

MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR

Defining the Scope of the Bilingualism N-SIG

Steve McCarty

Kagawa Junior College, Kagawa Prefecture, Japan

Introduction

Bilingualism can be seen as a branch of applied linguistics, a discipline with a canon of literature. Generally, it is the study of languages in contact, within, between and among individuals as well as groups such as families and societies. But what specific topics or areas of study are within the purview of bilingualism? Where does it border on or interact with other disciplines? For instance, where languages are in contact, does the study of the cultural factors involved belong to other disciplines or to bilingualism? Moreover, how and why are the concerns of bilingualism in Japan the same or different from those manifested elsewhere?

The National Special Interest Group on Bilingualism was formed in JALT (The Japan Association for Language Teaching) and has grown to include about 200 members because of the recognition that networking and sharing information in terms of this discipline can be helpful, among others for parents struggling to raise children bilingually in Japan. Language teachers know that theory and research inform practice, yet given the limited research on bilingualism--especially on bilingualism in Japan--available to date, educators in this N-SIG realize how much more of value there must be to learn about this field. We do not have all the answers: we are searching ourselves. This group therefore has strongly emphasized research in its statement of purpose. It lists the three major goals of the N-SIG to be to: (1) encourage bilingualism research projects and the wide dissemination of findings by organizing an extensive network of researchers and willing bilingual subjects, (2) promote awareness of current developments of interest to these overlapping communities, and (3) provide a base for mutual support among the group's members.

Yet it was felt important to determine exactly what the scope of bilingualism is seen to be, what areas of this field have been the subject of research in this N-SIG so far, and what areas the members wish to see more research in. The purpose of this paper, then is to investigate the scope of bilingualism, both as a worldwide discipline and as applied to the needs of foreign language teachers in Japan. By finding out the relative level of interest and relevance perceived by members in regard to areas of study possibly related to bilingualism, the N-SIG will gain some objective data by which to orient its activities in the future.

Actually the survey presented here is the second of two related investigations, both hypothesizing the same 27 areas of study in terms of which the scope and priorities of bilingualism might be discerned. The results of the first study were published in "Citation Analysis of Bilingualism N-SIG Publications," which appeared in the bimonthly newsletter of this N-SIG, *Bilingual Japan*, Vol. 4, No. 4 (July/August 1995), pp. 7-10 (see also pp. 1-2). While details of that study cannot be repeated in this limited space, there will be cross-references to the first investigation to shed light on what can be concluded from the second one presented here. What follows can only be described as concise research notes. With all the related questions not given full justice, readers are urged to draw their own conclusions from the data and help further define the mission of the Bilingualism N-SIG.

The Bilingualism Survey

A survey was sent to 83 Bilingualism N-SIG members in June, 1995; 38 have been returned, a response rate of 45.6%. Limited research funds made it impossible to send the survey to all N-SIG members, so there was some selectivity, with preference accorded to longer standing members. Thus, rather than making any claims for the response rate, let us later see what the results indicate about the expertise of the informants. For the survey sought objective knowledge of bilingualism, while, in effect, creating a data base of members' interests. The respondents are to be thanked for representing the N-SIG through their input, which will be taken seriously in charting the future course of the group.

Now let us look closely at the survey instrument: four questions asked about each of 27 areas of study possibly related to bilingualism. The 27 areas are presented here in alphabetical order, as they appeared on the survey sheet, but to each category is added in parentheses the abbreviation used in the table of results to follow. At the risk of considerable overlap and hardship for the informants, the aim was to be thorough and to go somewhat beyond the scope of bilingualism for its borders to be discerned. The survey results should help to refine the categories, combining or discarding some of them, and thus offer a more definitive taxonomy of bilingualism as viewed by language teachers in Japan.

The Bilingualism Survey

Objective, general questions:

- 1A. How do you think these areas of study are related to the discipline of bilingualism?
- 1Aa: A central or integral part
 - 1Ab: A minor or peripheral aspect
 - 1Ac: Closer to another discipline
 - 1Ad: Do not know
- 1B. Do you think these areas of study belong within the scope of Bilingualism N-SIG concerns?
- 1Ba: Central or integral to our scope
 - 1Bb: A minor or peripheral area
 - 1Bc: Not of particular concern to us
 - 1Bd: Cannot decide/do not know

Personal, professional questions:

- 2A. How deeply are you interested in these areas of study?
- 2Aa: Very or actively interested
 - 2Ab: Willing to learn about it
 - 2Ac: Not especially interested
- 2B. In what ways are you interested in these areas of study?
- 2Ba: As an individual or student
 - 2Bb: As a parent or spouse
 - 2Bc: As a language teacher
 - 2Bd: As a researcher or to publish
 - 2Be: As a past or possible presenter

Some Possible Areas of Study:

