいのは彼女ですね、絶対負けないみたいな” (*I think, she's the person I want to prove myself to the most, it's like I definitely don't want to be beaten by her*). He may have felt that if he was able to perform better than Chika – a student with Japanese parents – he would be able to prove his legitimacy as a speaker of Japanese despite not having Japanese blood.

As examined above, for both Takeshi and Teru, the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject appeared to be a *field* where they may have needed to actively demonstrate their language expertise in order to establish their legitimacy as a speaker of Japanese and as a member of the classroom. To this end, the curriculum as well as the literacies that they brought to the classroom provided them with means of claiming legitimacy and, in some instances, gain distinction even where it was not automatically “granted as a gift

of inheritance” (Blackledge & Creese, 2011:136). Indeed, both Takeshi and Teru can be said to have succeeded in this regard, as the former was successful in being perceived by his peers as a highly competent speaker and someone attuned to Japanese popular culture. Moreover, the other students, including Chika, regarded Teru highly for his exceptional writing skills. They both thus constructed legitimacy and distinction utilising their expertise rather than inheritance, and capitalised on the opportunities offered to them by the more challenging curriculum.

7.4 Aligning to alternative ways of being “Japanese”

7.4.1 Constructing transnational identities

Thus far, based on the students’ accounts of their participation in the Japanese for Background Speakers’ subject, I have analysed the different ways in which the students appeared to construct legitimacy and position themselves in the classroom. The identity positions adopted and the strategies utilised by these students in this class were much different from those in the Japanese Second Language classroom discussed in the previous chapter. This may have been a result of the higher expectations from the teachers of the Japanese for Background Speakers’ subject in terms of the students’ Japanese competence and the presence of peers with Japanese backgrounds, which changed the relative value of their linguistic and cultural resources.

However, it may be misleading to say that the students’ investment in constructing legitimacy were driven only by their desire to conform to the expectations of the classroom or to be seen and positioned as Japanese individuals. In fact, as I will examine in the following sections, the students’ investment could have a “simultaneity of contrasting interpretations” (Blommaert, 2013: 3). That is to say, the students also seemed to be aligning to a more pluristic definition of being “Japanese” that was not defined by ethnicity and heritage but rather indexical of their “transnational(ised) identities” (Vertovec, 2001: 578).

For example, although Takeshi and Teru seemed to be demonstrating their competence where it was most visible to the teachers and peers in order to prove their legitimacy,

they did not appear to be investing in positioning themselves as a Japanese individual. When the researcher asked Takeshi if he felt he was Japanese in the class, he confidently answered “no”, explaining as follows:

(Extract 7-10)

日本人じゃないから、オーストラリアで産まれたし、育ったし、日本語がわかるだけでは日本人じゃない、ちゃんと日本人の考え方とかもありますから、よくわからないですけど、僕はその考え方とかがない、接してないと思うから、オーストラリア人だと

Because I'm not Japanese, I was born in Australia, grew up here, knowing the Japanese language doesn't make someone Japanese, there's Japanese ways of thinking, I don't know, but I don't have that way of thinking, haven't been exposed to it, so I'm Australian

Takeshi seemed to be downplaying the significance of the cultural capital sometimes associated with Japanese individuals, including nationality, ethnicity, place of birth, place of education and ways of thinking. Given his self-perceived high expertise in the language, Takeshi may have been suggesting that he in fact possessed the linguistic expertise on the par with any other Japanese individual, but that he cared little about identifying as such.

It certainly is possible that Takeshi's comments in Extract 7-10 above were due to his sense of lack of entitlement to claim a Japanese identity because of the presence of students like Chika and Yuta, as discussed in the previous section. However, it seemed that it was not that he was unable to identify as such, but rather that he was resisting the identity position of Japanese as defined by membership in a single nation or ethnicity. The following comments by Teru suggest that this may have indeed been the case. Teru recalled a class discussion on the topic of the Second World War, and commented that he felt the teacher (T1) was justifying some of the acts committed by the Japanese government at the time. He explained that this was probably because T1 had too much pride in being Japanese:

(Extract 7-11)

なんか日本にすごいプライド感じている部分あると思います、だから時々、なんか、悪い意味じゃないんですけど、絡みづらいときもあります、なんか、すごい日本人っていうのも例えばあるとき、授業のトピックで、日本の特徴と短所、長所と短所しゃべってるときに、なんか、ある部分でこの、中国にやったこととか、ハワイでのこととかで、日本が嫌っていることが多いってことで、まあ、正式には少ないほうだと思いますけど、アンケートでは、で、実際オーストラリアにいる人たちに言われると、中国人も多いですから、中国でのこと気にしてる子も何人かいるってことを言ったんですけど、その先生はなんか認めなかった部分もあったっていうか、まあ、悪いことじゃなくて、ときどきなんか、わかりません、俺は別に、なんか、中国人、日本育ちの中国人なんでどっちも悪くないって思ってるんですけど

Like, I think she had this great sense of pride in Japan, so sometimes, I'm not saying this negatively, but there are times when it's difficult interacting with her, what I mean when I say she's very Japanese is, for example, in class we were talking about Japan's good points and bad points, what Japan did to China, what happened in Hawaii, about how some people dislike Japan, well, officially it was a small number, according to a questionnaire, but I told her ((the teacher)) that people in Australia tell you about these things because there's a lot of Chinese here and there are kids that are conscious about what happened in China, and the teacher didn't accept some parts of it, well, I'm not saying this is bad, but sometimes, I don't know, personally, as a Chinese, as a Chinese who grew up in Japan, I don't think either side is wrong

In the above extract, Teru seemed to conceptualise having too much pride in Japan and being very Japanese as something negative and undesirable for him. In this context, being Japanese seemed to be perceived as indexical of a narrow perspective lacking in international outlook. On the other hand, he positioned himself as a “日本育ちの中国人” (a Chinese who grew up in Japan) living in Australia, and by referring to authoritative data using the words such as “questionnaire” and “officially”, and furthermore attempting to maintain a somewhat neutral stance on the matter, Teru seemed to be constructing himself in contrast as someone with a more fair and objective

perspective on history. Thus, given this extract, Takeshi and Teru may have been resisting identifying as a Japanese, not because they could not do so or because they did not feel any affiliation to this position, but rather to avoid the negative indexicality that being positioned as a Japanese as defined by a singular connection to a particular nation or ethnicity could potentially entail vis-à-vis a more transnational norm.

Takeshi thus seemed to suggest an alternative way of being Japanese, which was not defined by one's connections to a particular nationality, ethnicity or by one's inheritance of cultural capital (i.e. heritage). In the following extract, he aligned himself to a more pluristic definition of being Japanese:

(Extract 7-12)

今は、日本人の友達の中でちゃんと、日本人の友達のグループの、みんな日本人だから、その仲間、その一員であることは、日本人であることの証明できると思います、オーストラリアに住んでいて、オーストラリア人の友達がいて、オーストラリアで育ったから、僕もオーストラリア人だと言い切れない、両方、オーストラリア人も日本人もあると

Now, with Japanese friends, in a group of Japanese friends, they're all Japanese, and the fact that I'm a member of that group proves that I'm Japanese, I live in Australia, I have Australian friends, I grew up in Australia, but I can't say for certain that I'm Australian, I'm both, Australian and Japanese

In the extract above, Takeshi seemed to be redefining being Japanese as something that could be proved through his linguistic expertise and as a sign of his membership in a group of Japanese friends. As he mentioned in Chapter 5, his social capital of Japanese friends was not only constructed locally, but also forged trans-locally with those who now lived in Japan and with whom he continued to maintain contact. As such, under this alternative norm, being Japanese may not have been indexical of his heritage or of his connection to a particular nationality or ethnicity, but may have been indexical of his “metroethnic” (Otsuji, 2008; Otsuji & Pennycook, 2010, 2011) identity and proof of his ability to forge social capital across national and geographical borders with peers whom

he described as “全員国際人” (*all of them are global citizens*).

Under this alternative way of being Japanese that Takeshi and Teru seemed to be suggesting in the above extracts, the identity position of Japanese was indexical of their pluristic identity and also a position that was claimable through one's language expertise. Thus the value of Japanese language was not in its function as an emblem of ethnicity but precisely in its value as capital for constructing transnational identities and thus as a tool for differentiation vis-à-vis individuals whom Takeshi and Teru perceived as monolingual Japanese or monolingual Australians. Here, the connection between language and ethnicity appear to be significantly disaligned, allowing both students to positively construe the cultural, linguistic and social capital that they actually possessed as assets rather than as deficits vis-à-vis monolingual Japanese speakers in Japan (or vis-à-vis students like Chika and Yuta). In this way, having a mixed-ethnic background for Takeshi or not having Japanese blood for Teru were not signs of their lack of legitimacy as Japanese individuals and as less legitimate inheritors of the Japanese language, but could be construed positively as a capital for social distinction from monolingual individuals.

7.4.2 Claiming authenticity

From the analysis thus far, it can be observed that Takeshi and Teru's claiming of legitimacy in Section 7.3 can thus be interpreted both as an investment in the norms of the classroom to avoid marginalisation and also as their investment in the construction of difference vis-à-vis monolinguals. This “layered simultaneity” (Blommaert, 2005: 130) of interpretations indeed suggests that the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject was a polycentric space in which the students' investment and the identity position of Japanese indexed significantly different meanings depending on the centre, or “orders of indexicality” (Blommaert, 2005: 69) against which they were examined.

Similarly, if we examine Chika and Yuta's accounts discussed in 7.2 from a more trans-local perspective, it may also have alternative interpretations. That is to say, while a heritage connection to Japan and the Japanese language may have been important for Chika and Yuta, and it was also an expectation placed on them by other Japanese

speakers, their claiming of inheritance may not only be an investment in their heritage and identification as ethnically Japanese individuals. Indeed, as can be observed in the following extract, Chika at times seemed to reject identifying as a Japanese:

(Extract 7-13)

やっぱり、その、言葉がよく話せるようにもっとよく話せるようになったら、もっと自分の意見を説明したり、言うことができるので、たぶん、日本人とは全く違う考え方をしている自分がもっと授業では現れているような気がします

You know, the better I can speak the language, the better I'm able to explain or say my own opinion, I think, someone inside me who is thinking totally differently from Japanese people is coming out more in the class (the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject)

Interestingly, Chika claimed that the more she became competent in the Japanese language, the less Japanese she became, suggesting a disalignment between investment in the Japanese language and an investment in an ethnic identity as a Japanese, much like Takeshi's positioning examined above. Chika too seemed to resist being monolithically positioned as a Japanese individual as defined by ways of thinking tied to a particular nation or ethnicity.

Thus, it is possible that Chika and Yuta's claiming of inheritance observed above in 7.2 may also be driven by other interests. As I touched on briefly above, the following extract by Yuta suggests that the claiming of inheritance observed in Extract 7-6 above may have also been a strategy to differentiate himself from less competent bilinguals. When the researcher asked Yuta whether he felt other people saw him as a Japanese, he commented:

(Extract 7-14)

結構あると思います、実際自分からも、こう、ああ、あんた日本人の血をもってるのになんで日本語話せないんだって思う時もあります、こう、こっち生の方とかで、親が日本語話させたくなかった、で、そ

ういう日本語ができないとかでしたら、なんでなんだろうって思ったりはします [...] えっと、どうなんだろう、ちょっと、悔いかな、可哀想っていうのもありますし、努力が足りないって、努力ができない人なんだなってちょっと上から目線でみてしまうのもありますね、ちょっと、こう、怒りじゃないですけど、ちょっと、なんか、いらいらすることだと思います

It actually happens quite often, I think “why do you have Japanese blood but can’t speak Japanese”, like students here ((Australia)), some of them can’t speak Japanese because their parents didn’t allow them to speak it, and if that’s the case, I really have to question why they ((the parents)) let that happen [...] It’s a little bit of regret and pity too, like, “you haven’t put enough effort into it”, I look down on them that they’re the kind of person who can’t put an effort into something, it’s not anger really, but a little irritating

In the above extract, Yuta appeared to distance himself from peers whom he perceived as incomplete or less competent Japanese speakers. The reason he got irritated by individuals whom he felt were disappointing and did not make much effort may have been because he, too, could be perceived in the same way, perhaps by other Japanese individuals. Therefore, considering the above extract, Chika and Yuta’s claiming of inheritance, may have been driven by an alternative interest to claim “authenticity” (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005) of their linguistic and cultural resources and construct difference with less legitimate inheritors of Japanese. For both Chika and Yuta who envisaged engaging with people from Japan in their future careers, the construction of difference and the claiming of authenticity may have been important because it meant that their Japanese linguistic resources could be utilised vis-à-vis Japanese monolinguals from Japan, and thus proved the potential mobility of their linguistic capital across social *fields*. The following comment by Yuta highlighted this aspect of his investment. When the researcher queried why learning Japanese was important for him, Yuta explained as follows:

(Extract 7-15)

将来的にプラスになる要点なので、レジュメとかにも、英語ぺらぺら

日本語ぺらぺらって書いたら、その分、採用かが高くなる、特に日本で英語話せればすごくプラスですし、こっちで日本語ってそんなにプラスにはならないですけど、2カ国語話せる、まあ、頭良いんだろうなって、こう、見られることはあると思いますんで、だから、結構、ありがたいです、日本語

It's an advantage in the future, on my resume, "English perfect, Japanese perfect", if I could write that, I'd be more employable, especially in Japan if you could speak English it's a big plus, on the other hand, here ((Australia)), Japanese isn't too big of an advantage but if you can speak two languages, well, I think people look at you and think you're smart

In the above extract, for Yuta, what was important was not so much what he knew, but what the authenticity of his linguistic resources indexed, for example, one's academic capabilities and smartness. In other words, Yuta's claim for authenticity seemed to be driven not by a sense of ethnic belonging, but rather by his investment in constructing difference with monolinguals and less competent bilinguals to obtain the symbolic capital of distinction.

7.5 Polycentricity and the complexity of investment

I have so far discussed the students' investment from two different perspectives, that of Japanese as a marker of ethnicity and inheritance (i.e. heritage) and that of language as capital for social distinction. It can be observed that the students navigate between these different norms to simultaneously attempt to claim legitimacy and construct difference with their peers and imagined others. However, at times, tension between these norms could also be observed. Therefore, in this section, I will focus on the account by Anthony, which appeared to highlight this tension, to further explore the complexity and polycentricity of the students' investment.

As I touched on in Extracts 7-3 and 7-6 above, Anthony appeared unable to claim legitimacy vis-à-vis the high expectations of the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject and was sometimes positioned as a foreigner or an Australian by the other students and the teacher. Perhaps for this reason, he seemed to distance himself from his

peers in the class whom he perceived were Japanese, commenting “僕は、他の子を、日本人だなんて思ってます、全然、僕の友達とは違う、することも、言うことも” (*I think the other students are Japanese, they're very different from my friends, what they do, what they say*). Moreover, Anthony seemed to reject the idea that the Japanese language was important because of its connection to Japan. He reported, “他の人はもっと日本に、毅君とかは、日本に行って仕事とか、日本の大学で勉強したいとか、他の子もそうだと思います、日本に戻りたいとか” (*The other students [want to go to] Japan more, like Takeshi, he wants to go to Japan to work, wants to go to university there, I think the other kids are the same, they want to go back to Japan*), claiming that he had no plans of living or working in Japan and was uninterested in the language or the culture. Considering that Anthony was able to comfortably claim inheritance and a Japanese identity in reference to the Japanese Second Language classroom (see Extract 6-11), this seemed to be a significant change in the identity position he adopted.

Anthony instead took a pragmatic attitude towards his study of Japanese. When he was asked why he decided to study Japanese in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject, he explained that it was to obtain additional points towards his tertiary entrance score and also because it was “かつこいい” (*cool*) attending a university subject as a Year 12 student. For Anthony, it seemed to be significant that the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject was an “Extension study” subject for a limited number of excelling Year 12 students and that it was administered by a university which was highly regarded by his peers. He elaborated on this point in the following extract:

(Extract 7-16)

Anthony: 学校のクラスとかあんまり行きたくないけど、コー
ルフィールドまで来て、あの、なんかユニヴァーシ
ティーのクラスに行ってるっていうのは、proud、好き
ですよ、あの、あんまり行きたくないとか思わない
*I don't really like going to school ((secondary school)),
but coming to XX ((location of the university)) and the
fact that I'm attending a university class [as a Year 12
student], I'm proud of it, I like it, I don't feel reluctant to*

- Interviewer: *go to class*
このコース
This subject (Japanese for Background Speakers' subject)
- Anthony: *そうです、だから、なんか、そうです*
Yes that's right, so, like, yeah
- Interviewer: *proud* っていうのは
What do you mean by proud?
- Anthony: たぶん、ユニヴァーシティー、ここに12年生でここに来ているのは、すごい
I think, coming here to university as a Year 12 means that you're outstanding
- Interviewer: 大学にね
So [coming to] the university
- Anthony: そう、くだらないけど、そうですね
Yeah, it's stupid, but that's right

Anthony's sense of being proud expressed in the extract above may not come from his sense of fulfilling expectations related to his heritage, but from the satisfaction he gets for being able to enrol in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject which was an "Extension study" subject that none of his friends were attending. As his comment "ぼくは日本語じゃなかったら絶対エンハンスメントコースなんて入れないから" (*I would never have got into an Extension study subject if it weren't Japanese*) showed, Anthony seemed to recognise that his linguistic resources were in fact capital that could be utilised as a means of gaining distinction, (i.e. symbolic capital) which may have been difficult, if not impossible, to obtain by other means.

