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PHONETIC SYMBOLS

1. English

Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iː</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>əː</td>
<td>guy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɪː</td>
<td>pretty</td>
<td>ertos</td>
<td>day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eː</td>
<td>bet</td>
<td>ɔː</td>
<td>toy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æː</td>
<td>act</td>
<td>ʌː</td>
<td>how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əː</td>
<td>alone</td>
<td>ʊː</td>
<td>slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɜː</td>
<td>fern</td>
<td>ɛː</td>
<td>beer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɑː</td>
<td>part</td>
<td>ɔː</td>
<td>bear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʌ</td>
<td>bud</td>
<td>ʊː</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oː</td>
<td>bother</td>
<td>ɔː</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɔː</td>
<td>law</td>
<td>uː</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uː</td>
<td>pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Phonetic Symbol</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>pill</td>
<td>[pɪl]</td>
<td>nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>bill</td>
<td>[bɪl]</td>
<td>sing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>tea</td>
<td>[tiː]</td>
<td>lay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>dance</td>
<td>[dæns]</td>
<td>race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>car</td>
<td>[kɑː]</td>
<td>Semi-vowels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>guide</td>
<td>[gaɪd]</td>
<td>yacht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>fat</td>
<td>[fæt]</td>
<td>win</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>vet</td>
<td>[vet]</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ</td>
<td>thin</td>
<td>[θɪn]</td>
<td>full length of preceding vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>[ðen]</td>
<td>more open quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>sick</td>
<td>[skɪk]</td>
<td>primary stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>zoo</td>
<td>[zuː]</td>
<td>secondary stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>sheep</td>
<td>[ʃiːp]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>measure</td>
<td>['meʒə]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>house</td>
<td>[haus]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tʃ</td>
<td>church</td>
<td>[tʃɑːtʃ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dʒ</td>
<td>joke</td>
<td>[dʒoʊk]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>mat</td>
<td>[mæt]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Japanese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowels$^2$</th>
<th>Consonants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>ibento [ibento]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'event'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>enjin [enjin]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'engine'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>apaato [apa:to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'apartment'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>opaaru [opa:ru]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'opal'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>uiiku [ui:ku:]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'week'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Long Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>g</th>
<th>guddo [gu:ndo]</th>
<th>'good'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i:</td>
<td>iiiji [i:3i:]</td>
<td>φ</td>
<td>fuudo [fu:do]</td>
<td>'food'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'easy'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e:</td>
<td>imeeji [ime:3i]</td>
<td>ç</td>
<td>koohii [ko:qi:]</td>
<td>'coffee'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'image'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a:</td>
<td>aato [a:to]</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>hotteru [hoteru:]</td>
<td>'hotel'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'art'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o:</td>
<td>Oojii [o:3i:]</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>sukii [su:k:ki:]</td>
<td>'ski'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Aussie'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u:</td>
<td>uuuru [u:ru:]</td>
<td>ç</td>
<td>shitii [ʃiti:]</td>
<td>'city'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^2$ For convenience simplified symbols [i, e, a, o, u] are employed here. See Imada (1989: 25-28) for detail.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants</th>
<th>Semi-vowels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts</td>
<td>tsūna [tsūna]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tf</td>
<td>chikin [tji̯kin]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dz</td>
<td>zerii [dzerii:]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dʒ</td>
<td>jirenma [dʒi̯remma]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>muubii [muubii:]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>nettobooru [nettobo:ru]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>Shidonii [ʃidɔni:]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η</td>
<td>uedingu [uedingu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>terehon [terehon]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>red [reddo]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x
Transcription Symbols

*Italics* loanwords/lexical transfers/code-switches; highlighted elements

With regard to the romanisation of loanwords/lexical transfers, the Hepburn system is adopted here, except that long vowels are transcribed by duplication of the appropriate short vowel symbol, e.g., koohii ‘coffee’, and the mora nasal is always transcribed as n.

[ ] single left-hand brackets indicate overlapping utterances

] single right-hand brackets indicate the ending point of the overlap

= latching (i.e., no interval in flow of talk) or continuous utterances

.. noticeable pause or break in rhythm less than 0.5 second

(3.5) numbers in parentheses represent pauses in seconds

- glottal stop or abrupt cutting off of sound

. stopping fall in tone

? rising intonation, not necessarily a question (including a high rise terminal or half-question intonation)

, continuing intonation (indicating more talk to come)