Adult bilingual development, e.g. sequential, not balanced (Adult)
Biculturalism/biculturality/acclturation/cultural identity (Biculturalism)
Bilingual child-raising methods, transmitting parents' L1 or L2 (Child-raising)
Bilingual education in schools overseas (Bil Ed abroad)
Bilingual or minority language education in schools in Japan (Schools here)
Bilingualism in applied linguistics/applied to FL/SL teaching (FL teaching)
Bilingualism programs in universities, graduate schools (Univ progs)
Bilingualism-related organizations/networks (Networks)
Biliteracy/minority language reading (Biliteracy)
Brain organization/neurolinguistics (Brain)
Childhood bilingual development, e.g. simultaneous, balanced (Childhood)
Family bilingualism/international families (Family)
Individual bilinguality/cognitive effects/psycholinguistics (Individual)
Intercultural communication (Intercultural)
Japanese-English/English-Japanese bilinguality and bilingualism (English-Jpse)
Language attrition/shift/loss (Attrition/loss)
Language processing/interference/code-switching/code-mixing (Processing)
Language pathologies, e.g. aphasia (Pathologies)
Language policy/planning/administration/history/politics (Policy)
Maintenance, e.g., of returnees' L2, immigrants' or minorities' L1 (Maintenance)
Minority language educational materials, e.g. picture books, videos (Materials)
Minority language home education, Saturday schools, play groups (Home Ed)
Multilingualism/combinations other than Japanese and English (Multilingual)
Second language acquisition/age-related factors, e.g. critical period (SLA)
Societal bilingualism/sociolinguistics/dialects/diglossia/conflicts (Societal)
Theory/methodology/definitions/measurement, e.g. of bilinguality (Theory)
Translation/interpretation (Translation)
Other: _____ (Other/gen'l [Bilingualism in general or sources thereof])

Respondents were asked to check one box for items 1A, 1B & 2A, and zero to five boxes for item 2B on the survey sheet. Zero was an option particularly for those who chose c (not especially interested) for item 2A. The formula used to rank the importance to members of the areas of study disregarded blank

spaces as well as indecisive choices such as 1Ad and 1Bd or checks in between two boxes. The ranking of combined interest and relevance of the areas of study was then calculated simply by subtracting unequivocally negative choices from unequivocally positive ones. That is, the 27 areas of study were ranked in importance to members in Table 1 according to the following formula: (1Ba - 1Bc) + (2Aa - 2Ac) = **CR** (Combined Rating of Relevance & Interest). Ties were broken by giving a higher ranking to areas with a larger total **2B**, the sum of all the facets of interest enumerated in items 2Ba-2Be.

The results are tabulated in Table 1, with areas of study listed according to their Combined Rating of Relevance and Interest. To provide a perspective on how well or poorly the N-SIG has dealt with each of these areas to date, the results of the earlier study on N-SIG publications and presentations are also provided on the table. In parentheses next to each area of study ranked in the results is the number of times out of a total 205 this area was focused upon in BNSIG-sponsored publications or conference presentations since 1990, according to the "Citation Analysis of Bilingualism N-SIG Publications" (**CA** in the table of results). The three boldface abbreviations **CA**, **CR** and **2B** appear in Table 1 in addition to the totals for each survey item.

Differences of more than three between corresponding items in 1A and 1B are underlined, indicating that the topic is perceived to be considerably more relevant to discipline of bilingualism in general than it is to the N-SIG, or vice versa. The largest number in each item is italicized, indicating that informants are most in agreement on this point.

Table 1: Bilingualism Survey Results

Areas of Study ranked according to **CR**, Combined Rating of Relevance and Interest