Indeed, Anthony's enrolment in the subject allowed him to index his academic capabilities to his peers. He reported that whenever he told his friends after school that he was going to university for the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject, they would tell him that it was very "Asian". Anthony, however, did not seem to mind being positioned as such. He explained:

(Extract 7-17)

うん、それは悪く言ってないんですよ、それは、すごいそうだと思います、やっぱ、ユニバーシティーに行くって言うのは、それはとても、やっぱ勉強できると、絶対僕もそう思うんですよ、絶対、あの、アジア系の人は勉強できるって、たぶん真面目だから、絶対頭良いと思います

Yeah, they're not saying it in a bad way, I definitely think so, after all going to university [as a Year 12] means that you can study, I definitely think so too, Asian people can study, because they're serious and smart

In the above extract, being perceived as an “Asian” was indexical not so much of Anthony’s ethnicity, but rather indexical of his seriousness and smartness, which Anthony felt were attributes that were valued and made him different from his Australian peers. Here again, the Japanese language functioned not so much as a marker of ethnicity, but as a deployable capital that allowed Anthony to align himself to a discourse on “Asian-ness”, construct difference with peers and acquire the symbolic capital of distinction.

As can be observed, there appeared to be a disalignment between language and ethnicity and the highlighting of the “symbolic added value” (Heller & Duchene, 2011: 10) of language, which was also observed in the accounts by Chika, Yuta, Takeshi and Teru. However, unlike these students who conceptualised their linguistic resources as a trans-local capital, Anthony seemed to conceptualise his Japanese linguistic resources as a strictly local capital with immediate exchangeable value in his secondary school environment. Furthermore, by conceptualising Japanese as something unrelated to his sense of self or his ethnic identity, Anthony also seemed to be attempting to make sense of his relatively poor performance in the Japanese for Background Speakers’ subject and thus self-justify or legitimate his presence in the classroom.

However, Anthony’s pragmatic conceptualisation appeared to clash with the notion that the Japanese language was an inheritance and an important part of one’s heritage. This tension could be observed in Extract 7-16 above, in which Anthony evaluated his motivation for enrolling in the Japanese for Background Speakers’ subject (i.e. to gain

distinction from peers) as something that he should not be proud of. This may have been a reflection of his belief, perhaps influenced by parental expectations, that learning a language should be for a “higher” pursuit, including ethnicity, heritage or a genuine interest in the language and culture.

Furthermore, the tension between Anthony’s pragmatic approach to his study of Japanese and the perception that Japanese is important because it is a cultural inheritance can be observed in the following extract in which he commented on his performance in class:

(Extract 7-18)

Anthony: ジョン君と僕が一番下手で、で、そのほかの子は本当に日本語は好きでうまいと思いますよ
John and I are the worst, and the others like Japanese a lot and they’re good at it

Interviewer: でも、それでも嫌じゃないの
But, you don’t mind that?

Anthony: 全然、それは面白いと思います、先生いつも僕のこと「トニー君は返事だけいいけど、だめだよちゃんと漢字勉強しないと」
Not at all, I think it’s amusing, the teacher always tells me “Tony, it’s good that you always respond very energetically, but you need to study kanji properly”

Interviewer: この前言ってた言ってた
Yes, yes, she was saying that

Anthony: 面白いと思います、そんなの、全然傷つかない、日本語が下手でも、そういうの、お母さんはもっとプライドあった方が良くって言うんですが、ぼくそんなの、みんな点数が高くて、プライド全然ないです、日本語の、日本語なんてどうでも良いって
I think that’s amusing, that doesn’t hurt me at all, even though my Japanese isn’t good, that doesn’t hurt me at all, my Mum says I should have more pride, but, I don’t care,

even though everyone else's points are higher, I don't have pride in Japanese at all, I don't care about Japanese

In the above extract, Anthony reported that T1 told him to put more effort into his study of Japanese. While it is possible that T1 made such a comment in her capacity as a teacher and cautioned Anthony for not doing the work he was supposed to do, given T1's comment in Extract 7-2 above, this comment may also carry the connotation that learning Japanese was the "right thing to do" because it was a part of Anthony's inheritance. In addition, Anthony's mother's insistence on Japanese as a matter of pride – that is to say, something deeply connected to one's sense of self and perhaps a matter of one's heritage – sat in an uneasy relationship with Anthony's perception of Japanese as just one among many other forms of capital that he possessed, including his knowledge of mathematics or his athletic ability in Australian football.

In fact, the tension between these different values attributed to the Japanese language was observed throughout the data in the other students' accounts as well. There were multiple instances in which the students used the word “ちゃんと” (*properly*) to explain their study of Japanese. One such example was the following excerpt by Fumiya in which he explained one of the reasons he was studying Japanese in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject. Fumiya commented, “日本生まれで、一応日本で8年ぐらいいたんで、日本語ちゃんとしゃべる、読み書きできるようにならないとだめかなと思って” (*I was born in Japan, and, after all, I lived there for eight years, so I think I need to become able to speak Japanese and read and write properly*). It can be observed that the use of “properly” and “need to” both denote a sense of obligation on the students' part to study Japanese. For Fumiya, who had Japanese parents, was born in Japan and lived there for eight years, learning Japanese was indeed connected to Japan and was an important part of his heritage that he felt obliged to develop, or at the least to maintain.

However, it is not to say that the competing values attributed to the Japanese language exerted only negative effects on the students. At times, the meaningfulness and satisfaction derived from studying Japanese came precisely from the sense of fulfilling the expectations of both of the above-mentioned values. This could be observed in the

following extract of Anthony:

(Extract 7-19)

ぼく、日本語は、もう、まあ、けど、こういうのやってクラスの後に
I feel not proud あの、accomplished something 何かしたって、あの、だ
から、それはいいと思います

*For me, Japanese is, yeah, um, but, after the class I feel not proud, but, like
I've accomplished something, like I've done something, um, so, that's
something I like*

Although why exactly Anthony felt proud was not articulated fully in the above extract, it may have been a result of his sense of accomplishment for being able to fulfil the high expectations that his mother placed on his Japanese education as a matter of heritage. At the same time, it may have also been a result of his sense of fulfilment for being able to gain distinction by successfully enrolling in an “Extension study” subject, which was available exclusively to excelling students.

Finally, to put the narratives into perspective, the students’ tendency to conceptualise their study of the Japanese language as driven by the desire to construct difference and social distinction may have been foregrounded in the data because of the particular time frame in which the data was elicited. As previously explained, Chika, Takeshi, Teru, and Anthony were in Year 12 at the time of the data collection and were preparing for their tertiary entrance exams and contemplating their pathways to university. Similarly, Yuta was in his third year at university and was contemplating what career he wanted to pursue and where he wanted to work. They were thus at a transitional stage in their lives in which the competition to enter university or to obtain their desired jobs loomed as a major concern. Thus, they may have wanted to seize this opportunity to utilise their resources that were only available to them in order to stand out from the crowd.

In addition, such investment in the symbolic value of language may have also been influenced by a trans-local ideology concerning the value of bilingualism. As I touched on briefly in Chapter 5, such an ideology certainly was felt in the homes of the students. Anthony, for instance, commented that his father always told him that Japanese was

very useful in the world of business. Anthony thus explained that this was one of the main reasons he was investing in Japanese. Indeed, as observed in Extract 5-32 above, Anthony seemed to feel that being a Japanese and English bilingual held considerable symbolic value and potential economic returns in an Australian workplace with strong ties to Japan. Being able to speak Japanese would thus allow him to differentiate himself from his future English-speaking colleagues.

Moreover, for students like Teru and Takeshi who envisaged utilising their bilingual resources to work transnationally, potential competitors were not only Japanese or English-speaking monolinguals but also other bilinguals. As Teru explained:

(Extract 7-20)

ていうか、実際に世界中で僕達みたいにこう英語と、英語しゃべれて、で両方が同じレベルくらいに達してる子達は何人いるのか知りたいです、で、こう、平均が知りたいです、そしたらなんか、どこまで頑張れば良いのかみたいな、立場知りたいです、例えば、日本帰ったとして、仕事探すとしたら、英語使う仕事だと思うし、そんなとき、選ばれるときに、そのほかの子達がどれだけうまいとか、どれだけうまくないといけないのかっていうのが、はい、知りたいです

You know, I want to know how many kids like us there are in the world that can actually speak English, can speak English, and speak both languages ((English and Japanese)) at about an equal level, I want to know what the average ability is, if I knew that, I'd know how much effort I need to make, I want to know where I stand, for example, if I were to return to Japan and look for a job, it would probably be a job that uses English, and when that time comes, to be chosen, I want to know how good the other kids are and how good I need to be, yes, I want to know that

Thus, for Teru, investing in Japanese was also an investment in consolidating his identity as a bilingual, and as a means of obtaining the linguistic resources to compete equally with other bilinguals on a global market where bi/multilingualism, rather than monolingualism, was increasingly attractive. Within such a global market, as Teru's attempt to compare himself with individuals who can speak both languages equally

showed, what was deemed to have the most symbolic value was a form of bilingualism which was conceptualised as a “double monolingualism” (Jørgensen, 2008: 163)

A similar comment was made by Takeshi in the following extract in which he explained his future career prospects:

(Extract 7-21)

日本とオーストラリアでも交流している企業とか、例えば、授業でユニクロとかそういう企業とか海外進出を始めていると思ってるんです
と言ってましたけど [...] その、外国進出のために日本語と英語両方
はなせる人がいたら、その、有利になると思うんで、オーストラリア
と日本と関係のある仕事に就きたいと思います

We learned in class that companies like Uniqlo are thinking about expanding overseas [...] and to expand if there was someone that could speak Japanese and English, it would be more advantageous, so I want to get a job that has connections to both Australia and Japan

As Takeshi’s extract above showed, from a more macro-perspective, the students’ conceptualisation of Japanese as a capital for social distinction may reflect the increased commodification of language in a globalised economy, led by multinational corporations like Uniqlo – a Japanese clothing manufacturer and retailer with shops around the world – in which the value of language was not as a marker of ethnicity or heritage, but rather as a commodity in itself that could be deployed to obtain symbolic and economic returns (Heller, 2012). Given these students’ reports, it is quite possible that such a trans-local ideology had a significant influence on the students’ local-level investment and how they conceptualised their linguistic resources in the Japanese for Background Speakers’ subject.

7.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have examined the students’ accounts of their participation in the Japanese for Background Speakers’ subject and examined the different ways in which they drew on their linguistic and cultural resources to position themselves and others in

the classroom. It was found that the students were indeed balancing two different ways of conceptualising the Japanese language. Firstly, at the local level, there appeared to be a fixed connection between the Japanese language and its function as a marker of ethnicity. This seemed to be reflected in the curriculum and the teachers' perceptions, which placed the "native speaker" and Japanese people as a point of reference in terms of the students' linguistic development. The relatively high competence required by these expectations contributed to the construction of a stratified *field* in which the identity position of Japanese was not readily available to all of the students. While students who held the linguistic and cultural resources that fit into those expectations seemed to be able to index themselves as Japanese individuals, those who did not may have needed to prove their legitimacy through other means or else be marginalised as less legitimate inheritors of Japanese. It is important to note that the identity positions the participants seemed to adopt in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject differed from the positions they adopted in the Japanese Second Language classrooms. Such changes highlight the shifting nature of the students' identities and suggest that the *fields* they engage in may have a significant effect on the students' self-perception and presentation.

Secondly, while the students appeared to attempt to conform to the above-mentioned expectations, they also seemed to be aligning themselves to a more pluristic, trans-local definition of being Japanese in which the fixed connection between language and ethnicity was significantly disaligned. That is to say, the function of Japanese as a marker of national or ethnic belonging seemed to be rather downplayed in favour of a pragmatic stance that conceptualised the Japanese language as a capital in itself that could be utilised as a means of constructing social distinction.

However, the students' alignment to the dual values attributed to the Japanese language was not an either/or decision. The Japanese for Background Speakers' subject was in fact a polycentric field in which both of these values were present simultaneously in the students' accounts. Thus, as we saw in Chika and Yuta's case, claiming of inheritance may be interpreted simultaneously as a claiming of an identity as a Japanese as defined by heritage connections and also as a claim for authenticity and the trans-local mobility of one's resources. On the other hand, as we saw in Takeshi and Teru's cases, the

disclaiming of inheritance may be interpreted simultaneously as a rejection of a Japanese identity defined by heritage connections and also as an investment in an alternative way of being Japanese that could be proved through one's expertise, and thus an investment in one's transnational identity.

Through the identity negotiations described above, the students appeared to be attempting to re-define what it meant to be "Japanese". This may be what Heller (2007) describes as the construction of a "new basis for legitimacy" (p.5). That is to say, being a legitimate Japanese speaker (or a Japanese) was conceptualised not as something predetermined by one's heritage (i.e. nationality, ethnicity, education or other such cultural capital) but rather as something that one can prove through the quality of one's linguistic resources. Under this new definition, the Japanese language was not an "inalienable dimension of individual identity" or as an "emblem of collective identity", but a "valuable form of linguistic capital" and a "mark of an international plurist elite" (Heller, 2007:19). These findings seem to support Blackledge and Creese's (2006) claim that the learning of a language as a cultural practice and a matter of ethnicity, nationality and heritage may at times be contested by students in favour of a more pragmatic view of language as a commodity and a form of linguistic capital.

Finally, I have argued that the students' attempt to provide a more pluristic definition of Japanese seemed to be underlined by two main interests: the construction of difference and the legitimation of their own capital. Indeed, by conceptualising being Japanese as a sign of one's transnational identity or by conceptualising the Japanese language as a valuable capital, the students seemed to be attempting to construct difference not only with Japanese monolinguals (or Japanese) and English monolinguals (or Australian), but also with other less competent Japanese and English bilinguals.

CHAPTER 8 Use of bilingual resources in translation and interpreting activities

In the previous chapters, I have examined the students' perceptions of their Japanese language and, to a lesser extent, their perceptions of their bilingual resources. In this chapter, I will turn my focus to how the students actually utilised such resources in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject, focusing particularly on their engagement in translation and interpreting activities that were conducted as part of the class. The data set used below is based on the students' actual translation task and recordings of the interpreting task as well as stimulated recall interviews conducted after these activities. In addition, the data is also based on a recording of naturally occurring talk during these tasks and the class discussion that followed. The way the students engaged with the translation text, as well as the interaction and dynamics with peers and teachers that occurred during the activity provided a fertile ground for exploring how translation and interpreting activities may contribute to the language learning experiences of these students by providing them with the opportunity to utilise and develop their "translingual and transcultural competence" (MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages, 2007: 3).

8.1 Moving between Japanese and English

Ever since the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject was established in 2010, translation and interpreting activities have been a small but constant component in the curriculum every year. The data is based on is derived from translation and interpreting activities that were conducted in 2011 when all of the participants in this study were enrolled in this subject. In the translation activity, the students were given one hour to translate two texts: one from Japanese into English and one from English into Japanese. The texts utilised in the activity were chosen from reading texts that the students utilised as a part of their study on intercultural communication. The English to Japanese text was an excerpt from an Australian newspaper article entitled "North Korea's Rooney more like Beckham" ("North Korea's Rooney", 2010). It was an article written in the lead up to the 2010 FIFA World Cup, and featured a young professional soccer player named Jong Tae-Se, a "*zainichi*" (ethnic Korean living in Japan) born and raised in

Japan, who played for the North Korean national soccer team. Tae-Se, a powerful forward and score-getter (thus the allusion to England's forward, Wayne Rooney), received considerable attention from the media for his passion for luxurious goods and his dream of living a celebrity-like lifestyle (thus the allusion to the soccer player and celebrity David Beckham), which the media perceived as atypical of a North Korean individual. The Japanese to English text was an excerpt from Tae-Se's biography that was written by a Japanese writer (Mori, 2010). The English text that was assigned for translation was approximately 60 words and the Japanese text was approximately 100 characters, thus equating to roughly the same length when translated. After the students completed the task, they were asked to present both their English and Japanese translations to the class by writing their work on a transparency sheet, which was then projected onto the whiteboard using an overhead projector. This was followed by a short class discussion involving the students and teachers on issues they encountered while undertaking the tasks.

In the interpreting activities, which was conducted a week after the translation activity, students were placed in groups of three and each group was given a short role-play dialogue of roughly five minutes in length. The dialogues consisted of either a typical conversation between an English-speaking doctor and a Japanese-speaking patient or between an English-speaking teacher and a Japanese-speaking parent. Of the group of three students, one student was assigned the role of the English speaker, another was assigned the role of the Japanese speaker and the remaining student acted as the interpreter. The English and the Japanese speakers were asked to converse based on the dialogue and the student acting as the interpreter was required to interpret after each utterance. The interpreting task itself was recorded using a video-recorder. After all of the students had finished acting as the interpreter, the students and the teacher had a short class discussion about their experiences, the challenges they encountered during the task and potential solutions for them. The analysis in the following section will focus primarily on the students' accounts of the translation activity, supplemented by their comments on the interpreting task.

8.1.1 Flexible bilingualism and the use of bilingual resources

Firstly, the students' interaction during the translation activity provided a view of how the students perceived their bilingual resources and how they utilised them in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject. The data suggested that for these students, utilising both Japanese and English appeared to be an "an everyday, unmarked practice" (Creese and Blackledge, 2010: 1204), and they seemed to flexibly utilise both of these resources to engage in the translation of the texts. To illustrate this point, I will begin by examining a short excerpt from the students' interaction during the translation activity. In the following extract, Anthony and John were working on translating the Japanese text into English and trying to determine which passage in the text they were supposed to translate:

(Extract 8-1)

- | | | |
|---|--------------|--|
| 1 | Anthony | Did you start with "it is true that"? |
| 2 | John | You gotta start from "試合中"
You gotta start from <i>during the game</i> |
| 3 | Anthony | Nah nah "確かに"
Nah nah, <i>it is true that</i> |
| 4 | John | ((Addressing T1)) どこからですか、確かにからですか
<i>Where do we start, from "it is true that"?</i> |
| 5 | Teacher (T1) | そうそうそう
<i>Yes, yes, yes</i> |
| 6 | Anthony | ((In a loud voice that could be overhead by the class)) ooh
ジョン君だめじゃーん、なにやってんの、ああジョン君よかったねー、良い友達がいて
<i>Ooh John, that's bad, what are you doing, ooh John, you should be glad you have a good friend like me</i> |
| 7 | John | aw man |
| 8 | Anthony | ((Addressing John)) oh you're so lucky I'm looking over you |

Although the students were instructed to translate individually, both languages were utilised throughout the task to interact with each other, ask for clarification and manage multiple frames of interaction. In the above extract, John and Anthony conversed between themselves in English to discuss the task and also to joke together, while switching to Japanese to communicate with the teacher and ask for clarification. It seemed that both students were making a distinction between Japanese as the official language for conducting the task in the teacher-student interactions, and English as the informal language of the student-to-student interactions. Elsewhere in the same interaction, English was utilised primarily to joke and make comments such as “that’s Engrish” (intentionally pronouncing “Engrish” with an “r” instead of an “l” to mimic a common pronunciation error made by Japanese speakers of English), which suggest that they perceived it as a way of excluding the teacher from the interaction and communicating messages between themselves that may be considered inappropriate in a classroom. In this regard, the students seemed to effectively manage these two alternating frames through their use of both Japanese and English to complete the task and to build and index solidarity with their peers.