	(CA)	1Aa	1Ab	1Ac	1Ba	1Bb	1Bc	2Aa	2Ab	2Ac	CR	2Ba	2Bb	2Bc	2Bd	2Be	2B
Childhood	(12)	36	0	0	36	1	0	32	4	1	67	16	28	11	17	9	81
English-Jpse	(13)	<u>29</u>	<u>6</u>	0	<u>35</u>	<u>0</u>	0	30	4	0	65	26	24	19	11	7	87
Family	(8)	<u>29</u>	3	1	<u>35</u>	2	0	28	8	1	62	17	32	8	12	9	78
Biculturalism	(8)	30	4	0	30	5	0	29	5	1	58	23	25	19	17	8	92
Childraising	(45)	32	5	0	31	5	0	28	4	3	56	15	29	7	9	9	69
Processing	(2)	32	3	1	29	7	0	27	8	2	54	20	21	20	14	5	80
Schools here	(5)	30	6	1	30	5	0	24	10	3	51	9	19	17	12	3	60
Biliteracy	(20)	29	6	1	30	5	1	21	12	2	48	12	27	16	12	8	75
Networks	(2)	<u>22</u>	<u>13</u>	0	<u>28</u>	<u>7</u>	0	21	12	3	46	18	20	12	7	2	59
Home Ed	(3)	<u>22</u>	9	2	<u>26</u>	10	0	22	10	4	44	10	26	10	9	6	61
SLA	(0)	<u>28</u>	3	4	<u>24</u>	<u>9</u>	2	23	10	2	43	12	13	16	12	4	57
Individual	(3)	<u>30</u>	<u>3</u>	2	<u>25</u>	<u>7</u>	1	20	13	3	41	18	11	15	12	5	61
Attrition/loss	(1)	<u>26</u>	<u>7</u>	3	<u>22</u>	<u>11</u>	2	21	13	2	39	21	20	18	10	6	75
Theory	(6)	<u>32</u>	<u>2</u>	1	<u>28</u>	<u>7</u>	0	15	15	5	38	17	8	15	13	2	55
Materials	(12)	18	13	3	21	15	0	20	12	4	37	11	23	12	4	4	54
Maintenance	(12)	25	9	3	25	12	0	17	16	5	37	10	12	18	6	5	51
Adult	(0)	<u>30</u>	<u>2</u>	2	<u>23</u>	<u>9</u>	2	13	20	3	31	23	8	20	7	2	60
Intercultural	(10)	19	6	10	21	9	7	19	13	4	29	21	22	22	11	7	83
FL teaching	(1)	24	6	3	21	9	4	13	18	4	26	8	6	19	5	2	40
Societal	(6)	<u>26</u>	<u>6</u>	3	<u>18</u>	<u>13</u>	4	17	12	6	25	16	10	16	14	4	60
Multilingual	(10)	<u>29</u>	<u>6</u>	1	<u>20</u>	<u>12</u>	2	9	16	10	17	15	8	12	11	3	49
Bil Ed abroad	(2)	<u>23</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>7</u>	10	18	7	11	9	15	14	5	1	44
Brain	(2)	11	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	9	<u>19</u>	<u>5</u>	13	12	10	7	14	9	14	9	3	49
Univ progs	(5)	<u>18</u>	13	2	<u>11</u>	16	5	7	22	8	5	10	3	15	5	0	33
Policy	(7)	<u>19</u>	<u>11</u>	5	<u>12</u>	<u>17</u>	4	7	17	12	3	11	6	15	6	2	40
Translation	(0)	7	13	15	6	11	16	10	12	11	-9	22	6	11	3	1	43
Pathologies	(0)	3	<u>10</u>	<u>21</u>	2	<u>16</u>	<u>13</u>	6	15	14	-19	10	3	7	7	2	29
Other/gen'l	(10)																
Totals		659	188	95	613	250	75	502	331	131		414	434	398	260	119	1625

Discussion of the Results

Before detailing each area of study according to its Combined Rating of Interest and Relevance (CR), let us look at the results overall. First, in considering the questions calling for objective knowledge of bilingualism, what do the results indicate about the informants themselves in terms of expertise and hence reliability? With five facets of interest (2Ba-e) distinguished for each of the 27 categories suggested, the total number of boxes that could be checked for item 2B in the survey was $27 \times 5 = 135$. The total facets of interest indicated must then total between zero and 38×135 or 5,130. Informants actually checked 1,625 boxes in total for item 2B, indicating an average of 42.8 facets of interest per respondent. That is, informants checked 31.7% of all the possible boxes in item 2B. The informants thus showed a remarkable extent of multifaceted interest in the topics hypothesized.

The total of item 2Bd (interest as a researcher or to publish), in particular, was 260 out of a possible 1,026, or an average of 6.84 areas of research per respondent. By another measure, 25 out of 38 respondents showed interest in researching bilingualism. Item 2Be elicited interest in the areas of study as a past or possible presenter, and 20, or over half, of the respondents indicated a total of 119 areas on which they could give a presentation. Furthermore, there were respondents who would consider presenting on all but one of the 27 areas suggested. Moreover, we know that these results do not indicate the full potential of the N-SIG to provide speakers capable of presenting on bilingualism, since a number of past presenters were not included or shied away from indicating their ability to present. There must also be others who are researching areas of bilingualism but did not receive a survey. They have been encouraged to request a survey sheet from the Bilingualism N-SIG Chair for follow-up studies and to help complete a data base of potential speakers nationwide.

Continuing with the overall results, we can gauge the extent to which items were left blank, undecided or not known by looking at the totals for items 1A, 1B and 2A, then subtracting the mean number of responses from the total number of respondents for each item. Placing topics within the purview of our N-SIG (item 1B) might seem more difficult than relating them to the discipline of bilingualism (item 1A), but the total for 1B was only four fewer. The depth of interest (item 2A) predictably had the fewest blanks, with a mean of nearly 35 responses out of 38 respondents. In contrast, the mean was nearly 34 for item 1A and nearly 33 for item 1B, perhaps the most difficult to decide. The informants as a whole thus gave unambiguous responses to over 90% of these three items.

One might expect the perceived scope of the Bilingualism N-SIG (a special interest group of an association of language teachers) in Japan (as indicated by item 1B), to be narrower than the members' view of the whole discipline of bilingualism (item 1A), but how much so? Again, taking only unequivocal responses into account, we see that $(1Aa - 1Ac) - (1Ba - 1Bc) = 24$, a small difference compared to the total of 38 respondents. Although many more items were considered minor or peripheral to our N-SIG (250 for item 1Bb vs. 188 for item 1Ab), according to the above equation the perceived scope of the JALT Bilingualism N-SIG touches upon 95.4% of the discipline as a whole.

We might ask, though, how (and why) does bilingualism differ in Japan? Most of the literature on bilingualism, which could not be reviewed in this space, tends to emanate from Europe, Canada and the U.S. Many of these countries have dealt with multilingualism and multiculturalism in their societies for decades if not longer, and there is also the whole infrastructure of bilingual education in such places to spark controversy as well as research. Among the countries not included in the above image of bilingualism, Japan is relatively large and the most wealthy. Although its monocultural reputation is founded more on ideology than fact, pluralism in Japan still does involve a relatively tiny minority. Such observations allow us to distinguish between bilingualism in Japan and elsewhere in general terms, while noting that Japan shares some characteristics with countries where English and other non-native tongues are generally learned as a foreign rather than as a second language or via bilingual education.

Now let's compare these general observations with the data from the survey, examining the items underlined in the table to indicate where the situation in Japan (or at least the N-SIG) is seen as different from abroad. Near the top with CR = 65, Japanese and English are clearly of more interest in Japan, while multilingualism (CR = 17) is viewed as more relevant abroad. Also, bilingual education abroad (CR = 11) was not of great interest to the respondents. Family bilingualism, networks, home education and materials are perceived as more important to N-SIG members, presumably because of the foreign language environment. Theory, SLA, university programs, individual and adult bilingualism are seen to be of moderate interest, but less to the N-SIG than to the field in general. Combined with the higher rating for children's concerns, these results could be seen to indicate that for the N-SIG, the imperative is more practical than academic.

If there is significance in the figures for language attrition/loss, it was seen as more relevant in general terms, even though members showed a multifaceted interest in it (2B = 75). Since there are

relatively few immigrants in Japan to be threatened by subtractive bilingualism (L2 replacing L1), the respondents may tend to perceive the situation here to be not folk but elite bilingualism, with additive phenomena such as cognitive benefits within reach.

Societal bilingualism and language policy were also perceived as more important to the field generally than to the N-SIG, perhaps indicating a reluctance to fight city hall in a country like Japan, with enough intercultural negotiations on the home front. For the foreigners in our membership, there is a delicate balance to be sought between assimilation and cultural imperialism.

Brain organization and pathologies had quite differing results, though the fields could perhaps be more profitably combined. These results could therefore be considered inconclusive. After going through each area of study as ranked, there will be some categories to review, combine or discard from our purview.

Next, we need to ask what the highest figures in each grouping tell us, besides that the respondents are of a consensus. Among the facets of interest (2Ba-e), the number of members expressing interest in bilingualism as a parent or spouse (2Bb) was the highest, followed closely by 2Ba (as an individual or student) and then 2Bc (as a language teacher), but the totals in all categories could be considered remarkably high. As an individual or student, members were most interested in English and Japanese, reflecting the commitment of these informants to function in the two most important languages in their professional and personal environment. They may aim to set an example for their students or children by becoming bilingual themselves. As a parent or spouse, 32 out of 38 respondents expressed interest in family bilingualism/international families, probably indicating that most are married to someone with a different native language and strive for both languages to be valorized. As language teachers, members were most interested in intercultural communication, quite an interesting finding. As a researcher or to publish, members showed equal interest in biculturalism and childhood bilingual development. The deep and multifaceted interest in biculturalism, as well as in intercultural communication, shows that the informants see the cultural concomitants of bilingualism as indispensable to--and inseparable from--the linguistic aspects. In expressing interest as a past or possible presenter, nine members selected the areas of bilingual child-raising, family bilingualism and childhood bilingual development, while there were eight for both biliteracy and biculturalism, and seven for intercultural communication as well as English and Japanese. These findings give a profile of the expertise of the N-SIG members responding.

Now, I would like to discuss each area of study as ranked in the table of results according to combined rating of interest and relevance (CR). In effect, number 1 is most collectively important and number 27 is of least concern to the informants as a whole. Following the number indicating the topic's relative importance, a number is shown in parentheses indicating the priority the N-SIG has given the topic thus far in terms of number of presentations and articles about it. This priority ranking (1 to 23) was given on the basis of the number of entries found in the Citation Analysis, with (X) shown for the four categories for which there were no entries. In this way we can compare the relative interest and relevance of each topic with the relative amount of attention it has received thus far in our publications and conference presentations. The combined interest and relevance levels go down very gradually, so there are neither clear groupings nor a significant difference to be claimed for adjacent items. Most areas of study as formulated earn a more or less positive rating, but relative priorities can be discerned in the range of CR scores from plus 67 to minus 19.

1 (4). *Childhood bilingual development*. This categorization may be most highly rated because of its breadth, or because it represents a perspective by which members would most like the N-SIG to be oriented. The examples given of simultaneous or balanced bilingual acquisition could be seen as ideals to aim for, not without difficulties. Interest was multifaceted, as shown by items 2Ba-e, but highest as a parent or spouse. Considering its overlap with several other categories rated highly, this topic has not lacked attention in our publications. Compared to the much less positive rating for adult concerns, however, childhood bilingual development may now be seen as providing a conceptual framework central to the mission of this N-SIG.