At the same time, as Creese and Blackledge (2011) note, the alternation between the students’ bilingual resources may not only be a matter of functional code-switching. The use of Japanese and English was marked by flexibility and transgression that made it difficult at times to distinguish between which language an utterance primarily belonged to. For instance, in turn 6 above, Anthony addressed John and perhaps the whole class in Japanese, which seemed to be a deviation from the functions of the languages examined above. In Extract 8-1, turn 8, Anthony dropped his volume and repeated the same comment in English, directed specifically at John. From the sudden rise in the volume and the parodic, over-exaggerated Japanese that Anthony utilised in turn 6, it is possible that the switch to Japanese was not simply a matter of cautioning John for his lack of attention by using the “official” language of the classroom, but may have also involved a symbolic and performative aspect. That is to say, it may have been an attempt at “speech stylization” which is “the intensification or exaggeration of a particular way of speaking for symbolic and rhetorical effect” (Rampton, 2001: 85). The symbolic and rhetorical effect in this instance may be the stylization of the voice of an “exemplary Japanese student”, which Anthony admitted that he was not. By parodying

the voice of such a student, Anthony seemed to distance himself from the other Japanese students who were engaged seriously with the task, thus mitigating his affiliation to classroom business while constructing solidarity with John. In doing so, Anthony appeared to show an understanding of the different functions of the languages in the classroom and, at the same time, the ability to challenge the norms to engage in “playful vernacular identity projections” (Rampton, 2001: 90) that transgressed the boundaries between languages and their functions.

The short extract above, one among a number of similar occurrences in the data, suggests the students’ ability to draw on their Japanese and English linguistic resources to fluidly manage the multiple frames of interaction in the class and also engage in symbolic identity work that was not easily categorised as belonging to a specific language. In this regard, it appeared that the students’ bilingualism was not marked by separateness of the languages, but rather characterised by “flexible bilingualism” (Creese and Blackledge, 2011: 1201) in which both language were mobilised as a means of meaning-making.

8.1.2 Translingual competence in translation activities

Despite the students’ flexible use of their bilingual resources that can be observed in the Extract 8-1 above, translation (and interpreting), which also requires the use of both Japanese and English, appeared to be an altogether different experience for many of the students. Although in the semi-structured interviews conducted before the translation activity all of the students reported that they had previous experiences of translation in second language classrooms and in their personal lives, many of them found that it was the first time for them to translate a passage longer than a sentence. Takeshi recalled that the activity was a new experience for him and explained:

(Extract 8-2)

日本の文、記事を読む時は、いつも日本語で考えてそのままにして、英語も同じ、で、別に読んで途中で英語にすることはなかったから、意識はしなかった、初めて、今回で、今回の授業で初めてやったこと

なので、このレベルでは

I've never done it before, Japanese sentences, when I read an article, I think in Japanese and leave it as it is, the same with English, and, I don't read it and change it to English in the middle, I've never been conscious of that, this was my first time doing it in this lesson, at this level [of difficulty]

Similarly, while Chika commented that she enjoyed the activity because it was the first time to change back and forth instantaneously between her English and Japanese, she also found the activity different from her everyday language use:

(Extract 8-3)

あまり普段の生活で日本語と英語とを略す(*sic.*)ことあまりなくて、どっちかって言うと、英語の時は英語だけを考えて、日本語の時は日本語だけを考えているので、二つ合わせて考えるのが難しかったです

*In my daily life there aren't many situations where I abbreviate (*sic.**) between Japanese and English, more often than not, when it's in English I think only in English, when it's in Japanese, I only think in Japanese, so it was difficult thinking of the two together*

((**In Japanese, "yakusu" (to translate/interpret) and "ryakusu" (to abbreviate) are phonetically very similar. Here, Chika probably meant to say translate/interpret*))

The difficulty of translation voiced by Chika and others was surprising, considering the students' bilingual competence and the fluidity with which they appeared to utilise both Japanese and English in their classroom interactions. Of course, part of the difficulty may be because the students were engaging in a translation task of this length and complexity for the first time and were unaccustomed to the task. Moreover, as evidenced by the students' language use diaries and their reports of their language use during the semi-structured interviews, many of them were not exposed to Japanese newspaper articles regularly, and more complex content may have added to the challenge.

However, another possible reason is that as Chika's comment of “二つ合わせて考えるのが難しかったです” (*It was difficult thinking of the two together*) showed, the translation task may have been the first time the students needed to compare their Japanese and English resources and utilise them side-by-side as compartmentalised “languages”. It may have been precisely because “bilingualism was an everyday, unmarked practice” (Creese and Blackledge, 2010: 1204) that it may have been difficult to make a connection between their Japanese and English resources in this manner. In the following comment, Chika reported on this phenomenon in reference to the interpreting activity:

(Extract 8-4)

でも、英語の言葉を知ってて、日本語の言葉を知ってても、あの、頭の中ではあまりつながりを作っていないので、通訳しなさいって言われてもなかなかできないんです

But, even though I know English words and I know Japanese words, I don't make a connection between them in my head, so even if I'm told to interpret, it's not easy to do

Similar to Chika's comment above, Takeshi also reported that “この場合だと、やっぱり両方の言葉使うから、両方の言葉両方で考える必要があると思って、余計混乱する” (*In this case, you have to use both languages, to think in both languages, so it made it more complicated*). Therefore, it appeared that Chika and Takeshi both found the translation activity difficult because of the necessity to utilise both Japanese and English at the same time.

Thus, while the students could competently speak Japanese and English and utilise both languages effectively in classroom interactions, it seemed quite difficult for them to think about both of their languages separately and to make the connection between them in these translation and interpreting tasks. Chika further elaborated on this point, commenting:

(Extract 8-5)

なんででしょう、本当に、たぶん、日本語で話してる時はその言葉が自然に出てきて、その言葉の意味とかも理解しているんだけど、英語でその言葉の、あの、翻訳をしてくださって言われても、見つけれません

I'm not sure why, really, I think, when I'm speaking in Japanese, the words come out naturally, I know the meaning of the words and I understand them, but if I was told to translate those words in English, I can't find them

Chika and Takeshi's comments above suggest that, for them, being bilingual may have been a normal condition and because they could competently deal with both Japanese-speaking situations and English-speaking situations in their daily lives using Japanese or English monolingually, they may not have had a chance to reflect on their languages. Moreover, as the students' accounts in the semi-structured interviews and in the language use diaries show, because there were rarely any situations in which they were required to use both Japanese and English to complete a single task (aside from the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject), they may not have needed to establish a connection between their Japanese and English linguistic resources. In other words, it may be possible that the students perceived English and Japanese not as separate languages, but as "part of a single integrated system" (Canagarajah, 2011: 403). This may explain why they found it difficult to move between the two languages that made up their linguistic repertoire.

However, regardless of the difficulty of conceiving Japanese and English as discreet languages and making a connection between them, the stimulated recall interview that followed the translation suggested that the students were also able to draw strategically on their linguistic resources and literacies associated with both "languages" to accomplish the translation tasks. Indeed, there were some instances in which they were able to utilise such "translingual competence" to operate between languages (MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages, 2007). For example, Fumiya attempted to utilise English writing strategies when translating the English text into Japanese. When he encountered a particularly long English passage, he reported that he attempted the following strategy:

(Extract 8-6)

僕はなんか日本語で二つ繋げたら、なんか、yeah なんか、僕、いつも
センテンスとか書く時、なんか、長いついてい言われたりするんですよ、
先生とかに、だから、なんか、ま、この場合は、なんか、二つに分け
た方がいいかなと

*If I combine the two in Japanese, like, yeah, like, when I write sentences, I get
told by the teacher that it's long, so, um, well, in this case, I thought it best to
separate it into two*

When the researcher further queried Fumiya as to why he split the sentence into two Japanese sentences, he commented “その方が読んでわかりやすかったり、なんか、あ、なんか、英語だと better writing” (*It's easier to understand that way, um, oh, um, in English, it's better writing*). Thus, it is evident that Fumiya was able to apply the conventions of what was deemed “good” writing in English and apply it to his writing in Japanese and succeeded in creating a more readable sentence structure. Although it was the first time Fumiya engaged in a formal translation task, he showed an understanding that translations do not need to be formally equivalent and thus he demonstrated his metalinguistic awareness to “attend to and reflect on the structural feature of the language” (Malakoff & Hakuta, 1991: 148).

Similar to Fumiya's use of English writing conventions in his Japanese translation, Takeshi utilised his knowledge of newspaper headlines in English and applied it to his translation in Japanese. When translating the title “North Korea's Rooney more like Beckham”, Takeshi described his use of the following strategy:

(Extract 8-7)

Rooney は Rooney そのまま書いたんですけど、あの、日本の新聞はど
うかわからないんですけど、オーストラリアの新聞の記事のタイトル
は、面白そうなタイトルとか、わざと、書きたい言葉じゃなく、もっ
と楽な表現で、楽な言葉を使って、あの、タイトルを付けているんで
すけど、この場合もそんな風にしてみようかなと思って、このベッカ
ムっぽいかも、「っぽいかも」は会話語 (sic.) を入れてみようかなと
Rooney is Rooney, I wrote it as it is, um, I'm not sure about Japanese

newspapers, but the headlines of Australian newspaper articles use interesting titles, or on purpose, use less formal expressions rather than just writing as it is, use less formal expressions, um, in the titles, so in this case, I decided to translate it like that, this “Beckham-like” is conversation language (sic.), I wanted to put that in there

Takeshi observed that Australian newspapers tended towards the employment of eye-catching, interesting headlines. He also seemed to believe that a literal translation would not give the same rhetorical effect, commenting “英語で伝わる文とか、日本ではあんまり効果的じゃない文とかを、その入れてもつまんないと思うから、自分で言葉を変えてみないと良い伝わり方できない” (*sentences that work in English may not be effective in Japanese, so it would be boring to put that in there, so I need to change the word to make it more effective*). Therefore, Takeshi translated the headline colloquially as “北のルーニー、ベッカムっぽいかも” (literally, “North’s Rooney, Beckham-like”). Takeshi thus demonstrated the ability to compare the two languages and reflect on the differences in the rhetorical effects of the source and target texts. His choice to translate the sentence as “ベッカムっぽいかも” (*Beckham-like*) conveyed his intention to provide a more engaging and interesting way of expressing the intended effect of the English source text. It showed, more importantly, that Takeshi was also able to supplement his lack of knowledge of Japanese conventions with his linguistic awareness of both languages and his sociocultural knowledge of English newspaper conventions.

From the above extracts, it appeared that Fumiya and Takeshi were able to utilise and transfer their linguistic resources acquired in one language, including their literacy skills and knowledge of genre conventions, to the other language, thus showing signs of their ability to “translanguage” or “codemesh” (Canagarajah, 2011: 404). However, from a critical perspective, the translanguaging was not always successful. Attempts to utilise English conventions in their Japanese translation especially appeared to be salient when lack of linguistic or sociocultural knowledge of Japanese conventions forced them to find alternative means of translating the English source text. In a sense, English resources were used to make up for their lack of literacy skills in Japanese. In this regard, while the above extracts may have displayed the students’ translingual

competence and the flexible use of their bilingual resources, it can also be seen as a case of interference from their English resources. For instance, although the use of “ベッカムっぽいかも” (*Beckham-like*) showed Takeshi’s linguistic awareness and creativity, it could be considered an inappropriate translation in a Japanese newspaper headline. Indeed, Takeshi’s presentation of his translation was followed by the teacher’s comment that “新聞でベッカムっぽいかもって言うかなあ [...] ちょっと、すごいカジュアルな感じ” (*I’m not sure that they would say “Beckham-like” in a [Japanese] newspaper [...] It’s, well, very casual sounding*). Similarly, Fumiya’s strategy to split the sentence into two could have been a strategy that was utilised because he was not able to effectively translate the relatively long English source text sentence. In fact, Fumiya’s translation undoubtedly succeeded in conveying the meaning, but appeared to lack the structural complexity of the source text.

From this standpoint, it seemed that the students did have a good command of their bilingual resources, but may still have been in the process of developing translingual competence. As Canagarajah (2011) states, translanguaging, or the “the ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as an integrated system” (p. 401) needs to be accompanied by a developed sense of a “critical awareness of the choices that are rhetorically more effective” (p. 402), and the ability to distinguish between effective translingual transfer and interference from their bilingual resources. In this regard, translation activities may potentially provide the students with an opportunity to critically reflect on the effectiveness and appropriateness of the strategies they utilise, and thus consolidate their translingual competence.

8.2 Moving between multiple discourses

8.2.1 Transcultural competence in translation activities

While the examples thus far have highlighted the students’ translanguaging and language awareness from a linguistic perspective, the data also showed the students’ awareness for the symbolic dimension of both languages and an awareness towards the multiple discourses involved in the translation tasks. In other words, the students also

showed signs of “transcultural competence” which is the ability to “reflect on the world and themselves” (MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages, 2007: 4). For some students, the translation activity was not only a linguistic exercise of simply reading in one language and constructing its equivalent in the other language. It may have also been an activity that involved mediation between the source and target texts (Pratt, 2002). Below, I will draw examples from the translations of Chika, Fumiya and Anthony to illustrate this point.

A particular phrase in the English source text appeared to catch the attention of some of the students. In reference to Tae-Se’s love for shopping, snowboarding, high-tech gadgets and female pop stars, the English source text article concluded that none of these luxuries “would be possible in the impoverished North, one of the most isolated countries in the world”. Interestingly, Chika, Fumiya, Takeshi and Teru did not translate the word “impoverished”, leaving it out of their Japanese translations. In the stimulated recall interview, when the researcher queried these students about this aspect, there were mixed responses. Takeshi explained that he did not have a dictionary with him and could not come up with an equivalent in Japanese. Teru mentioned that he did not realise that he had omitted it. Chika articulated a fuller explanation given below:

(Extract 8-8)

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| Chika: | この impoverished って使いませんでした
<i>I didn't use “impoverished”</i> |
| Interviewer: | それは何か理由があって
<i>Was there a reason for that?</i> |
| Chika: | 辞書に入れたら貧乏って出てきたんですよ、絶対使わないと思って
<i>I put it in the [electronic] dictionary and it came up with “poor”, and I thought it would never be used [in a newspaper article]</i> |
| Interviewer: | それはどうして
<i>Why is that?</i> |
| Chika: | 貧乏ってすごく見下してるっていうか、もしこれが |

日本の新聞に貧乏の北朝鮮がって書いてたらすごく大変なことになります、関係とかかが、やっぱり、でも、オーストラリアのこの記事では impoverished はあまり悪い意味ではないです

“Poor” is really looking down, and if this was a Japanese newspaper and it said that North Korea was “poor”, it would be a very big deal, the relationship and stuff, so, but, in this Australian news article, “impoverished” doesn’t have too bad of a meaning

Interviewer: そうなの

Is that the case

Chika: あの、impoverished ってすごい euphemism って言うか、euphemism ではないけど、正直に言ってるけど、なんかすごくフォーマルな言葉なので、あまり悪い感じがしないというか、ただの事実みたいなんですけど、poor って使ったらきっと悪い意味だと思うんですけど

Um, impoverished is really like a euphemism, not a euphemism exactly, but it’s being honest, and it’s a really formal word, so it doesn’t feel too bad, like as if it’s a fact, but if “poor” was used, I think it would be taken badly

Taking the above extract into consideration, the omission of the term “impoverished” may have been a deliberate choice based on Chika’s contemplation of how the dictionary equivalent of the term, “貧乏” (*poor*), could potentially be received by a Japanese audience in Japan.

Similarly, Fumiya also appeared to have omitted the same word “impoverished” from his translation into Japanese. During the stimulated recall interview, when the I asked Fumiya whether he had any comments on his translation of the sentence that contained this term, he explained:

(Extract 8-9)

- Fumiya: ああ、impoverished って、書き忘れました
Um, “impoverished”, I forgot to write that
- Interviewer: あ、これも忘れて抜けてただけなん、そっか
Oh, so you forgot this as well, just missed it, I see
- Fumiya: 辞書で「貧乏な」しか出てこなかった
My dictionary only came up with “poor”
- Interviewer: 貧乏な
poor
- Fumiya: なんか、貧乏な国って書きたくなかったんです
Like, I didn’t want to write a “poor” country
- Interviewer: ああ、なんで、それは
Oh, why was that?
- Fumiya: いや、記事とかに書きますか、日本、日本語の記事
とか
*Is it written like that in an article, Japan, in a Japanese
article?*
- Interviewer: ああ、なるほど、フミヤ君は書かないと思って
Oh, I see, so you thought it wouldn’t be written like that
- Fumiya: いや、書くつもりあったんですけど、で、引いて、
で、まあ、書き忘れて、はい、書き忘れたんだと思
います
*Well, I wanted to write it, but, I looked it up, and, well, I
forgot to write it, yeah, I think I forgot to write it*

As the above extract revealed, Fumiya seemed to stumble on the same word for a similar reason to Chika. For lack of a good translation of the word “impoverished”, Fumiya claimed at the time of the interview to have forgotten to write it down. Whether this was a conscious choice or else an unconscious avoidance at the time of his translation is difficult to determine from the data. At the very least, Fumiya seemed to have looked up the word and contemplated its meaning and connotation, explaining that he felt that the word “貧乏” (*poor*) would not be an appropriate translation in a

Japanese newspaper because, “貧乏だって言うとなんか、なんか、本当に服も買えなかったり、ちゃんとともに食べてないっていう、まあ、アフリカの子みたいな感じがするんで” (*If you say “poor”, it’s like, they can’t even buy clothes, can’t even eat properly, well, like kids in Africa*). It is possible that Fumiya left the word out and thought of returning it to later, but ran out of time. Indeed, in the stimulated recall interview, Fumiya repeatedly mentioned the time constraints that prevented him from translating in a manner that he felt was most appropriate. At the same time, it could have equally been an avoidance measure that he made as a result of contemplating the negative discourse that it possibly invoked.