2 (3). *Japanese-English/English-Japanese bilinguality and bilingualism*. This category could be seen as including adults as well as children, and academic as well as practical concerns with these two languages. While in the Citation Analysis it was difficult to quantify this category, the Bilingualism Survey shows that the N-SIG would do well to explicitly focus on English and Japanese while also welcoming the study of other language combinations. Interest is deep and multifaceted, particularly in the three capacities of individual or student, parent or spouse, and language teacher, for a total of 87 facets of interest indicated. Only this item had no responses placing it at the periphery of the bilingualism discipline or of this N-SIG; it was unanimously considered central or integral to our scope.

3 (10). *Family bilingualism/international families*. This category has much overlap with other categories, so its coverage in our publications is difficult to quantify. Perceived relevance to bilingualism

and the N-SIG is higher than members' interest, and it is chiefly as a parent or spouse where this topic scores highest. Intermarriage, though not in every respect, could be researched under this category. More salient to the work of this N-SIG is the interaction between persons whose native languages are different. Though most but not all respondents to this survey have married across cultures, it should be noted that all these topics are objects of study regardless of the marital status of members. The N-SIG wishes to welcome everyone interested in this area of applied linguistics regardless of their personal situation.

4 (10). *Biculturalism/bicultural/acculturation/cultural identity*. While the Citation Analysis was inconclusive, the Bilingualism Survey results place the cultural concomitants of bilingualism firmly within our purview. Interest is deep and multifaceted, with the highest overall number of facets of interest indicated (92), including many willing to research or present on this challenging area. Our N-SIG can unreservedly identify with biculturalism along with bilingualism and develop this dual focus.

5 (1). *Bilingual child-raising methods, transmitting parents' L1 or L2*. This area was overwhelmingly first in BNSIG written publications, while it is not far from the top in interest and relevance. Its scores resemble those of item 3 above on families, but not everyone is presently involved with child-raising. This topic was second to biliteracy in the number of conference presentations sponsored by the BNSIG since 1990, and here it is tied for the largest number of possible presenters among the informants.

6 (19). *Language processing/interference/code-switching/code-mixing*. Although there is some overlap with other categories, we could say that the area has been relatively neglected in our publications, as members show wide interest in it. Research findings on how and why language mixing occurs could help dispel the common misconception that children should be spared the confusion of learning more than one language at once, or that codeswitching is a result of deficiencies in language skills.

7 (15). *Bilingual or minority language education in schools in Japan*. One informant suggested adding another topic to our list: the education of language minority students in Japanese schools. As the informant pointed out, this category as it stands doesn't seem to include situations where minority language children go to ordinary schools and don't get any bilingual or minority language education. So I'd like to broaden this topic, changing it to "Schools in Japan" so it could include such topics as immersion, international schools, language minority students in mainstream Japanese schools, and the school system in Japan. Ordinary situations pressuring kids to be monolingual could also be researched. Even as presented, however, this topic scored highly in relevance, and was of particular interest to members as parents and as language teachers. Seeing that it ranked 15th in the citation analysis, we learn that this is another topic we should accord more attention in our future publications.

8 (2). *Biliteracy/minority language reading*. In the Citation Analysis this area was first in conference presentations and second in written publications. Here it is of much interest to members as parents, and is seen as relevant to bilingualism, but the general interest level is not so high. Perhaps its score is limited because it is just one skill, but it should be noted that literacy is known to reinforce language acquisition and maintenance, so research in this area is important. Moreover, there is no problem of any topic being overrepresented in BNSIG publications. Thus, biliteracy will remain an area of relevance and interest.

9 (19). *Bilingualism-related organizations/networks*. This is not an area within the study of bilingualism *per se*, but members living in Japan do find networks of relevance and considerable interest. The N-SIG itself is a network for information exchange and mutual supportiveness, but there could be more explicit attention to this area in our publications.

10 (17). *Minority language home education, Saturday schools, play groups*. As with school education in Japan, home education has not received attention in our publications in proportion to its perceived importance. Members find this area of high relevance to the N-SIG and of fairly high interest, although mainly in their role as parents.

11 (X). *Second language acquisition/age-related factors*. This area has not been addressed in our publications, yet members find it integral to bilingualism. Seeing the Citation Analysis results, with no entries in this area, and considering that the informants are language teachers, it is fair to say that a closer look is needed into how second language acquisition research (SLAR) relates to bilingualism. SLA might be viewed as an area of research whose findings inform both classroom language teaching and the broader development of bilingualism.

12 (17). *Individual bilinguality/cognitive effects/psycholinguistics*. Individual bilinguality includes children, but concerns specifically for the latter were rated more highly. This area was considered highly relevant but not so deeply of interest, perhaps because the category as presented was complex and specialized. To the individual level of bilingualism, recognized as distinct from the societal, has been added a representative issue and a methodological approach suitable to this psychological area. The purpose of this combination was to distinguish the category from several others with which it would

overlap. Psycholinguistics is not subsumed under bilingualism but serves as an auxiliary discipline to it at the individual level.

13 (23). *Language attrition/shift/loss*. Language attrition and loss have not been neglected in our publications, but tend to be seen as the downside of areas such as maintenance, particularly for returnees (*kikoku shijo*). In that sense more explicit attention to this area might be in order. Interest is moderately high and multifaceted. The cognitive effects of language attrition and loss should also be considered. Language shift in individuals immigrating to Japan in early childhood without a valorized L1 and changing to Japanese would raise the specter of subtractive folk bilingualism in a country where additive elite bilingualism is seen as the norm. Both the upside and the downside of bilingualism need more research.

14 (13). *Theory/methodology/definitions/measurement*. High relevance was recognized, but considerable disinterest was also shown. The practical applications of bilingualism are evidently an imperative, as more academic concerns such as these score in the lower half of the 27 areas of study suggested. N-SIG Publications Chair Stephen Ryan has noted in private correspondence that there is a distinction between a research group and a research-based group such as our N-SIG. Thus members can network and learn about all these areas of bilingualism without being obliged to engage in such research.

15 (4). *Minority language educational materials*. In this foreign as opposed to second language environment, L2 materials such as videos and picture books cannot receive too much attention in our publications. Here the moderately high interest and relevance indicated by respondents was chiefly in their role as parents.

16 (4). *Maintenance, e.g. of returnees' L2, immigrants' or minorities' L1*. Here the interest was moderate and more as language teachers than any other facet. Although the Citation Analysis findings show this area tied for fourth place, the limited interest expressed by members may be a result of the fact that most attention has been given to returnees, with whom many informants do not have direct experience. It could be noted that, like the Hindu trinity of creator, preserver and destroyer, acquisition, maintenance and attrition are the ubiquitous trinity facing language teachers and researchers.

17 (X). *Adult bilingual development*. This area is acknowledged by members to be part of the field, but it seems to lack the imperative, compared to concerns for children, to surface in our public agenda or publications. Or, because of overlap with other categories here, it may simply have been eclipsed by specific targets such as EFL or JSL.

18 (7). *Intercultural communication*. In our newsletter there has been criticism of the intercultural training school of thought which developed out of the intercultural communication discipline amid the explosive growth of cross-cultural commerce. There was thus some question whether or not this area was within our purview as an N-SIG, but this and biculturalism were two of the top three in total facets of interest indicated. Without attempting to swallow the area whole, as it were, we can draw from intercultural communication as an auxiliary discipline to develop our knowledge of culture and communication as they relate to bilingualism and language teaching in Japan.

19 (23). *Bilingualism in applied linguistics/applied to FL/SL teaching*. The respondents' acknowledge this connection, but it does not yet appear to move them. It is rather on the frontier and may seem theoretical until it is experienced. When we develop a better knowledge of bilingualism, the role of applied linguistics as an auxiliary discipline to language teaching may become clearer and lead to practical applications.

20 (13). *Societal bilingualism/sociolinguistics*. Beyond the family level, members' concern seems to become less acute and more cautious. Sociolinguistics is another branch of applied linguistics, but which lends methodologies of the social sciences to bilingualism. It can serve as an auxiliary discipline to discern the social context of bilingual concerns and possibly to help navigate the way of bilinguals in society. Therefore it may be better for the N-SIG not to shy away from social issues but to bring academic rigor to bear on them.

21 (7). *Multilingualism/combinations other than Japanese and English*. As the Citation Analysis also indicates, the N-SIG welcomes the treatment of other language combinations while giving the most attention to English and Japanese. Publications and presentations can be about other languages but need to be anchored in English and/or Japanese, since most N-SIG members are involved with English professionally, while Japanese is the sole official language of this country.

22 (19). *Bilingual education in schools overseas*. Members realize that we have to sift through much recorded experience overseas to find how bilingual education could be applied to Japan, such as through immersion programs. Members may therefore prefer to try and design our own future, as it were, here in Japan.

23 (19). *Brain organization/neurolinguistics*. The relation of this new area to bilingualism met with anything but a consensus, and some reformulation may be needed. A comment from one informant leads

to combining this category with the 27th and last: Language pathologies such as aphasia. Their combined rating might then be more positive, i.e. that this constitutes a border region of bilingualism to match its pioneer status. It may be helpful to see neurolinguistics functioning as an auxiliary discipline to bilingualism here, even while it is a branch of applied linguistics and a discipline in its own right.

24 (15). *Bilingualism programs in universities, graduate schools.* This area might be considered academic in the pedantic sense, but many parameters can be set more reliably by the community of scholars than otherwise. The most attention and funding has accrued to bilingual education, but courses do exist on bilingualism *per se*, with textbooks representative of the discipline. This was the only area that did not elicit a potential presenter, and specifics about such programs have not yet appeared in our publications—all the more reason to call for such information.

25 (12). *Language policy/planning/administration/history/politics.* These topics are acknowledged as part of the discipline but do not engage many members actively. Again this may manifest a reluctance to delve into social issues. As an alternative formulation, regardless of social activism, these topics might combine with Societal bilingualism to form a stronger category and be seen more clearly as objects of research.

26 (X). *Translation/interpretation.* The combined rating of this area was negative, yet a majority found it at least peripheral to bilingualism. The nature of this work is clearly akin to bilingualism. But translators and interpreters have their own professional organizations and specialized literature. This area can thus be seen as an auxiliary discipline to bilingualism. Its methods could bolster our concerns in Japan—for example the reliability of cross-cultural investigations with similar numbers of English and Japanese native speakers—by strengthening the intercommunicability between English and Japanese.