While there could be multiple reasons for the omission examined above, the reports of both Chika and Fumiya suggest that they contemplated not only the meaning of both the term “impoverished” and its dictionary equivalent in Japanese, but also the different historical, social and political contexts in which the word “impoverished” would be translated. In other words, they seemed to show sensitivity to the different “discourse worlds” (Kramsch, 2012) of English/Australia and Japanese/Japan, that would influence what can or cannot be said in the respective languages (Johnstone, 2008). That is to say, they seemed to recognise that the symbolic meaning of when an Australian (or an English speaker) calls North Korea an “impoverished” country is significantly different from when a Japanese (or a Japanese speaker) calls North Korea a “貧乏な” (*poor*) nation, in the light of the historical, social and political relationship between the countries. In other words, they both show the ability to contemplate the world-views of both Japanese and English speakers (or “Australians”), and show sensitivity to the linguistic differences as well as to the symbolic dimensions and relationships that it conjectures to an imagined audience of their translations. It thus suggests that this may be a sign of the students “transcultural competence” to recognise different world-views.

8.2.2 Engaging in mediation

In Chika’s case, she goes one step further in her translation and appeared to engage in mediation of the texts. The avoidance that she showed may not only be an awareness towards the discourses surrounding the texts, but also her active attempt to mitigate the effect of the word “impoverished” and to re-frame the discourse altogether. With regard

to the same sentence in the above extract, she commented that aside from the word “impoverished”, she was also concerned with the phrase “[North Korea is] one of the most isolated countries in the world”. She explained:

(Extract 8-10)

- Chika: あと、やっぱり、世界でもっとも孤立してると言ったら、悪い意味を与えているような気がして、とも言えるだったら、かもしれないみたいな、普通に、そうじゃないよって言う余地があると思って、で、もっと、やっぱり、そこに住んでないとわからないじゃないですか、だから、言い切れないと思って、使いました
- Also, I think, if you said that it was the most isolated in the world, it would give off a bad meaning, if you said that “you could say that [it was an isolated country]”, it’s like it could be that way, and there’s a possibility of saying that it’s not true, and, um, you have to have lived there to actually know, so I didn’t think it would be possible to make it a statement*
- Interviewer: そっか、じゃあ、あんまりネガティブな風に言わないようには気をつけたんだね
- I see, so, you tried not to make it sound so negative*
- Chika: あ、はい、あたしすごく、あの、他の国とかを批判するような記事が嫌いなので、それはできるだけ避けて、はい
- Oh, yes, I’m really, um, I hate articles that criticise other countries, so I decided to avoid that as much as I can, yes*
- Interviewer: すごい考えてるんだね
- So you were thinking a lot*
- Chika: あともう一つが、この、これを書くまえに「GO」って映画を見たじゃないですか、それが人種差別の話なので、日本ではそういう差別が多すぎると思う

ので、北朝鮮に対しての、それはできるだけ減らして respect を持って書きたかったので、そういう風に書きました

And one more thing, this, before we wrote this, we watched a movie called “GO”((A Japanese movie about a “zainichi” or ethnic Koreans living in Japan)), and it was about racial prejudice, and I thought that there was too much prejudice of that kind in Japan towards North Korea, and so I wanted to lessen that as much as I can and write in a way that showed respect, so I wrote it like this

In the above extract, by emphasising that North Korea was “one of the most” rather than “the most isolated” country, and, furthermore, by omitting the word “impoverished” from her translation, Chika appeared to be changing the positionality and perspective expressed in the source text. This decision seemed to be prompted by her understanding of the prejudice towards North Koreans in Japan and her subjective ideas about equality and her dislike for racial or ethnic prejudice. Thus, through her translation, she attempted to re-frame the text from a discourse that took a somewhat critical stance toward North Korea’s economic and political state (thus possibly invoking a somewhat racial/ethnic prejudice discourse) to one that showed respect. In doing so, Chika demonstrated her awareness for different world-views and subjectively seemed to be engaging in “cultural mediation” (Pratt, 2002) of the text. However, as Chika acknowledged during the stimulated recall interview, she was unsuccessful in this attempt due to her lack of competence, stating “そこまで略す (sic.) 力が自分にはないんで、何をつかえばいいかわからなかった” (*I didn’t have the ability to abbreviate it ((she probably meant “to translate”)) to that extent, because I didn’t know what to use*). Thus, Chika was also able to identify the shortcomings of her own Japanese linguistic competence and showed signs of reflexivity towards her own linguistic resources.

An interesting contrast can be seen in Anthony’s translation for the same concept described above. Anthony did not appear to contemplate the aspects mentioned by Chika and Fumiya. Instead, he translated “impoverished” as its dictionary equivalent

“貧乏” (poor):

(Extract 8-11)

- Interviewer: そっかそっか、うん、これは、impoverished っていうのは
I see, I see, yes, what about this “impoverished”?
- Anthony: 貧乏
“poor”
- Interviewer: 貧乏、それ、貧乏にしたのは
“Poor”, what was the reason you made it “poor”?
- Anthony: えっと、「これは北朝鮮では無理です」で、これ後から入れたんですよ、「貧乏」っていうのは、ここに、後から、だから、impoverished を忘れちゃって、気づいて書いた後、だから、これを見て「貧乏」をここに入れたんです
[I first translated it as] “in North Korea, all of these are impossible” and I put this “poor” in here afterwards, I mean, I forgot [to translate] “impoverished”, so after I wrote this I noticed that, so, I saw this and I put “poor” right in here
- Interviewer: ああ、なるほどね、「貧乏」って言葉選んだのは
Oh, I see, why did you choose the word “poor”
- Anthony: いや、えっと、貧乏っていうのは poverty、impoverished は poverty
Well, um, “poor” means “poverty”, “impoverished” is “poverty”

In the extract above, Anthony did not appear to show an awareness towards the semiotic and symbolic weight that the word “貧乏” (*poor*) could have in a Japanese context when referring to North Korea. He simply looked up the word in his electronic dictionary and used the first term that appeared. Of course, Anthony’s linguistic competence and lack of familiarity with Japanese newspapers may have been a major factor. As evidenced by Anthony’s language use diary, he seldom read Japanese

newspapers and was not exposed to Japanese writing regularly. Therefore, it may also be possible that Anthony lacked the sociocultural knowledge about the relationship between Japan and North Korea. At the same time, there could perhaps be another interpretation. If we consider that “all reading is a contextualised interpretative practice that may draw on frames of interpretation that are organised inter alia in terms of assumptions about geographic scale, as well about historic social relationships organised in terms of major ethnic divisions” (Collins & Slembrouck, 2004: 15) and influenced by the subjectivities (i.e. self-inhabited identities) that individuals bring to a text, the difference between Chika and Fumiya, and Anthony may have also been a matter of how they positioned themselves vis-à-vis the text and the multiple discourses it invoked.

That is to say, it is also possible to argue that, as Blommaert (2007) points out, certain words hold different meanings and invoke different reactions from different individuals depending on the social position they take. This is what Blommaert (2007) calls “intertextual asymmetry”, explaining as follows:

It is useful to note, however, that terms are never sensitive to everyone, everywhere and all of the time: they are often sensitive to particular groups and not to others, and the values of such words are thus often emblematic of particular social positions. (p. 8)

Considering such intertextual asymmetries amongst the students, Chika and Fumiya may have been aware that they could potentially be identified as a Japanese, which may have lead to their critical self-awareness towards what they say with regard to North Korea. Indeed, both of them had Japanese parents as well as Japanese names and recognised that other people could potentially position them as a Japanese. Therefore, the word “impoverished” in this context may have been more charged with meaning. Anthony, on the other hand, had one Japanese parent, an English name, and was not immediately identifiable as a Japanese. Moreover, he identified himself on most occasions as an Australian and had no plans of living in Japan, which may have made it difficult for him to image the world-view of Japanese speakers in Japan and made him less critical to what he said with regard to North Korea. That is to say, the

interpretations that Chika, Fumiya and Anthony drew on and the translation strategy they utilised may also reflect how they perceive themselves and their own positions within the multiple discourses. While a direct connection between the students' self-inhabited identities and their interpretation of the text would be difficult to establish from this data, this may be one factor that influenced the difference in the accounts of these students.

8.3 Other aspects of translation and interpreting activities

8.3.1 Necessity to confront challenges

Thus far I have examined the students' translingual and transcultural competence and shown how the translation activities provided the students with the opportunity to not only utilise translanguaging strategies but also contemplate the discourses of both languages. This may be a result of the bilingual nature of the translation activities that allowed the students to make a connection between their Japanese and English resources. I have suggested that this may not have been possible in other monolingual Japanese exercises that were conducted as part of the class, including the online discussion boards, essays, *kanji* tests and other similar activities.

Moreover, as Hashimoto and Takimoto (2011) observe, the pedagogical benefit of translation may lay in the presence of the source text (or utterance) that may make it difficult for students to resort to avoidance strategies and require the students to stretch the limits of their linguistic competence. They explain as follows:

When they (students) converse or write an essay in Japanese, they tend to say/write what they can say/write. However, interpreting and translation require students to render an original message (what someone else says/writes) in the target language. In other words, students are “denied resort to avoidance strategies and obliged to confront areas of the L2 system” (Cook, 1998, p. 119). This enables such students to experience new challenges, which also makes them aware of their weaknesses and strengths objectively. (p.11)

For some of the students in this study, this comparison and reflection on one's bilingual resources prompted by translation and interpreting seemed to be a new experience, as explained above. I have already indicated in the previous section that because being bilingual was an everyday, unmarked practice for these students, the translation and interpreting tasks may have provided them with an opportunity to objectively reflect and compare their Japanese and English, which, in turn, may have led to a raised awareness towards their languages.

Indeed, the students' reports seemed to support Hashimoto and Takimoto's (2011) observation stated above. For example, Takeshi commented that the interpreting task was challenging because “自分が言ってることは訳しやすい、人が言ってることは考える必要があるから” (*It's easy to translate what you are saying, but you have to think when it's something that somebody else said*). Furthermore, John aptly described the interpreting activity as a “test”:

(Extract 8-12)

なんか、英語と日本語をちゃんと本当に使うテストだと思いました、自分がどれくらい使えれるか本当のテストだと思いました [...] どっちとも同時にどれくらい使えるかなという全然前は知らなかったけど、試してみてこれくらい出来るんだなと思いました、同時に使う時、同時に使うのはまったく無いので、結構良い経験でした

You know, I think it was like a test where you have to use English and Japanese really appropriately, a real test to see how well you can use them [...] I really had no idea how well I could use both of them at the same time, but after doing this I know the level that I'm at, I really don't use both of them together, so it was a pretty good experience

Interestingly, it seemed that John did not consider his use of Japanese and English in class (see Extract 8-1) and in other similar interactions to be a case of using Japanese and English at the same time. It is possible that because John considered these two languages to be a part of an integrated system, he was not conscious of comparing them or reflecting on them in his daily interactions. Moreover, as his language use diary showed, there were very few occasions aside from the Japanese for Background

Speakers' subject where both languages were utilised. However, the interpreting activity may have allowed John to reflect on his use of linguistic resources, thus leading him to test the limits of his Japanese and English competence.

Indeed, the stimulated recall interview conducted after the translation and interpreting activities showed that the students were challenged by the task of having to translate accurately what "somebody else said", which allowed the students to re-evaluate their competence in Japanese. For instance in Chika's case, she realised that her Japanese competence was not as good as she had thought prior to the activity:

(Extract 8-13)

ずっと英語の方が強いとは思っていたんですけど、最近日本語の言葉が、なんかわからない言葉が減ってきたので、やっと自分がもうちょっと日本語が上手になったのかなと思ったんですけど、やっぱり足りないなって思いました、日常生活には困らない程度の日本語にはなってるから、日本に帰って親戚に会いに行ったときとかも、スーパーに行っても、まったく困らないから自分は普通のレベルかなと思ったんですけど、やっぱりこういうアクティビティすると、英語の方がだいぶ自分の中では、第一言語に近いなと思いました

I knew all along that I was stronger in English, but recently there's less Japanese words that I don't understand, so I was thinking that my Japanese improved a little bit, but I felt that it was yeah not enough, my Japanese is at a point where I don't have any problems in my daily life, when I go back to Japan and see relatives, at the supermarket, I don't have any problems at all, so I thought that my level was normal, but after doing these activities, I thought perhaps my English was closer to being my first language

From this extract, it seems that as a result of this translation and interpreting activity, Chika realised that although her Japanese was competent enough that it allowed her to conduct daily interactions without any difficulty, especially in the context of Japan, it was still not enough relative to her English. It is possible to observe that the necessity to interpret the original message spoken by others seemed to engage Chika in an active comparison of her Japanese and English within the same interaction, thus prompting her

to notice the short-comings of her Japanese and confirm the strengths of her English.

At the same time, some of the students also showed reflexivity towards their English competence and consciously or unconsciously compared it with their Japanese or with the English spoken by others. For example, Chika commented after the stimulated recall interview that she was dissatisfied with her English translation and felt reluctant to present it to the class. When she was asked during this interview to evaluate both her Japanese and English translation, she commented:

(Extract 8-14)

こっちはもっと新聞記事らしく、フローもあって、文章、もっとキレイな文章にしようと頑張ったんですけど、英語になると、自分も心がゆるかったというか、すぐなめてたというか、もっとリラックスして書いたんで、というのが、読んだら大体頭の中で大体もう英語に直接訳せるんですよ、簡単に、簡単に訳せたからあまり何も考えず、そのまま思いついたことをそのまま書いたんですよ、だから、全然、文章の構成とか、何も考えてません

This one ((her Japanese translation)) was more like a newspaper article, it flowed, the sentences, I worked hard to make the sentences better, but the English translation, my mind wasn't focused and I thought it would be a piece of cake, I was relaxed when I wrote this, because, the second I read it I could directly translate it into English in my head, easily, and because I could translate it easily I didn't think about anything, I wrote what came to me, so, really, the sentence structure and things like that, I didn't think about anything

In the above extract, Chika showed a critical attitude towards the English translation that she had undertaken, reporting that although it was much easier and automatic, she felt that it lacked the stylistic, structural and lexical sophistication of her Japanese translation. At the same time, she seemed to be perplexed as to why her English translation was not up to her expectations, even though she had thought that it was her stronger language.

There could be multiple reasons why Chika was able to give her full attention to the

translation into Japanese but was relatively carefree with her translation into English. For instance, the activity was, after all, conducted as part of a Japanese language class. Chika may have thus felt obliged to devote more time to writing in Japanese and perform better in that language. Secondly, it may have been a matter of the difficulty of the text. Although the texts chosen for the Japanese and English translations were lexically and grammatically approximately the same level of complexity, the English into Japanese text may have contained more cultural factors that needed to be mediated. As a result, Chika may have had to spend more time and attention on the English into Japanese translation to attend to these cultural differences. Thirdly, it may be that because English was her stronger language, she may have set a higher standard for herself in the Japanese into English translation.

In addition, an aspect that may be most relevant to this analysis is that Chika's perception of her bilingual competence may have been another important factor. Chika commented during the stimulated recall interview that her stronger language was definitely English because of her lexical and grammatical knowledge and the amount of expressions she knew in the language. It is thus possible that she devoted more time to her English into Japanese translation because she had a good understanding of the English source text, which allowed her to contemplate the complexity contained in the source text, including the nuances, discourses and the multiple meanings of lexical items. Thus because of this awareness and knowledge of English, Chika may have devoted much more time and careful attention when translating into Japanese. On the other hand, because Chika reported that her Japanese was weaker relative to her English, she may not have had a complete grasp of the complexity of the Japanese source text when translating into English. Therefore, she may have had fewer issues to consider and contemplate, resulting in a much quicker translation that may have left out some of the complexity of the Japanese source text.

In this regard, Chika's comment in Extract 8-14 above may be a result of the above-described discrepancy in the comprehension level of Japanese and English, which could have resulted in the differences in the time and effort devoted to the respective translations. It is evident from the extract that Chika was engaging in a conscious or unconscious comparison of these differences in her linguistic resources through the

activity. While such perceptions were not drawn out in the classroom discussions, translation activities could have the potential of providing students with the opportunity to thus reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of their bilingual repertoire. Furthermore, perhaps the stimulated recall interview itself may have provided a chance for the students to critically reflect on the usage of their languages.