27 (X). *Language pathologies.* We have seen that this category cannot stand on its own in a taxonomy of bilingualism, but it could be combined with Brain organization/neurolinguistics, where it would find a link to medical science. At the same time, the growing body of scientific findings in this area could enhance our understanding of bilingualism.

28 (7). *Other.* If any category emerged in addition to the 27, it was bilingualism as a whole. The Citation Analysis revealed many reviews of books introducing bilingualism or wide areas thereof. In compiling a data base of speakers, this general category might be added, as we know of several speakers not included in the above results who have given conference presentations introducing bilingualism and this N-SIG.

Conclusion

27 areas of study were hypothesized as related to bilingualism, and thanks to the input of 38 Bilingualism N-SIG members their relations are now much clearer. According to the results and by combining categories as indicated above, every area of study suggested could be seen as related to bilingualism in some way. Disciplines not subsumed under bilingualism turned out to function as auxiliary disciplines to it, lending their research findings and methodologies, and sometimes this relationship was mutual, as in the case of bilingualism and language teaching.

To reiterate the combinations and other adjustments of the categories along with the relations among disciplines would take too much space here, but the pieces can be put together to form a taxonomy of bilingualism clearer than what was hypothesized. A revised classification will be submitted to a Bilingualism N-SIG publication in the future. The clarification of what constitutes bilingualism in general and for Japan continues as the circle of our network widens.

BOOK REVIEWS

***A Parents' and Teachers' Guide to Bilingualism.* Colin Baker. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1995. 240 pages.**

The title says it all. This is a guide for parents and teachers who have little theoretical knowledge of bilingualism but find themselves having to take practical decisions about children's bilingual development. Cast in question-and-answer form, the book deals comprehensively and comprehensibly with the issues involved.

It is not, as the author points out, an academic book. Instead it presents the fruits of the latest academic research in the field in a form which is accessible to an interested lay-person. Baker does not hesitate to offer advice, but he is always careful to explain the theoretical underpinnings of any suggestions made. For a more academic treatment of similar ground, readers are referred to the same author's *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (also from Multilingual Matters, 1993).

The 117 questions and answers that make up the book are divided into six sections: Family Questions, Language Development Questions, Questions about Problems, Reading and Writing Questions, Education Questions and Concluding Questions (mainly about where to find further information about bilingualism). The divisions are not rigid and often the same information is repeated in several sections in answer to different questions. For the reader who works straight through the book, this has the effect of reinforcing the various messages, but it also means that the answer to each question is self-contained, so the book can be dipped into when a particular issue arises.

The tone throughout is extremely supportive of bilingualism, as the author demolishes time after time arguments that are often heard against a bilingual upbringing. Baker's attitude, though, is not dogmatic: he shows that his advice is the result of careful consideration of the latest research and of the "human factors" involved. He also explains the kind of situation (extremely rare) in which he would be prepared to drop his arguments and agree that bilingualism may not be advisable for a particular child.

He assumes that readers of the book will have no previous reliable information about the issues and deals, point by point, with the unreliable information they may have received from friends, neighbours and the majority of doctors, teachers and even speech-therapists who have had no training in dealing with bilingualism. A glorious passage from the second chapter will serve to illustrate his approach:

Children are born ready to become bilinguals and multilinguals. Too many are restricted to becoming monolinguals. Children are born with the equipment to run and play, to laugh and learn. No caring parent or teacher denies children the chance to develop physically, socially, educationally or emotionally. Yet we deny many children the right to develop bilingually and multilingually. (p. 35)

The great difficulty to be overcome in writing such a book is that of audience: bilingualism is a phenomenon which occurs in so many different situations throughout the world that it is difficult to address people in each of these situations at the same time. To a large extent Baker succeeds in dealing with this problem. From the beginning, he makes clear distinctions between minority and majority languages, between mixed language and in-migrant families, between transitional and additive bilingual education. When comments refer only to particular situations, he is careful to state whom he is addressing at each point.

Where this approach fails, I feel, is in dealing with the parent/teacher divide. For most of the book he assumes that teachers, like parents, will benefit from an explanation of the fundamental concepts of the field and their practical applications. In the chapter about the differing forms of bilingual education, however, he often gives detailed explanations of classroom procedures and school-management operations which go beyond what a parent would need to know to make informed decisions about schooling, but do not, of course, constitute a full training course for teachers.

A further point about audience and scope has to do with geographical coverage. Nearly all the examples used come from Europe and North America. The section on reading and writing, in particular, suffers from a failure to grasp the problems involved in becoming biliterate in languages with very different scripts and sound-symbol correspondences. The omission is understandable, given the focus of bilingualism research to date, but it does serve to highlight the importance of the task our N-Sig has undertaken in seeking to put bilingualism in Japan on the map.

This is a great book for anybody approaching bilingualism for the first time. I recommend it wholeheartedly to any parent or prospective parent concerned about the implications of language decisions they make for their children. Once you have read it, you will want others around you to read it, too. What higher recommendation can I give?