In a different case, the comparison of English was not with the students' Japanese but was vis-à-vis the English of the other students. This was observed in the retrospective accounts by Teru. Similar to Chika, Teru was also dissatisfied with his English translation. Interestingly, Teru actually commented in the semi-structured interview prior to the translation activity that “オーストラリアでももう何年間か住んでるから、まあ、英語となんか日本語がど真ん中にあるんですよ、レベル的に、そろそろオーギーにもなっているのかなって思います” (*I've been living in Australia for a couple years now, so, English and Japanese are right in the middle, level-wise, I think I've become somewhat like an Aussie*). However, when the researcher asked him how he felt when he presented his Japanese to English translation to the class, Teru answered that he was nervous, explaining as follows:

(Extract 8-15)

一つは、なんかこの部分が上手くいかなかったから、えっともう一つは、なんだろう、こっちの方がすらすら書けすぎちゃったっていう、普段こっちの方が手こずる、こっちの方が手こずると思う、こっちの方が難しいと思ってて

First of all, because this part didn't go well, and another point was, what should I say, this one ((the Japanese into English translation)) went way too smoothly, usually I struggle with this ((writing in English)), I think I struggled with this one more, I thought that this one would be much more difficult

Similar to Chika, the reason that Teru was dissatisfied was because of the unexpected speed at which he completed the English translation. However, his reason seemed to be different. Teru went on to comment as follows:

(Extract 8-16)

それに、なんか、この人たちは僕よりオーストラリアに住んでるし、長く、だから、他の人たちの方が早く終わると思ったんですけど、僕は何位で終わったかわからないんですけど、早く書きすぎちゃったと思いました、だから、なんか絶対どっかでたくさんミスしてるなと思って、緊張しました、こっちは

Besides, like, these people ((classmates in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject)) have lived in Australia longer than me, so I thought they would finish before me, I'm not sure which place I finished at, but I thought I wrote too quickly, so, like, I thought I definitely made a lot of errors somewhere, I was nervous, with this one ((his English translation))

It seemed that Teru's timidity and his lack of confidence in his English translation not only came from finishing his English translation faster than he had expected, but also from his perception of his English competence relative to his peers in the classroom.

One way in which the translation activity was different from other monolingual Japanese activities undertaken in class (for example, online discussion boards, essays, *kanji* quizzes and so on), was that the students needed to produce English in front of their peers. While these translation tasks were not assessed by the teachers, it nonetheless created a space in which the students' English expertise became open to the informal evaluation by others. In other words, for Teru, who held considerable legitimacy as a speaker of Japanese, the translation activity was an activity in which his legitimacy as an English speaker could potentially be contested. This perhaps may be the reason for his sense of self-consciousness towards his English expertise. This activity of translation can thus be said to have led to a raised awareness towards his own English expertise that was not elicited in the semi-structured interviews.

Teru's sense of lack of legitimacy as a speaker of English was also apparent in the interaction during his presentation of his English translation. In the following segment, Teru presented his translation to the class, often stopping to ask for assistance from his peers and the teachers. His translation was written on a transparency sheet and was projected onto the whiteboard using an overhead projector:

(Extract 8-17)

- Teru: ああ、俺のダメですよ、全然おかしいですよ、なんか絶対なんかスペリング
Aw, mine's no good, it's really wrong, definitely um the spelling
- Teacher: どうぞどうぞ英語で
Go ahead go ahead, in English
- Anthony: Don't worry about it, don't worry about it
- John: Dude mine doesn't make sense
- Anthony: Won't be as bad as yours
- Teacher: 読んで読んで
Go ahead read it
- Teru: it is true that これどういう
It is true that how do you
- John: Tae-Se
- Teru: Tae-Se cannot control his own emotions 合ってるかわからない
Tae-Se cannot control his own emotions I'm not sure if this is correct
- John: あってるよ
It's correct
- Teru: これ「s」 必要ないですよ
This "s" isn't needed, right?
- Anthony: uun "at times"
- John: it's right, it's right
- Teru: without thinking he would roar, but his intention behind his なんかここおかしいです
Without thinking he would roar, but his intention behind his, something's wrong with this part

It can be observed above that Teru appeared to be significantly self-critical towards his own English translation. He showed timidity in starting and only began reading with the repeated urging from the teacher. He did, in fact, start presenting his translation in

English, but often switched to Japanese to ask for clarification with regard to pronunciation, grammar and the expressions that he utilised. Teru's use of Japanese in this extract seems to be his attempt to maintain the Japanese language activity frame, where he was most comfortable and where he believed he held more legitimacy as a speaker.

From this perspective, Chika's lack of satisfaction, described in Extract 8-14 above, towards her English translation may not only be a matter of the discrepancy between her linguistic expertise in Japanese and English, but may also be a matter of how she felt others perceived her English expertise. Indeed, during the stimulated recall interview conducted with the students' recordings of their interpreting activity, Chika felt that her English did not have a natural pronunciation:

(Extract 8-18)

レコーディングとか聞いていると、英語が第一言語のはずなのに、やっぱりまだアクセントがあって、別に日本語アクセントではないらしいんですけど、やっぱりナチュラルなアクセントではなくて、一番ナチュラルなアクセントは日本語だなんて

Listening to the recordings, English is supposed to be my first language, but there is an accent ((Chika perhaps meant "pronunciation")) to it, it doesn't seem to be a Japanese accent, but it's not a natural accent, I think my most natural accent is in Japanese

It was particularly her pronunciation that deviated from English norms that led her to question her English expertise. She thus concluded “でもやっぱり自分は違うんだなと思って、やっぱり self conscious になっちゃいますね” (*I realised that, just as I knew, I'm different, I can't help getting self-conscious*), suggesting that her dissatisfaction towards her English translation may indeed come from her sense of lack of legitimacy as an English speaker.

In this regard, while the class was a Japanese language class, the students were indeed aware of the other students' English expertise and were actively comparing their English not only with their Japanese, but also with the English of the other students, as

suggested above. Translation and interpreting, which appeared to make English a legitimate resource in the classroom, thus seem to have been instrumental in raising the students' awareness towards their linguistic expertise in English as well as Japanese. Moreover, while Teru seemed to comfortably claim language expertise and affiliation to English during the one-to-one semi-structured interview, even going so far as to say that he was almost an "Aussie", he could not do so in the presence of other students whom he felt held more legitimacy as speakers of English. Thus, the activity also seemed to lead some students to a re-evaluation of their language identities.

8.3.2 English as a legitimate resource

Contrary to the cases of Chika and Teru's examined above, the legitimacy of English as a resource in the classroom activity may have provided Anthony, whom we observed was labelled as an "Australian", with an opportunity to claim legitimacy in the classroom practice. This seemed to motivate him in the activity:

(Extract 8-19)

- Anthony: あと、こっちの方がやる気が出た、英語の文、英語の方が、もっとよく出来たから
Also, I was more motivated to do this one, the English text, the English one, because I was able to do it better
- Interviewer: こっちの方がやる気出たっていうのは
What do you mean by you were more motivated to do this one?
- Anthony: 英語の方が簡単だから、あとみんなと、どっちの方がうまくできるか争ってた、で、こっちは別にどうでもよかったから、
Because the English one was easier, and we were competing to see which one we can do better, I didn't care about this one ((the English into Japanese translation))
- Interviewer: あ、みんなと争ってたの、どっちか
Oh, so you were competing, which one

Anthony: 争ってたっていうか、あの、僕は、なんか、みんなより、みんなと同じくらいできると思って頑張ってた

Not competing exactly, um, I, like, I thought I could do equally well as the others, so I gave it my best

The translation activity, in which English was deemed a legitimate resource in the classroom, indeed provided Anthony with the access to his bilingual competence, which he could not mobilise in activities such as the online discussion board where only his Japanese was being utilised and evaluated. Contrary to this, Anthony was able to construct a more active engagement with the translation task.

As Anthony expressed in the above extract, translation, and particularly the Japanese into English translation, was an opportunity to demonstrate his English ability to the class. For instance, in the English into Japanese translation, which Anthony felt was much more challenging than the Japanese into English direction, he appeared to agree with the translation of his peers. When contemplating how to translate the English phrase, “born and raised”, Anthony resorted to copying Takeshi’s translation:

(Extract 8-20)

Born and raised は、えっと、「生まれて育ち」って書こうとしたんですけど、「生まれ育ち」ってあるらしくて、隣の子とかに聞いたんですけど、だから、「生まれ育ち」

“Born and raised” is, um, I wanted to write “born and then raised”, but I heard there’s “born and raised”, I asked the person next to me ((Takeshi)), so [I translated this as] “born and raised”

However, in the Japanese into English translation, Anthony showed resistance towards his peers' translations and asserted his own views. In the following extract, Anthony was recalling how he queried Takeshi’s Japanese into English translation, claiming that Takeshi’s translation did not meet the conventions of an Australian newspaper article.

(Extract 8-21)

- Anthony: なぜ日本の記事はいちいちこの人は59歳だ、69歳だって、それで、それを言ったら、あの、タケシ君が英語の記事でもそうだって言ってたんですが、やっぱ書いてませんよ、そんな
[I asked] why do Japanese articles write this person is 59 years old, [this person is] 69 years old, every single time, and I told Takeshi that, um, and he said that it was like that too in English newspapers, but even if I think about it now, it's not written like that
- Interviewer: 括弧に
In parenthesis
- Anthony: 括弧で、括弧でじゃなくて、あの、人の年齢をいちいち言わない、ここには26歳って、この人の記事だから書いてあるけど、この人のお父さんのことはここに書いてあったら、書かないっていう
In parenthesis, but not only that, um, [English newspapers] don't say the person's age every single time, it says here 26 years old ((referring to Tae-Se)), but that's because it's his article, if the article had referred to his father, they wouldn't write it ((the father's age))

As it can be observed in the above extract, in translating from Japanese to English, Anthony showed a critical attitude toward his peers' language choice and resisted Takeshi's advice and chose what he felt was the more appropriate translation.

8. 4 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have examined the students' use of their bilingual resources focusing on their engagement with the translation tasks and, to a lesser extent, the interpreting task that they completed as part of the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject. Firstly, it was found that the students were able to flexibly utilise their bilingual resources in Japanese and English to engage in the translation task. More specifically,

they appeared to be able to draw on linguistic knowledge and literacy skills associated with English and transfer them when producing a translation in Japanese. This may be a sign of their ability to translanguage between the two languages. However, it should be noted that it was difficult to determine whether this was a result of the nature of translation tasks or whether the students employed such strategies, even in monolingual activities. Nonetheless, the above finding is significant because it suggests that the students may have perceived English and Japanese not as discreetly bound languages, but rather as resources that made up their bilingual repertoires (Blommaert, 2010; Blommaert & Rampton, 2011).

Secondly, it was found that translation tasks may have also prompted the students to consider and compare the multiple discourses associated with English as well as with Japanese. For example, not only did the Chika and Fumiya contemplate the semantic difference between “impoverished” and its dictionary equivalent, “貧乏” (*poor*), they also seemed to consider the historically, socially and politically different contexts in which both terms would be utilised. It is possible that this awareness of the different discourses was prompted particularly because of the nature of translation activities, which required the use and comparison of both Japanese and English within the same task. Moreover, Chika even attempted to mediate between these differences by re-framing the discourse in her translation.

At the same time, there were also differences in the students’ level of awareness toward the multiple discourses involved in the translation of the above-mentioned English text into Japanese. This may have been due to a number of factors. Certainly linguistic competence, sociocultural knowledge and the amount of exposure to Japanese language newspaper conventions may have been important factors. Additionally, it is possible that the identity positions the students’ brought to the text may have resulted in “intertextual asymmetries” (Blommaert, 2007: 8) between the participants, which in turn may have resulted in differences in the way each student perceived the “ideological load” (Blommaert, 2007:9) of words such as “貧乏” (*poor*). This suggests that translation tasks may provide an important opportunity for students to reflect on the identity positions they bring to the text and how they position themselves vis-à-vis the multiple discourses invoked by the translation process.

In addition, despite the students' ability to translanguage or to recognise the multiple discourses involved in the translation task, it appeared that the students were not always successful in providing appropriate translations in the target language. For instance, while Chika and Fumiya could indeed recognise that the word “貧乏” (*poor*), the dictionary equivalent of the word “impoverished”, was an inappropriate translation, they could not find a more suitable term or find an alternative means of expressing the idea, for example, by paraphrasing it. What this may, in turn, suggest is that both of these students may have perceived Japanese and English lexical items to have a one-to-one correspondence, thus placing a great trust in their dictionaries to provide them with an equivalent in the other language. It may also show that these students were inexperienced in undertaking this kind of formal translation task.

Lastly, I have demonstrated how the bilingual nature of the translation and interpreting activities, which required the students to utilise Japanese and English at the same time, provided them with the opportunity to compare their Japanese and English expertise. Interestingly, although the students seemed to move fluidly between Japanese and English during classroom interactions (see Extract 8-1), many of them reported that utilising and comparing the two languages side-by-side was a new experience for them. In particular, the presence of the source text (or utterance) that made it difficult to resort to avoidance strategies may have forced the students to confront the strengths and weaknesses of their Japanese and English. Moreover, because the translation and interpreting activities required the use of English in the presence of other students, the students also may have needed to re-evaluate their English competence vis-à-vis their peers, thus resulting in different accounts of their English expertise when compared to their accounts given in the semi-structured interviews. Indeed, in the case of Anthony, the opportunity to utilise English in the class appeared to motivate him because it provided him with an opportunity to demonstrate his expertise, which was something he could not do in monolingual Japanese activities.

CHAPTER 9: Concluding chapter

This study examined the identity negotiation of seven bilingual Japanese heritage learners based on the students' narratives about their personal histories and language learning experiences at home and in their Japanese language classrooms. In this concluding chapter, I bring together the major findings and discuss their implications for heritage language education. In addition, I also outline the limitations of this study and give suggestions for further research.

9.1 Summary of major findings

Due to the intensified transnational movement of people brought about by advances in transportation and ICT, an increasing number of children are growing up around the world with varying degrees of exposure to multiple languages. As a result, there has also been a steady increase in the number of heritage learners who enrol in language classrooms to study their “heritage” language. Concomitant to such developments, in the past few decades, the field of heritage language education has seen a growth in the number of empirical studies that examine different aspects of heritage learners. A particularly fruitful area of research has been in the examination of the relationship between these students' identities and their heritage language. These studies have typically highlighted how competence in the heritage language is connected to a strong sense of ethnic identity, or vice versa (Chinen, 2005; Cho, 2000; Cho, Cho and Tse, 1998; Lee, 2002; Lee and Kim, 2008). However, globalisation has significantly complicated the social fields that individuals engage in, and the theoretical basis for understanding the ways in which bilinguals (or multilinguals) construct multiple senses of belonging. Traditional “language-as-identity” paradigms that were often employed in past studies, and which assumed a one-to-one correlation between language and ethnic identity, have thus become insufficient in capturing the complexity of the identities of multilingual individuals (See Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004; Young, 2008). There is thus an urgent need to address heritage learners' identities from this perspective and examine the local as well as trans-local factors that influence their identity negotiations and motivations for studying their heritage language.

Given the gap described above, this present study has attempted to apply recent developments in the study of language and identity to examine the identities of secondary and tertiary level Japanese heritage learners in Australia. More specifically, I attempted to address three main research questions. The first research question, explored mainly in Chapter 5, addressed the students' individual profiles and their narratives about their language and ethnic identities. The second research question, examined primarily in Chapter 5, 6 and 7, addressed the ways in which the students negotiated their identities within two different institutional settings: the VCE Japanese Second Language subject and the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject. The third research question, which was investigated in Chapter 8, addressed how the students utilised their bilingual resources in translation and interpreting tasks which were conducted as part of the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject. The analyses presented in the above chapters have provided rich insight into the ways in which various identities and resources are mobilised or negotiated in various contexts.

9.1.1 Construction of transnational identities

Firstly, this study has identified significant heterogeneity within students who fall under the category of heritage learner as defined by Draper and Hicks (2000). Indeed, there was diversity in terms of the students' family backgrounds (for example, age of immigration, parents' ethnicity, parental policy towards their children's Japanese language development), educational backgrounds (for example, years of schooling in Japan and Japanese Saturday School attendance) and life trajectories, which lead to diverse senses of belonging.

While the students' lives were based in Australia at the time of this study, these students constructed transnational ties to Japan, through both regular visits to the country or through the use of ICT. Tools such as Skype, Facebook, blogs and streaming websites allowed the students to maintain connections with friends, family and relatives living in Japan and also to access the latest news and popular culture (for example, *manga*, *anime*, music TV dramas and books) almost in real-time. The value of the Japanese language as a means of maintaining such transnational connections was therefore a common theme in the students' narratives.

However, regardless of the transnational connections that these students maintained with Japan, this study has shown that this did not necessarily equate to a sense of belonging to the nation-state or ethnicity that is often assumed to be linked to the heritage language. Indeed, the students expressed varying senses of ethnic identification, including Japanese, Australian and mixed-ethnicity (i.e. Japanese and Australian). Furthermore, these ethnic identifications were contextually dependant and were not necessarily indicators of the students' language identities or of their choice of nationality in the future. For instance, in Yuta's case, identifying as an Australian existed simultaneously with a sense of expertise in Japanese, an extensive consumption of Japanese popular culture and a decision to obtain a Japanese passport in the future. In Chika's case, identifying as a Japanese existed simultaneously with a sense of expertise in English and a decision to obtain Australian citizenship before she entered university in Australia. Moreover, in Teru's case, his life trajectories spanned Japan, Australia and China, which led him to conclude that he wanted a mode of belonging in-between fixed ethnic categories. In this regard, this study has provided empirical evidence for the potential disalignment between transnational ways of being (i.e. constructing or maintaining transnational ties to a nation) and transnational ways of belonging (i.e. feeling a sense of belonging to a nation or ethnicity to which one maintains transnational connections) that have been theorised by some scholars (c.f. Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004: 1011).

The findings of this study thus convincingly showed the insufficiency of language-based, ethnicity-based and nationality-based identity categories alone in describing the complex senses of belonging reported by the students. In addition, the students' flexible use of bilingual resources to engage in classroom tasks observed briefly in Chapter 8 also illuminated the everyday transgression of these boundaries and the un-categorisable identity positions the students occupied in their situated interactions. In this regard, the students' narratives clearly showed signs of what may be called transnational identities (Çaglar, 2001; Gupta & Ferguson, 1992; Kearney, 1995; Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; Rouse, 1991, 1995; Vertovec, 2001, 2007).

9.1.2 Polycentric view of Japanese language classrooms

This study also contributes to the ways in which we conceptualise language classrooms as sites of identity negotiation. This study started with the examination of Japanese language classrooms as discreet *fields* in which a dominant norm – those legitimated by the teacher and the curriculum – stratified the students based on their volume and composition of capital. Under this conceptualisation, it was assumed that students conformed to such norms, resisted them or were marginalised if they could not fit in. This initial view was useful in highlighting how the students “appeal to – or resist – particular languages, language varieties or linguistic forms in the struggle to claim the rights to particular identities and resist others that are imposed on them ” (Pavlenko and Blackledge, 2004: 3). It also illuminated how the students’ language identities, including their expertise, changed depending on the classroom and the peers they engaged with, which supports the idea that competence is about how one is positioned rather than about open-ended potential (Blommaert, Collins and Slembrouck, 2005). For example, although Chika was regarded highly for her Japanese competence in the Japanese for Background Speakers’ subject, her linguistic resources were initially not recognised as competence in the VCE Japanese Second Language subject because she did not conform to the expectations of the teacher.

However, this study has led to a much more complex understanding of the identity negotiations that occur in Japanese language classrooms. The Japanese language classrooms that were examined in this study were not insulated *fields* with a single unified norm, as envisaged at the start of this study. Instead, what has been highlighted was the relative autonomy of the Japanese language classes examined, in which macro factors “outside” of the classroom influenced the identity positions the students adopted inside the class (c.f. Canagarajah, 1993; Pennycook, 2001). More specifically, if classroom norms constituted one local centre of authority, the students’ identity positioning also showed alignment to multiple centres operating at different scale levels (Blommaert, 2008, 2010; Blommaert, Collins and Slembrouck, 2005). These alternative centres may be trans-local in scope, for example, parental expectations, peer groups, secondary school curricula, and the tertiary entrance system, to name a few. They may also be transnational in scope, for example, these may include wider ideologies

concerning the value of Japanese and English bilingualism or the commodity value of Japanese in the field of business.

The perspective outlined above significantly complicates the way in which the students' identity positionings in Japanese language classrooms are interpreted. It was not simply a matter of conformity or resistance, which is central to Bourdieu's notion of power (Swartz, 1997). It is perhaps closer to what Blommaert (2005) suggests as the polycentricity of *fields* in which multiple centres of authority are at play simultaneously at different scale levels. He explains that "adopting a polycentric image of society shows a more complex and more nuanced picture in which a reaction *against* something is also a marker of *adherence* to something else" (p. 78). In the case of this study, Takeshi's resistance to being monoethnically positioned as a "Japanese" in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject may have been a reaction *against* the classrooms norms, and, at the same time, an *adherence* to the trans-local norm of his "cosmopolitan" friends in which the plurality of one's ethnicity was valued. Therefore, the students in this study were found to be strategically utilising and adjusting their language identities in order to navigate these multiple norms in ways that maximised the legitimacy and the benefits they can obtain from the Japanese language classes.

9.1.3 Multiplicity of different ways of being "Japanese"

Given the polycentric view of Japanese language classrooms summarised above, perhaps one of the most important findings to emerge from this study is the identification of a multiplicity of different ways of being "Japanese" and the various indexical meanings attached to them. That is to say, whether the students conceptualised their language as a heritage by linking their language and ethnicity (i.e. claiming inheritance) or sought to disalign such connections (i.e. disclaiming inheritance), what the students seemed to share was the rejection of being positioned as a Japanese as defined by a connection to a particular nation, geographical location or ethnicity, which could, in turn, index their lack of legitimacy in second language classrooms (Chika), result in being expected to have a high level of Japanese competence which one may not be able to fulfil (Anthony) or perceived as a monoethnic individual lacking a transnational perspective (Teru and Takeshi). On the other hand, the students seemed to

be investing in a more democratic conceptualisation of being Japanese that was not defined by one's birth but by the quality of one's linguistic resources and indexical of one's potential transnational mobility (Chika and Yuta), academic capabilities (Anthony) or the plurality of one's identity as transnational individuals (Takeshi and Teru).

The findings above support Pavlenko and Blackledge's (2004) approach, which claims that identities in multilingual settings are shaped by discourses. However, this study expands on this notion by highlighting the fact that the above-mentioned indexical meanings may be simultaneous. This may be what Blommaert (2005) suggests as the "layered simultaneity" (p. 130) of discourses pertaining to the meaning of "Japanese". For example, Chika's self-positioning as a Japanese in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject can be interpreted simultaneously as a bid to position herself as an ethnically Japanese individual, and also as a bid to claim the authenticity of her linguistic resources and index her potential transnational mobility as a balanced bilingual. As such, this conceptualisation provides "a view of multiple, stratified layering in social conduct, in which multiple ideological and identity positions are at play simultaneously, not in a chaotic or random way but structured and to some extent predictable" (Blommaert, 2005: 236). The findings of this study provide supporting evidence for this claim and contribute empirically to the ways in which we conceptualise how these transnational individuals construct and negotiate their identities in Japanese language classrooms, which are complex, layered and polycentric social *fields*.

In addition, the polycentric view outlined above may help to explain the seemingly contradictory accounts given by the participants. For instance, although Chika positioned herself as a Japanese (Extract 7-5) and also distanced herself from such a position (Extract 7-13) in the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject, this may not be a case of "fragmentation" or "hybridity" as proposed by Pavlenko and Blackledge's (2004). In case of the former, Chika may have been aligning to the local norms of the classroom in which demonstrating linguistic resources that conformed to those of "native speakers" was highly valued, while in the case of the latter, she may have been aligning to a trans-local (or transnational) norm in which she was expressing her

transnational identity that cannot be categorised under a single identity category. Moreover, the meaning of Japanese utilised in these different contexts can be said to hold significantly different indexical meanings. Thus, these findings suggest the need for a more critical discussion and further theoretical and empirical investigation into the difference between identities emerging from the polycentric nature of *fields* and identities that are indeed fragmented or hybrid.

The identification of multiple and simultaneous meanings attached to the identity position of Japanese is a significant finding, especially in the light of past studies on Japanese heritage learners. While a direct comparison of this study with past studies on Japanese heritage learners' identities (for example, Koshiha & Kurata, 2012; Oguro & Moloney, 2012; Oriyama, 2010) is difficult because of the different cohorts of students examined, it can nonetheless be said that the earlier studies are based on an implicit assumption that the identity positions available to the students are a binary choice between Japanese and Australian (or a position somewhere in-between). Moreover, there seems to be an assumption that being Japanese is a monolithic identity category that holds the same meaning for all students, all of the time. Such assumptions do not sufficiently capture the different indexical meanings that a single identity category may have for students, even within the same classroom. In this respect, the findings of this study are similar to the views expressed in Doerr and Lee (2010) in which the authors highlight the diverse ways in which "Japanese-ness" is inherited. As such, this study suggests the importance of examining the layered meanings attached to seemingly monolithic identity categories that have often been used in studies on heritage learners.

9.1.4 The Japanese language as a "heritage" and as "capital"

In line with Pavlenko and Blackledge's (2004) claim, it was found that the Japanese language had dual values for the students: as a marker of national or ethnic belonging and as a capital for obtaining other forms of value cultural and symbolic capital. Indeed, it was found that the value of Japanese as a heritage, in other words, as something that one inherits was an important theme in the students' narratives about their parents and their expectations. This was also observed in the students' expressions of their sense of obligation to learn or speak Japanese properly, which consolidate the findings of

previous studies which point to the importance of ethnic ties to the heritage language as a motivation for studying it (Chinen, 2005; Cho, 2000; Cho, Cho and Tse, 1998; Lee, 2002; Lee and Kim, 2008).

At the same time, what the findings summarised in the above sections suggest is that the students in this study also perceived their Japanese linguistic resources as a powerful tool for obtaining other forms of valued capital (for example, high tertiary entrance scores), indexing their transnational identities and constructing difference with monolingual English speakers, monolingual Japanese speakers and with other less competent bilinguals. From this perspective, for these students, the Japanese language was important as linguistic capital in itself, with its value resting on its convertibility into other forms of valued cultural as well as symbolic capital. This tendency towards “commodification” (Heller, 2012) of Japanese may have been foregrounded in this study because of the particular time frame in which the data was collected. That is to say, most of these students were in Year 12, which was a transitional stage in their education. Thus, time-wise, it may have been an ideal opportunity for them to utilise their Japanese linguistic resources as a capital to gain an edge in the competition to enter their desired universities (or in Yuta’s case, entering his desired career). It is possible that this temporal element may have had an influence on the students’ perception of the value of their Japanese linguistic resources.

Importantly, this study has also identified that the value of Japanese as a heritage and as capital are not competing binaries. For instance, Yuta’s conceptualisation of his Japanese language as a heritage in the Japanese for Background Speakers subject may have been both a sense of his inheritance of the language and also an implicit claim that he possessed the Japanese competence on the par with a “native speaker” and therefore that his linguistic resources had high capital value. In this regard, this study has shown that language as a heritage and language as a capital may sometimes be interconnected.

9.1.5 Use of bilingual resources in translation and interpreting tasks

This present study also contributes to our understanding of how the students actually utilise their bilingual resources to engage in translation and interpreting tasks, and how

such tasks may contribute to their language development. Firstly, it was found that the students appeared to perceive their Japanese and English as a “single integrated system” (Canagarajah, 2011:403) rather than as discreet languages. Stimulated recall interviews conducted with the students revealed their ability to utilise linguistic conventions associated with one language in order to complete tasks in the other language, thus showing signs of what may be called “translingual competence” (MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages, 2007: 3). Furthermore, it was also found that the students showed signs of “transcultural competence” (MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages, 2007: 3) by demonstrating their awareness towards the multiple discourses involved in the translation process. Indeed, the students reported that they considered the political, social and cultural discourses surrounding the text and how it could be perceived in the target language. For instance, when translating the word “impoverished” (in reference to North Korea’s economic state) into Japanese, Chika and Fumiya avoided the use of the dictionary equivalent, “貧乏” (*poor*), in their translations in order to avoid the negative consequences that the term may invoke, given the political and social relationship between Japan and North Korea. In some cases, it was found that the students even actively engaged in cultural mediation, as when Chika attempted to shift the discourse of the English source text in her Japanese translation in order to mitigate the negative effects that the English phrase “[North Korea is] one of the most impoverished nations in the world” could potentially have in Japanese.

However, it was also found that the ability to mediate between texts varied from student to student. There may have been two major reasons for this. Firstly, it may have been due to differences in the students’ language ability and sociocultural knowledge. The students’ narratives revealed that some students were exposed to Japanese language media more often than others and thus these students may have held a higher level of written competence and awareness towards the nuances that the above-mentioned words or phrases held to a Japanese audience. Secondly, the difference may have been a result of “intertextual asymmetries” (Blommaert, 2007: 8) between the students, resulting from the different identity positions the students adopted vis-à-vis the text. For instance, Chika and Fumiya who were aware that others could position them as a “Japanese” due to their appearance and names may have been more critically self-aware towards what they said with regard to North Korea, compared to Anthony who was not immediately

identifiable as Japanese and who positioned himself on most occasions as an Australian.

In addition, the bilingual nature of the translation and interpreting activities were found to engage the students in the comparison of their Japanese and English. In particular, it was found that the presence of the source text (or utterance) may have made it possible for students to stretch the limits of their competence, allowing them to notice the strengths as well as the weaknesses of their Japanese and English resources.

Furthermore, because the activities provided a space in which the students needed to utilise English in the presence of their peers, the activities were also found to engage the students in the re-evaluation of their English resources. In addition, for English-dominant students like Anthony, the ability to utilise English as a legitimate resource in the classroom led to an increase in his motivation, allowing him to demonstrate considerable initiative in the way in which he engaged with the task.

9.2 Educational implications

The findings summarised thus far have important practical relevance for heritage language education. Therefore, in this section, I will firstly re-examine the notion of “heritage learner” in the light of my findings and then outline some of the educational implications of this study that may be applied to course development and to the teaching of Japanese to this group of learners. This section will also discuss the pedagogical potential that translation and interpreting tasks has for this particular group of bilingual learners.

Re-visiting the term “heritage learner” and “background speaker”

The findings of this study suggest that the term “heritage learner” may not be an appropriate label for this particular group of learners who have relatively high bilingual competence in both Japanese and English and who showed signs of transnational identities. Indeed, this study seems to support the criticism that the term heritage learner is rear-viewing and that the term heritage language “connotes something that one holds onto vaguely as one's remembrances, but certainly not something that is used in the present or that can be projected into the future” (García, 2005: 601). As I summarised in

9.1.1 above, the Japanese language was not a “remembrance” but a day-to-day tool that was important in constructing transnational ties to Japan and in the consumption of popular culture. Moreover, as summarised in 9.1.3 and 9.1.4 above, the Japanese language was, for these students, not so much about their ethnic “heritage”, but rather about its value as capital that allowed them to index their transnational identities and to shape their future trajectories.

The alternative term of “background speaker”, which has often been used in the Australian context, circumvents the issues raised above to a certain extent. However, the Japanese background to which the term presumably refers to was found to be significantly diverse, as summarised in 9.1.1 above. While Clyne et al. (1997), who suggested the use of the term, certainly acknowledged this diversity, their sub-categorisation of background speakers was based primarily on the students’ ethnic backgrounds and age of immigration. This categorisation may have been applicable in the past for certain ethnic groups and their relation to particular communities, but may not be completely applicable for the group of students examined in this study. As we have seen, ethnic background (i.e. one Japanese parent, two Japanese parents, no Japanese parents) and age of immigration was not an indicator of the students’ expertise. Furthermore, the notion that ethnicity is a clearly-bound identity category was queried by the presence of Teru who crossed those boundaries to construct a strong sense of affiliation and inheritance to the Japanese language, regardless of not being “Japanese” in the conventional sense of the word (Leung, Harris and Rampton, 1997). Therefore, the term “background speaker” and the sub-categorisation suggested may not fully consider the complexity of the notion of ethnicity and its relationship to the students’ language expertise and inheritance.

A proficiency-based categorisation may in fact be a more practical distinction for the purpose of classroom development and pedagogy (see for example, Kagan, 2005; Kondo-Brown, 2005). However, this study has shown that there can be a discrepancy between one’s sense of expertise in a language and one’s affiliation to it. For instance, even though Fumiya felt that Japanese was his weaker language, he nevertheless felt a strong affiliation to it. Designating learner as a heritage language on the basis of the students’ expertise may result in those with relatively weak Japanese competence and a

strong sense of affiliation to it being categorised as a second language learner, while those with relatively high competence in Japanese but with a limited sense of affiliation to the language being categorised as a heritage learner. This categorisation may thus ignore the complex relationship between expertise and affiliation and also downplays the importance of the agency that students exert in determining whether or not they are heritage learners.

The criticisms towards existing categorisations outlined above do not solve the problem of how best to label this group of learners, and may even further complicate the issue. Nonetheless, the findings provide a more nuanced representation of heritage learners, which may assist educators and policy makers in recognising the diverse cohort of students that are often subsumed under one label. At the very least, it is possible to suggest that for this particular group of students, as García (2009) argues, the term bilingual or emergent bilinguals would be a better alternative. Similarly, the students' Japanese language may be better conceptualised as a part of their "linguistic repertoire" (Blommaert and Rampton, 2011), which would then make it easier to recognise the unequal distribution of their linguistic resources across different modalities and contexts.

Incentives for enrolling in Japanese language classes

On a very practical level, this study also suggests that instrumental motivations and incentives play a crucial role in motivating heritage learners to enrol in Japanese language subjects. Raising the potential returns one can gain may be a simple, yet effective way of endorsing enrolment in such heritage language subjects. This may be particularly applicable for students at the secondary school level considering university entrance and for whom class marks directly affect their pathways to university.

However, it should be noted that, as evidenced in Chapter 6, the higher the stakes are, the more likely that students may opt to conform to the norms of the classroom, even if this entails the downplaying of one's expertise and inheritance. For instance, Chika disclaimed inheritance and downplayed her Japanese expertise in the VCE Japanese Second Language classroom in order to conform to the expectations of the teacher. Thus, care needs to be taken in recognising the considerable power that such tertiary entrance

systems and teachers have in influencing the identity positions that students choose to adopt in language classrooms.

Considering the diverse background and aspirations of students

The significant heterogeneity within this group of students in terms of their backgrounds, linguistic resources and future aspirations suggest that a single definition of competence may not be appropriate. As Chapter 5 revealed, while all of these students expressed their hope of utilising Japanese in their future careers, the particular contexts in which they envisaged using it varied considerably. While some students hoped to work in Japan, others hoped to work in Australia using their Japanese with the occasional Japanese client. Naturally, the competence required in each of these different *fields* will vary. Therefore, while catering for each students' different needs within a single classroom may be very difficult, at the very least, teachers may assist these students to have a clearer understanding of what "competence" they may need to aspire to and what they need to improve or learn in order to achieve it.

The relevance of identity in heritage language education

The findings also suggest that the relevance of identity in the language development of this particular group of heritage learners may not be a case of strengthening or developing their ethnic identity as Japanese individuals. Rather, the importance may be in fostering these students' meta-awareness towards the multiple discourses and ideologies in which they participate. In this regard, this study supports Kramsch's (2011) claim that the competence that needs to be fostered in a highly globalised world is the ability "to reflect critically or analytically on the symbolic systems we use to make meaning" (p. 365) and how such systems may position one in certain identity categories. In other words, what may be important for these students who engage with a multiplicity of different discourses is "the ability to shape the multilingual game in which one invests – the ability to manipulate the conventional categories and societal norms of truthfulness, legitimacy, seriousness, originality – and to reframe human thought and action" (Kramsch & Whiteside, 2008: 667). In concrete terms, it is not only about the learning and teaching of certain aspects of the Japanese language (for example,

pronunciation, *kanji*, honorifics, grammar and so on), but also about raising the students' awareness towards how those resources (or lack thereof) *index* them as a certain kind of person, how such indexical meanings may differ between *fields* and interlocutors and how to take advantage of the various discourses.