Reviewed by Stephen M. Ryan, Osaka Institute of Technology

Multilingual Japan. Edited by John C. Maher and Kyoko Yashiro. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1995. 164 pages.

By presenting a wide range of research on a number of bilingual groups in Japan, this collection of papers fills an important gap in the world literature on bilingualism, which to date has dealt mostly with European languages and rarely with Japanese or Japan. It also effectively refutes the widely held image most prominently enunciated by former Prime Minister Nakasone in 1986: that the people of Japan are a homogeneous group and there are no minorities in this country. In their introduction, editors John Maher and Yashiro Kyoko go back to some of the earliest Western reports about the country to show that linguistic diversity has a long history in these isles. They then explain the historical social, academic and ideological factors that combined to produce a climate in which the "invented tradition" of harmony prevailed and linguistic pluralism came to be viewed as a threat. While noting a paucity of research on Japanese bilingualism, Maher and Yashiro provide an overview of research that has been done in this field to date.

In "Ryukyuan: Past, Present and Future", Matsumori Akiko presents a thorough analysis of the languages used in the Ryukyus--the chain of islands that make up Okinawa Prefecture. Matsumori begins by explaining that Ryukyuan is actually a group of languages--all unintelligible to each other as well as to standard Japanese--that, "for political rather than purely linguistic reasons" are generally referred to as the Okinawan dialect (*Okinawa-ben*). She provides a brief history of the Ryukyus, then moves into an in-depth analysis of the linguistic relationship between these languages and mainland Japanese before touching on some of the differences between the languages used on different islands. She explains the pressures that have led to a rapid decline in the use of these languages, details present patterns of their use, and finally, suggests steps that might lead to their preservation. As with all of the papers in this collection, Matsumori provides an extensive reference list, though most of the works cited here and later in the book are in Japanese.

In "English In Japanese Society: Language Within Language", Honna Nobuyuki focuses on the conspicuous use of English loan words in Japanese, explaining the structural and semantic nature of this borrowing, the function of the words--especially as euphemisms, and the social factors that have contributed to their rampant use. In particular, he cites the restrictions on use of *kanji* (Chinese characters) after the war and the compulsory English language education program, with its non-communicative approach, as the two main factors behind this massive influx of foreign words.

"Bilingualism in International Families" by Yamamoto Masayo brings together the results of several surveys familiar to long-term members of this N-SIG. It explains general attitudes towards bilingualism in Japan, the attitudes of parents in international families, and patterns of language use that can promote bilingualism.

The history and linguistic situation of Koreans living in Japan are detailed in "On Being There: Koreans in Japan" by John Maher and Kawanishi Yumiko. The educational opportunities and options of resident Koreans, as well as discrimination problems and differences in attitudes between older and younger generations are detailed. The article concludes by examining recent legal and social developments that hold promise for a brighter future for this minority.

Joseph DeChicchis presents a very thoughtful and thought-provoking analysis in "The Current State of the Ainu Language". Artfully defining terms and concepts at every step, he explains why, while "there is no present-day Ainu speech community, it would be misleading to say that Ainu is a dead language" (p. 109). In doing so, he presents a lively account of the struggle to regain Ainu rights and preserve the language.

In "The *Kakyo*: Chinese in Japan", John Maher weaves together a wealth of information on the many different ways in which the Chinese language is present in Japan, from the use of its terminology in the field of medicine and its writing system in one form of classical Japanese writing (*kanbun*), to the use of spoken Cantonese in established Chinatowns and Mandarin in enclaves of such new immigrants as foreign students, workers and the so-called "war orphans".

Finally, in "Japan's Returnees", Yashiro Kyoko covers not only school-age returnees, but also adult Japanese who have lived overseas, focussing on the linguistic as well as cultural issues they face, and carefully explaining the gradual improvement in their treatment in this country.

Together these eight papers, which originally appeared as a double issue of the *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* (Vol. 16: 1&2, 1995) but were also issued as a hardback book, present a wealth of information on linguistic diversity in this country while also offering extensive reference lists and suggestions for further research. My one quibble is that the book seems to have been put together in a hurry: lapses in grammar and syntax abound, a number of awkward repetitions appear and some of the papers could have done with a tighter, more logical organization. Many Japanese terms are not defined in English and while they are printed in italics in some papers, they appear in standard print in

others. Also, some works cited in papers do not appear in the lists of references. That said, let me emphasize that this is an important work that will be of great interest both here and abroad.

Reviewed by Mary Goebel Noguchi, Ritsumeikan University

JAPAN JOURNAL OF MULTILINGUALISM AND MULTICULTURALISM

多言語・多文化研究

1995年10月27日印刷

1995年11月3日発行

VOLUME 1, NUMBER 1

1巻1号

編集人 野口メアリー・ゲイブル

発行所 全国語学教育学会バイリンガリズム研究部会

〒610-03 京都府綴喜郡田辺町草内山科56-19

電話：(0774) 63-6002

印刷所 進晃堂印刷株式会社

〒612 京都市伏見区深草19軒543