However, it is important to acknowledge that for heritage learners who have limited competence in written and spoken Japanese, which may make up the majority of heritage learners in Australia, consolidating their understanding of their ethnic background, developing their ethnic identities and allowing them to positively view their Japanese “heritage” may be an important part of their Japanese language development.

Translation and interpreting tasks as a pedagogical approach

One possible approach to consolidating students' competencies is the use of translation and interpreting activities. Indeed, this study has shown that the students displayed signs of their translingual and transcultural competence when undertaking these translation and interpreting tasks. However, it was also found that the resultant translations (and interpretations) were not always appropriate in the target language. Thus, teachers may be able to assist these students by helping them distinguish between successful translingual strategies and interference from their bilingual resources. In other words, a critical perspective towards their bilingual resources may need to be fostered (Canagarajah, 2011). To this end, providing the students with an opportunity to critically reflect and review their translation and interpretation is equally important as the task itself. Furthermore, in terms of the choice of translation or interpreting material, the findings suggests that students' awareness towards multiple discourses may be best brought to the foreground if the text the students translate contain political, social or cultural elements that require the student to mediate between different discourses and make decisions pertaining to what can or cannot be said in the respective languages (Johnstone, 2008).

9.3 Limitations and directions for future research

One significant limitation of this study that requires acknowledgement is a weakness inherent in the case study approach. That is to say, the students in this study represent a very small cohort of students who fall under the categories of “heritage learner” or “background speaker”. More specifically, these students were a handful of “elite” bilinguals who had the linguistic, cultural and perhaps economic means in the first place to maintain transnational connections with Japan, to negotiate and manage their identities and to choose their future pathways. In addition, as evidenced by the students’ narratives in Chapter 5, most of the students’ parents were indeed highly supportive of the students’ Japanese language development and, importantly, their bilingual development. It is also possible that the selection criteria to enrol in the university subject may have favoured academically talented students who were motivated to learn Japanese to begin with. For the vast majority of heritage learners who may only have receptive competence in Japanese, or who for some reason cannot construct transnational ties to Japan, identity options may be far fewer and transnational identities may be inaccessible. In such cases, it is quite possible that the value of Japanese as a means of re-connecting with one’s roots and as a symbol of one’s connection to Japan may be an important aspect of their investment. In this regard, this study may be further consolidated by future research that examines individuals with Japanese backgrounds who do not enrol in Japanese language classrooms, or those who have a more limited competence in Japanese.

Another important limitation that needs to be addressed pertains to the methodology of this study. Although a variety of data sources were effectively utilised in this study, a reasonable portion of the data utilised in this study was derived from semi structured interviews conducted with the participants. Thus, it should be noted that the narratives and the analysis were based on the students’ recollection of their lives and of their participation in the two Japanese language classrooms examined. Therefore, while the participants’ accounts indeed provide a glimpse into their experiences, it is equally possible that poor recall, the students’ current circumstance and their relationship with me, the researcher, may have had an influence on the data elicited.

Furthermore, it is important to note that the participants were aware that I was a teaching staff at the university where this study was undertaken and where the Japanese for Background Speakers' subject was offered. Thus, this may have also influenced what the students felt was appropriate to say in such an institutional context. Moreover, it may have also influenced the students' choice to utilise Japanese during the interviews. It is possible that if the interviews had been conducted in English, the narratives and the identity positions the students adopted may have been considerably different. As such, the narratives and the analysis presented in this study should be viewed as one aspect of the students' "acts of representation" (Harris, 2006).

In connection with the above limitations, Rampton (2013) citing Silverstein (1985) writes that a comprehensive account requires the consideration of the "total linguistic fact", which is comprised of the analysis of linguistic forms, situated interactions and ideologies. Due to the nature of the methodology employed, the focus of this study has mainly been on the ideologies that became apparent through the interviews, and, to a lesser extent, the situated interactions. Thus this study may be consolidated by future studies that focus on the students' situated interactions and the linguistic forms they utilise. Indeed, recent studies in interactional sociolinguistics that utilise conversation or discourse analysis have yielded important and new findings concerning how macro social structures and ideologies are manifested in micro-level interactions and the linguistic forms that are employed by speakers (for example, Chun, 2009; Dong & Blommaert, 2009; Jaspers, 2011). Thus, future studies may benefit from examining the situated interaction amongst Japanese heritage learners or between Japanese heritage learners and Japanese or English monolinguals.

Finally, this study has focused primarily on the students' perceptions of their identities in relation to their Japanese. While the students' perception of their English is touched on briefly in Chapter 5 and less so in Chapter 8, a more comprehensive analysis would require the examination of the values that the students attach to their English resources and the multiple indexical meanings attributed to the identity position of Australian, for example. This may be an important avenue for future research that would provide a more holistic understanding of the complex ways in which the students' negotiate their identities both in Japanese and English.

9.4 Conclusion

In summary, this study has attempted to provide a nuanced representation of a particular group of bilingual Japanese heritage learners and how they negotiate their identities in Japanese language classrooms, which are in fact polycentric social *fields*. In doing so, this study has also queried some of the theoretical assumptions that underlie previous studies on similar groups of students. This study has, most importantly, argued for the necessity to understand these learners not as “Japanese”, “Australian” or even as “heritage learners”, but as transnational individuals. For these students whose lives were defined by multiple languages and connections to multiple nations, the construction of such transnational identities was important because it allowed them to side-step essentialist ideologies concerning identity, language, ethnicity and citizenship. As Heller (2007) writes, these students preferred “to alter the discourse, to move it to something pluralist which might be a way-station to not caring at all any more about ethnicity, or race, or any other social category which might be used as a basis for social stratification” (p. 218). Indeed, transnational identities and the re-framing of “Japanese” as a sign of one’s pluristic identity was important not only as a means of constructing distinction vis-à-vis monolinguals, but also as a means of positively construing the linguistic and cultural resources they possessed as assets, rather than as deficits vis-à-vis “native speaker”. As Anthony aptly described, the Japanese language for these students was precisely a “life skill” which they utilised to navigate the multiple social *fields* they engage in and which they hoped to utilise in shaping their futures.

REFERENCES

- Aparcio, F. R. (1983). Teaching Spanish to the native speaker at the college level. *Hispania*, 66, 232-238.
- Baker, C., & Jones, S. P. (1998). *Encyclopedia of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Beaudrie, S., & Ducar, C. (2005). Beginning level university heritage programs: Creating a space for all heritage language learners. *Heritage Language Journal*, 3(1), 1-26.
- Berardi-Wiltshire, A. (2009). *Italian identity and heritage language motivation: Five stories of heritage language learning in traditional foreign language courses in Wellington, New Zealand*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Massey University, New Zealand.
- Berry, J. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models, and some new findings* (pp. 9-25). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Berry, J., Kim, U., Power, S., Young, M., & Bujaki, M. (1989). Acculturation attitudes in plural societies. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 38(2), 185-206.
- Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2007). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (3rd ed.). Maidenhead, England: McGraw-Hill.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2011). Pride, profit and distinction: Negotiations across time and space in community language education. In A. Duchene & M. Heller (Eds.), *Language in late capitalism: Pride and profit* (pp. 116-141). Hoboken: Routledge.
- Block, D. (1995). Social constraints on interviews. *Prospect*, 10, 35-48.
- Block, D. (2000). Problematizing interview data: Voices in the mind's machine? *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(4), 757-763.
- Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Block, D. (2006). *Multilingual identities in a global city: London stories*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Block, D. (2007). The rise of identity in SLA Research, post Firth and Wagner (1997). *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 863-876.

- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2007). Sociolinguistic scales. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 4(1), 1-19.
- Blommaert, J. (2008). Multi-everything London. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 7(1), 81-89.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2013). Citizenship, language and superdiversity: Towards complexity. *Tilburg Papers in Cultural Studies*, 45, 1-4.
- Blommaert, J., Collins, J., & Slembrouck, S. (2005). Spaces of multilingualism. *Language and Communication*, 25, 197-216.
- Blommaert, J., & Rampton, B. (2011). Language and superdiversity. *Diversities*, 13(2), 1-22.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977a). The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information*, 16(6), 645-668.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977b). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Brinton, D. M., Kagan, O., & Baucks, S. (Eds.). (2009). *Heritage language education: A new field emerging*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4-5), 585-614.
- Burns, R. B. (1990). *Introduction to research methods*. Melbourne: Longman.
- Çaglar, A. S. (2001). Constraining metaphors and the transnationalisation of spaces in Berlin. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 27(4), 601-613.
- Calhoun, C. (1993). Habitus, field, and capital: The question of historical specificity. In C. Calhoun, E. LiPuma & M. Postone (Eds.), *Bourdieu: Critical perspectives* (pp.

- 61-88). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cambell, R. N., & Rosenthal, J. W. (2000). Heritage languages. In J. W. Rosenthal (Ed.), *Handbook of undergraduate second language education* (pp. 165-184). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Campbell, R., & Peyton, J. K. (1998). Heritage language students: A valuable language resource. *The ERIC Review*, 6(1), 38-39.
- Canagarajah, S. (1993). Critical ethnography of a Sri Lankan classroom: Ambiguities in student opposition to reproduction through ESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(4), 601-626.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(iii), 401-417.
- Carreira, M. (2004). Seeking explanatory adequacy: A dual approach to understanding the term "heritage language learner". *Heritage Language Journal*, 2(1), 1-25.
- Carrington, V., & Luke, A. (1997). Literacy and Bourdieu's sociological theory: A reframing. *Language and Education*, 11(2), 96-112.
- Chinen, K. (2005). Heritage language development: Understanding the roles of ethnic identity and Saturday school participation. *Heritage Language Journal*, 3(1), 27-59.
- Cho, G. (2000). The role of heritage language in social interactions and relationships: Reflections from a language minority group. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24(4), 369-384.
- Cho, G., Cho, K., & Tse, L. (1997). Why ethnic minorities want to develop their heritage language: The case of Korean-Americans. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 10(2), 106-112.
- Chun, E. (2009). Speaking like Asian immigrants: Intersections of accommodation and mocking at a U.S. high school. *Pragmatics*, 19(1), 17-38.
- Clyne, M. (1970). Some aspects of the bilingualism and language maintenance of Australian-born children of German speaking parents. *ITL*, 9, 35-47.
- Clyne, M. (1991). *Community languages - The Australian experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clyne, M. (1997a). Managing language diversity and second language programmes in Australia. *Current Issues in Language and Society*, 4(2), 94-119.
- Clyne, M. (1997b). Multilingualism in Australia. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*,

- 17, 191-203.
- Clyne, M., Fernandez, S., Chen, I. Y., & Summo-O'Connell, R. (1997). *Background speakers: Diversity and its management in LOTE programs*. Canberra: Language Australia.
- Clyne, M., & Kipp, S. (1996). Language maintenance in multicultural Australia, 1991. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 1-19.
- Collins, J., & Slembrouck, S. (2004). Reading shop windows in globalized neighborhoods: Multilingual literacy practices and indexicality. *Working Papers on Language, Power and Identity*, 21, 1-28.
- Cook, G. (2010). *Translation in language teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2011). Separate and flexible bilingualism in complementary schools: Multiple language practices in interrelationship. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1196-1208.
- Cummins, J. (1995). Discursive power in educational policy and practice for culturally diverse students. In D. Corson (Ed.), *Discourse and power in educational organisations* (pp. 191-213). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 20(1), 43-63.
- de Kretser, A., & Spence-Brown, R. (2010). *The current state of Japanese language education in Australian schools*. Carlton South: Educational Services Australia Ltd.
- Doerr, N., & Lee, K. (2010). Inheriting "Japanese-ness" diversely. *Critical Asian Studies*, 42(2), 191-216.
- Dong, J., & Blommaert, J. (2009). Space, scale and accents: Constructing migrant identity in Beijing. *Multilingua*, 28, 1-24.
- Doran, M. (2004). Negotiating between Bourge and Racaille: Verlan as youth identity practice in suburban Paris. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 93-124). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Draper, J. B., & Hicks, J. H. (2000). Where we've been; What we've learned. In J. B. Webb & B. L. Miller (Eds.), *Teaching heritage language learners: Voices from*

- the classroom*. New York: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- Duff, P. (1990). Developemts in the case study approach to SLA research. In T. Hayes & K. Yoshioka (Eds.), *Proceedings of the First Conference on Second Language Acquistion and Teaching* (pp. 34-87). Tokyo: International University of Japan.
- Duff, P. (2006). Beyond generalizability: Contextualization, complexity and credibility. In M. Chalhoub-Deville, C. A. Chapelle & P. Duff (Eds.), *Inference and generalizability in applied linguistics: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 65-95). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Duff, P., & Uchida, Y. (1997). The negotiation of teachers' sociocultural identities and practices in postsecondary EFL classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 451-486.
- Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Friedman, D., & Kagan, O. (2009). Academic writing proficiency of Russian heritage speakers: A comparative study. In D. M. Brinton, O. Kagan & S. Baucks (Eds.), *Heritage language education: A new field emerging* (pp. 181-198). New York: Routledge.
- García, O. (2005). Positioning heritage languages in the United States. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(4), 601-605.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Garcia, R., & Diaz, C. (1992). The status and use of Spanish and English among Hispanic youth in Dade County (Miami), Florida: A sociolinguistic study, 1981-1991. *Language and Education*, 6, 13-32.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2007). *Data elicitation for second and foreign language research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideologies in discourses*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Gee, J. P. (2000). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of*

- Research in Education*, 25, 99-125.
- Giampapa, F. (2004). The politics of identity, representation, and the discourses of self-identification: Negotiating the periphery and the center. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 192-218). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Giroux, H. (1992). Resisting difference: Cultural studies and the discourse of critical pedagogy. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson & P. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural studies* (pp. 199-212). New York: Routledge.
- Gupta, A., & Ferguson, J. (1992). Beyond "culture": Space, identity and the politics of difference. *Cultural Anthropology*, 7(1), 6-23.
- Hall, S. (1992a). New ethnicities. In J. Donald & A. Rattansi (Eds.), *"Race", cultures, and difference* (pp. 252-259). London: Sage Publication.
- Hall, S. (1992b). The question of cultural identity. In S. Hall, D. Held & T. McGrew (Eds.), *Modernity and its futures* (pp. 274-316). Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Open University.
- Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs 'identity'? In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 1-17). London: Sage Publication.
- Hammersley, M. (1992). *What's wrong with ethnography? Methodological explorations*. London: Routledge.
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1983). *Ethnography principles in practice*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Harré, R., & van Langenhove, L. (1999). *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of intentional action*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Harris, R. (2006). *New ethnicities and language use*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hashimoto, H., & Takimoto, M. (2011). Intercultural language learning through translation and interpreting: A study of advance-level Japanese learners. *Babel*, 45(2-3), 11.
- Hatori, R. (2009). Fukugō aidentiti to nihongo kyōiku kenkyū [Multiple identities and Japanese language education research]. *Web-ban Literacies*, 6(2), 21-26.
- Heller, M. (1987). The role of language in the formation of ethnic identity. In J. Phinney

- & M. Rotheram (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization* (pp. 180-200). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Heller, M. (2007). *Linguistic minorities and modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Heller, M. (2012). Language as a resource in the globalized new economy. In N. Coupland (Ed.), *The Handbook of Language and Globalization* (pp. 349-365). New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Heller, M., & Duchene, A. (2011). Pride and profit: Changing discourses of language, capital and nation-state. In A. Duchene & M. Heller (Eds.), *Language in Late Capitalism: Pride and Profit* (pp. 1-21). Hoboken: Routledge.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Wang, S. C. (2009). Who are our heritage language learners? Identity and biliteracy in heritage language education in the United States. In D. M. Brinton, O. Kagan & S. Baucks (Eds.), *Heritage language education: A new field emerging* (pp. 3-38). New York, NY: Routledge.
- James, D. (2011). Beginning with Bourdieu in educational reserach. *British Education Research Association online resource*, 1-4. Retrieved from http://www.bera.ac.uk/files/2011/06/beginning_with_Bourdieu_in_educational_research.pdf
- Jaspers, J. (2011). Talking like a 'zerolingual': Ambiguous linguistic caricatures at an urban secondary school. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1264-1278.
- Jensen, L. (2007). Heritage language reading in the university: A survey of students' experiences, strategies, and preferences. *Heritage Language Journal*, 5(1), 98-116.
- Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse analysis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Jørgensen, J. N. (2008). Polylingual language around and among children and adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5(3), 161-176.
- Joseph, J. E. (2004). *Language and identity: National, ethnic, religious*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kagan, O. (2005). In support of a proficiency-based definition of heritage language learners: The case of Russian. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 8(2/3), 213-221.
- Kanno, K., Hasegawa, T., Ikeda, K., Ito, Y., & Long, M. H. (2009). Prior language-learning experience and variation in the linguistic profiles of advanced English-

- speaking learners of Japanese. In D. M. Brinton, O. Kagan & S. Baucks (Eds.), *Heritage language education: A new field emerging* (pp. 165-180). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kanno, Y. (2000). Bilingualism and identity: The stories of Japanese returnees. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 3(1), 1-18.
- Kanno, Y. (2003). *Negotiating bilingual and bicultural identities: Japanese returnees betwixt two worlds*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kataoka, H. C., Koshiyama, Y., & Shibata, S. (2008). Japanese and English language ability of students at supplementary Japanese schools in the United States. In K. Kondo-Brown & J. D. Brown (Eds.), *Teaching Chinese, Japanese, and Korean heritage language students: Curriculum needs, materials, and assessment* (pp.47-76). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kawakami, I. (2007a). *Children crossing borders and literacy education for the 21st century*. Paper presented at the Malaysia International Conference on Foreign Languages, Malaysia.
- Kawakami, I. (2007b). "Idō suru kodomo tachi" to gengo kyōiku: Kotoba, bunka, shakai wo shiyani ["Children crossing borders" and language education: Language, cultural and society]. In R. Sasaki, H. Hosokawa, Y. Sunakawa, M. Kadokura & H. Segawa (Eds.), *Henbō suru gengo kyōiku: Tagengo tabunka shakai no literacies toha nanika [Language education amidst change: Rethinking literacies in multilingual multicultural societies]* (pp. 1-10). Tokyo: Kurushio syuppan.
- Ke, C. (1998). Effects of language background on the learning of Chinese characters among foreign language students. *Foreign Language Annals*, 31, 91-100.
- Kearney, M. (1995). The local and the global: The Anthropology of globalization and transnationalism. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24, 547-565.
- Kim, E.-Y. (2010). Using translation exercises in communicative EFL writing classroom. *ELT Journal*, 65(2), 154-160.
- Kim, E. J. (2003). An analysis of particle errors by heritage and non-heritage learners of Korean. In C. You (Ed.), *Korean language in America 8: Papers from the Eighth Annual Conference and Professional Development Workshop* (pp. 37-50). Honolulu: American Association of Teachers of Korean.
- Kim, H.-S. H. (2001). Issues of heritage learners in Korean language classes. In J. Ree

- (Ed.), *Korean language in America 6: Papers from the Sixth Annual Conference and Professional Development Workshop* (pp. 257-273). Honolulu: American Association of Teachers of Korean.
- Kim, J. T. (2001). The degree of L1 interference among heritage and non-heritage learners of Korean: Do heritage students have advantages over non-heritage students? In J. Ree (Ed.), *Korean language in America 6: Papers from the Sixth Annual Conference and Professional Development Workshop* (pp. 285-296). Honolulu: American Association of Teachers of Korean.
- Kinginger, C. (2004). Alice doesn't live here anymore: Foreign language learning and identity reconstruction. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 219-242). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kondo, K. (1998). Social-psychological factors affecting language maintenance: Interviews with *Shin Nisei* university students in Hawaii. *Linguistics and Education*, 9(4), 369-408.
- Kondo-Brown, K. (2001). Heritage language students of Japanese in traditional foreign language classes: A preliminary empirical study. *Japanese Language and Literature*, 35(2), 157-179.
- Kondo-Brown, K. (2005). Difference in language skills: Heritage language learner subgroups and foreign language learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(4), 563-581.
- Kondo-Brown, K. (2006). How do English L1 learners of advanced Japanese infer unknown kanji words in authentic texts? *Language Learning*, 56, 109-153.
- Kondo-Brown, K. (2009). Heritage background, motivation, and reading ability of upper-level postsecondary students of Chinese, Japanese, and Korean. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 21(2), 179-197.
- Kondo-Brown, K., & Brown, J. D. (Eds.). (2008). *Teaching Chinese, Japanese, and Korean heritage language students: Curriculum needs, materials, and assessment*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kondo-Brown, K., & Fukuda, C. (2008). A separate track for advanced heritage language students?: Japanese intersentential referencing. In K. Kondo-Brown & J. D. Brown (Eds.), *Teaching Chinese, Japanese, and Korean heritage language students: Curriculum needs, materials, and assessment* (pp. 135-156). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Koshiba, K., & Kurata, N. (2012). Language identities of Japanese home-background speakers and their language learning needs. *Japanese Studies*, 32(3), 357-375.
- Kramsch, C. (2011). The symbolic dimension of the intercultural. *Language Teaching*, 44(3), 354-367.
- Kramsch, C. (2012). *Re-framing the cultural component of foreign languages in an era of globalization*. Paper presented at CLaSIC 2012 - The 5th CLS International Conference, Singapore.
- Kramsch, C., & Whiteside, A. (2008). Language ecology in multilingual settings: Towards a theory of symbolic competence. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(4), 645-671.
- Landry, R., & Allard, R. (1992). Subtractive bilingualism: The case of Franco-Americans in Maine's St John Valley. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 13(6), 515-543.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Le Page, R., & Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, J. S. (2002). The Korean language in America: The role of cultural identity in heritage language learning. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 15(2), 117-133.
- Lee, J. S., & Kim, H.-Y. (2008). Heritage language learners' attitudes, motivations, and instructional needs: The case of postsecondary Korean language learners. In K. Kondo-Brown & J. D. Brown (Eds.), *Teaching Chinese, Japanese, and Korean heritage language students: Curriculum needs, materials, and assessment* (pp. 159-186). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Leung, C., Harris, R., & Rampton, B. (1997). The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 543-560.
- Levitt, P., & Glick Schiller, N. (2004). Conceptualizing simultaneity: A transnational social field perspective on society. *International Migration Review*, 38(3), 1002 - 1039.
- Liddicoat, A. (2002). Static and dynamic views of culture and intercultural language acquisition. *Babel*, 36(3), 5-11.
- Liddicoat, A., Papademetre, L., Scarino, A., & Kohler, M. (2003). *Report on intercultural language learning*. Retrieved 30 August 2007, from www1.curriculum.edu.au/nalsas/pdf/intercultural.pdf

- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Malakoff, M., & Hakuta, K. (1991). Translation skill and metalinguistic awareness in bilinguals. In E. Bialystok (Ed.), *Language processing in bilingual children* (pp. 141-166). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matsunaga, S. (2003). Instructional needs of college-level learners of Japanese as a heritage language: Performance-based analyses. *Heritage Language Journal*(1), 1-18.
- Mckay, S., & Wong, S.-L. (1996). Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second-language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(3), 577-608.
- Milburn, C. (2011, 18 October). 'Bamboo ceiling' stymies rise to the top. *The Age*. Retrieved from <http://www.theage.com.au/national/education/bamboo-ceiling-stymies-rise-to-the-top-20111017-1lt8x.html>
- Miller, J. (2000). Language use, identity and social interaction; Migrant students in Australia. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 33(1), 69-100.
- Miller, J. (2003). *Audible difference: ESL and social identity in schools*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Miller, J. (2004). Identity and language use: The politics of speaking ESL in schools. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 290-315). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. (2009). *Kaigai zairyū hōjinsū chōsa tōkei [Annual report of statistics on japanese nationals overseas]*. Retrieved 19 April, 2010, from <http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/toko/tokei/hojin/09/index.html>
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. (2012). *Kaigai zairyū hōjinsū chōsa tōkei [Annual report of statistics on japanese nationals overseas]*. Retrieved 28 February, 2013, from <http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/toko/tokei/hojin/12/index.html>
- Mizukami, T. (1991). Integration of Japanese residents into Australian society: Immigrants and sojourners in Brisbane. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Griffith University, Australia.
- MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). New structures for a changed world. *Profession*, 2007, 1-11.
- Mori, M. (2010). *Jong Tae-Se big world*. Tokyo: Shogakukan Creative.

- Nash, R. (1999). Bourdieu, 'habitus', and educational research: Is it all worth the candle? *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20(2), 175-187.
- National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project. (1999). *Standards for foreign language learning in the 21st century*. Lawrence, KS: Allen Press, Inc.
- Neustupný, J. V. (1990). The follow-up interview. *Japanese Studies Association of Australia*, 10(2), 31-33.
- Nishimura, M. (1992). Language choice and in-group identity among Canadian niseis. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 3(1), 97-113.
- North Korea's Rooney more like Beckham. (2010, 10 June). *The Age*. Retrieved from <http://www.theage.com.au/world-cup-2010/world-cup-news/north-koreas-rooney-more-like-beckham-20100615-yak8.html>
- Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 409-429.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Norton, B., & Gao, Y. (2008). Identity, investment, and Chinese learners of English. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 18(1), 109-120.
- Norton Pierce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 9-31.
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- O' Grady, W., Lee, M., & Choo, M. (2001). The acquisition of relative clauses by heritage and non-heritage learners of Korean as a second language: A comparative study. In J. Ree (Ed.), *Korean language in America 6: Papers from the Sixth Annual Conference and Professional Development Workshop* (pp. 345-356). Honolulu: American Association of Teachers of Korean.
- Oguro, S., & Moloney, R. (2010). An alien from their own language: The case of Japanese in New South Wales. *Babel*, 44(2), 22-31.
- Oguro, S., & Moloney, R. (2012). Misplaced heritage learners of Japanese in secondary schools. *Heritage Language Journal*, 9(2), 70-84.
- Oh, J. S., & Au, T. K. (2005). Learning Spanish as a heritage language: The role of sociocultural background variables. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 18(3), 229-241.

- Olk, H. (2003). Cultural knowledge in translation. *ELT Journal*, 57(2), 167-174.
- Oriyama, K. (2010). Heritage language maintenance and Japanese identity formation: What role can schooling and ethnic community contact play? *Heritage Language Journal*, 7(2), 76-111.
- Oriyama, K. (2011). The effects of the sociocultural context on heritage language literacy: Japanese-English bilingual children in Sydney. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14(6), 653-681.
- Otsuji, E. (2008). *Performing transculturation: Between/within 'Japanese' and 'Australian language, identities and culture'*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Technology, Sydney, Australia.
- Otsuji, E., & Pennycook, A. (2010). Metrolingualism: Fixity, fluidity and language in flux. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 7(3), 240-254.
- Otsuji, E., & Pennycook, A. (2011). Social inclusion and metrolingual practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14(4), 413-426.
- Pavlenko, A. (2004). 'The making of an American': Negotiation of identities at the turn of the twentieth century. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 34-67). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Pavlenko, A., & Blackledge, A. (2004). Introduction: New theoretical approaches to the study of negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 1-33). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Peyton, J. K., Ranard, D. A., & McGinnis, S. (Eds.). (2001). *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource*. McHenry, IL: The Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
- Pratt, M. L. (2002). The traffic in meaning: Translation, contagion, infiltration. *Profession*, 2002(25-36).
- Preece, S. (2006). British Asian undergraduate students in London. In D. Block (Ed.), *Multilingual identities in a global city* (pp. 171-199). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rampton, B. (1990). Displacing the "native speaker": Expertise, affiliation and inheritance. *ELT Journal*, 44, 97-101.

- Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Rampton, B. (1996). Language crossing, new ethnicities and school. *English in Education*, 30(2), 14-26.
- Rampton, B. (2001). Critique in interaction. *Critique of Anthropology*, 21(1), 83-107.
- Rampton, B. (2013). Drilling down to the grain in superdiversity. *Tilburg Papers in Cultural Studies*, 48, 1-15.
- Rampton, B., Harris, R., & Leung, C. (1997). Multilingualism in England. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 17, 224-241.
- Reay, D. (2004). 'It's all becoming a habitus': Beyond the habitual use of habitus in educational research. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25(4), 431-444.
- Rouse, R. (1991). Mexican migration and the social space of postmodernism. *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 1(1), 8-23.
- Rouse, R. (1995). Question of identity: Personhood and collectivity in transnational migration to the United States. *Critique of Anthropology*, 15(4), 351-380.
- Scalera, D. (2004). The invisible learners: Unlocking the heritage language treasure. *Language Association Journal*, 55(2), 2-5.
- Shum, L. L. (2001). The effects of environmental factors on bilingualism among Chinese and Korean Americans. *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied linguistics*, 1(1), 1-14.
- Silverman, D. (2000). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Silverstein, M. (1985). Language and culture of gender. In E. Mertz & R. Parmentier (Eds.), *Semiotic mediation* (pp. 219-259). New York: Academic Press.
- Swartz, D. (1997). *Culture and power: The sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Tai, E. (1999). *Tabunka shugi to diaspora: Voices from San Francisco [Multiculturalism and diaspora: Voices from San Francisco]*. Tokyo: Akashishoten.
- Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behavior. *Social Science Information*, 13, 65-93.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human group and social categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Takimoto, M., & Hashimoto, H. (2008). *Noticing and intercultural language learning:*

- A study of advanced-level Japanese learners*. Paper presented at the Language Management Workshop: Probing the Concept of Noting, Melbourne, Australia.
- Takimoto, M., & Hashimoto, H. (2010). An "eye-opening" learning experience: Language learning through interpreting and translation. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 7(1), 86-95.
- The Melbourne International School of Japanese. (2010). *Jyugyō no gaiyō [Overview of classes]*. Retrieved 18 May, 2010, from <http://www.misj.org.au/class.htm>
- The Melbourne International School of Japanese. (2013). *MISJ no shōkai [Introduction to MISJ]*. Retrieved 9 June, 2013, from <http://www.misj.org.au/introduction.htm>
- The UCLA Steering Committee. (2000). Heritage language research priorities conference report. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24, 475-488.
- Toohy, K. (2000). *Learning english at school: Identity, social relations and classroom practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Tudor, I. (1987). Using translation in ESP. *ELT Journal*, 41(4), 268-273.
- Valdés, G. (1995). The teaching of minority languages as academic subjects: Pedagogical and theoretical challenges. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79(3), 299-328.
- Valdés, G. (2000). *Spanish for native speakers: AATSP professional development series handbook for teachers K-16*. New York, NY: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Valdés, G., Lozano, A., & Garcia-Moya, R. (1981). *Teaching Spanish to the Hispanic bilingual: Issues, aims, and methods*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Vertovec, S. (1999). Conceiving and researching transnationalism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2), 447-462.
- Vertovec, S. (2001). Transnationalism and identity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 27(4), 573-582.
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024-1054.
- Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority. (2013a). *Higher education studies in VCE*. Retrieved 13 June, 2013, from <http://www.vcaa.vic.edu.au/Pages/vce/studies/studiesextension.aspx>
- Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority. (2013b). *Japanese First Language: Victorian Certificate of Education study design*. Retrieved 12 June, 2013, from

<http://www.vcaa.vic.edu.au/Documents/vce/japanese1st/JapaneseFLSD.pdf>

Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority. (2013c). *Japanese Second Language: Eligibility criteria*. Retrieved 12 June 2013, from

<http://www.vcaa.vic.edu.au/Pages/vce/studies/lote/japanese2nd/jap2ndindex.asp>
[X](#)

Wacquant, L. (2006). Pierre Bourdieu. In R. Stones (Ed.), *Key contemporary thinkers* (pp. 1-16). London: Macmillan.

Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. London: Blackwell.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

West, C. (1992). A matter of life and death. *October*, 61, 20-23.

Wong-Fillmore, L. (1979). Individual differences in second language acquisition. In C. J. Fillmore, W.-S. Y. Wang & D. Kempler (Eds.), *Individual differences in language ability and language behaviour* (pp. 53-76). New York: Academic Press.

Xiao, Y. (2006). Heritage learners in the Chinese language classroom: Home background. *Heritage Language Journal*, 4(1), 47-56.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yoshimitsu, K. (1999). *Language maintenance efforts of Japanese school children in Melbourne*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Monash University, Australia.

Yoshimitsu, K. (2008). Japanese language socialisation of second-generation Japanese in the Australian academic context. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 5(1), 156-169.

Young, R. F. (2008). English and identity in Asia. *Asiatic*, 2(2), 1-13.

APPENDIX 1 Language use diary

Example

DATE: 01 March 2011

Time	English	Mixed (English & Japanese)	Japanese
Morning	Watched the news Read The AGE newspaper 	Talked to father	Talked to mother Listened to Japanese music on the way to school
Afternoon	Wrote an email to a friend Spoke with customers at part-time job 	Talked to friends A and B at school	Wrote an email to a relative in Japan
Evening	Facebook Sent a text message to friend D Talked to brother/sister Watched TV 	Called friend C and talked on the phone Studied for Japanese background speaker course Chatted with friends using MSN/Skype 	Read a Japanese manga Browsed and read Japanese websites

APPENDIX 2 Interview guide

Background speakers' course

1. Why did you enrol in this course?
2. Do you enjoy the course? Why?
3. What is it like studying with peers with similar backgrounds?
4. How are you doing so far with the assignments? What do you think about it?
5. What sort of resources do you use to complete assignments? Is this different from previous VCE courses you have taken?
6. How much do you participate in class activities and online discussions? Why?
7. How do you view your peers' Japanese competence compared to yourself?
8. How comfortable are you using Japanese in class? In front of the teachers?
9. Do you meet your peers outside of the class? If so, how often? For what purpose?
10. Which language do you speak with your classmates during class? During break? Outside of class?
11. Has the course increased your interest in learning Japanese?
12. Has the course changed the way you think about your Japanese competence?

Language identity

13. How do you feel about your current competence in Japanese and English (speaking/ listening/ writing/ reading)? Is there anything that you would like to improve?
14. How do you think other people perceive your Japanese ability?
 - a. Japanese teachers (secondary school, Saturday school Japanese teachers, background speaker course teachers)
 - b. Parents(mother/ father)
 - c. Peers (English speaking peers at school, peers in the background speakers course)
 - d. Japanese speakers in Japan (e.g. relatives in Japan, people in Japan, etc.)
15. What sort of expectations do you think the following people have regarding your Japanese?
 - a. Japanese teachers (secondary school, Saturday school Japanese teachers, background speaker course teachers)

- b. Parents (mother/father)
- c. Japanese speakers in Japan (e.g. relatives in Japan, people in Japan, etc.)
- d. Peers (English speaking peers at school, peers in the background speaker course)

16. What do you think about your siblings' Japanese (if any)?

Future

- 17. How important is your Japanese ability in your current life?
- 18. How good do you want to become in Japanese?
- 19. What do you imagine yourself doing using Japanese?
- 20. How important is learning Japanese for your future goals?
- 21. For what purposes do you plan to use Japanese in the future?
- 22. Where do you hope to live in the future?
- 23. Which passport do you plan to keep? Why?

Appearance

- 24. Has your appearance influenced the way you perceive your Japanese/English? How?
- 25. How do you think your appearance influences the way others perceive your Japanese/English?

Japan

- 26. Please tell me about your last visit to Japan. Did you notice anything, especially with regard to your Japanese language?