-- sustained intonation

↑ rising shift in intonation immediately prior to the rise

↓ falling shift in intonation immediately prior to the fall
progressively rising intonation

progressively falling intonation

animated tone

prominent high pitch

emphatic stress; highlighted loan elements

pitch shift on word from low to high

pitch shift on word from high to low

preceding word unaccented

lower volume than the surrounding talk

laughter

laughter while talking

spoken quickly (appears over the line)

spoken slowly (appears over the line)

louder

softer

transcription impossible

uncertain transcription

extralinguistic sounds, comments by transcriber

horizontal ellipses
/ / phonemic transcription

[ ] phonetic transcription

* incorrect form
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUE</td>
<td>Australian English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS</td>
<td>correcting strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>follow-up interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gk</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Higa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Inoue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAU</td>
<td>Japanese in Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>Japanese English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNZ</td>
<td>Japanese in New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>lexical strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Malay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>morphological strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>noun phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>non-subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZE</td>
<td>New Zealand English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>participant-observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>prosodic strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prt</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>phonological strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>quote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>received pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skr</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>semantic strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS</td>
<td>syntactic strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMS</td>
<td>transference-marking strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top</td>
<td>topic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABSTRACT

This thesis attempts to examine language contact phenomena in the speech of first-generation Japanese adults in Australia and New Zealand through the analysis of interview and other spoken data. The main objectives of the thesis are: (i) to describe and analyse the types of transference and integration phenomena identified in the corpus; (ii) to identify and analyse the types of strategies employed by first-generation Japanese speakers in Japanese-Australian/New Zealand English contact; (iii) to investigate the types of lexical transfers (i.e., loanwords) peculiar to the Australian/New Zealand environment; (iv) to investigate the factors affecting lexical transference.

The basic assumption underlying the thesis is that there are principles which we may call strategies at work behind language contact phenomena and that these strategies (i.e., processing, monitoring, and social) affect contact processes such as transference and integration. These three types of strategies operate concurrently and generate rules for transference and integration under the influence of certain more general principles (i.e., maxims and determinants) prevailing in a given contact setting. In this thesis evidence is presented to show that interdialectal differences in the types of lexical transfers are attributable to differences in rules, strategies, maxims, and determinants operating in different bilingual communities.

Various factors are involved in transference. It is observed that according to length of stay and type of stay, Japanese speakers employ different contact strategies. In the interview situation with a newcomer from Japan, migrants
tend to suppress lexical transference while sojourners are likely to adopt it.
The choice of contact strategies depends primarily on whether the speaker and
the interlocutor share the same communicative norm. In a dynamic type of
bilingual situation such as that found in the Japanese communities in Australia/
New Zealand, the communicative norm is in a state of flux, and therefore the
Japanese speakers in these communities employ a set of contact strategies which
allow them to explore an ad hoc norm for communication with respect to lexical
transference.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1. Scope of This Study

The present study is a sociolinguistic examination of language contact phenomena in Japanese-based interactions among first-generation Japanese adults in Australia and New Zealand. The basic assumption of this thesis is that there are principles which we may call strategies at work behind language contact phenomena and that contact processes are affected by these strategies. Although numerous studies have been conducted on Japanese-English contact, especially on English loanwords in Japanese, little attention has been paid to strategies underlying the use of English lexical items in Japanese speech and social/psychological factors affecting contact processes. A grammatical approach to lexical transference usually focuses on decontextualised, isolated items, and

---

1 In this study “interaction” refers to face-to-face communication.
2 Although the definition of “strategy” differs among researchers, in this thesis it is used as in Neustupný (1987b, 1989). According to Neustupný, strategies are one of the principles that contribute to determining typological patterns of linguistic, social, cultural, and behavioural modes (see 2.2.2 and 3.4 for detail).
3 “Loanwords” may be defined as lexical items borrowed from foreign languages and phonologically and grammatically integrated into the recipient language. It should be noted, however, that most Chinese loans are regarded by Japanese as part of the native vocabulary (Ishino 1983: 8-10).
4 In this thesis “transference” is used for “the process of bringing over any items, features or rules from one language to another, and for the results of this process. Any instance of transference is a transfer” (Clyne 1991: 160; see also 3.2.1). Following many other language contact studies conducted in Australia, this study adopts the term transference proposed by Clyne (1967: 19).
therefore fails to clarify dynamic strategies operating in language contact processes, not to mention social meanings of foreign language use. A careful examination of contact phenomena in interaction reveals these strategies as well as linguistic acculturation induced by prolonged language contact. Thus, through the analysis of 87 interviews and other supplementary spoken data gathered in Australia/New Zealand, this thesis investigates the linguistic behaviour of first-generation Japanese residents in Sydney and Melbourne, Australia, and in Christchurch, New Zealand. 5

Living in an English-speaking environment like that of Australia/New Zealand, first-generation Japanese expatriates start using English lexical items that refer to new objects and concepts peculiar to Australian/New Zealand life. Other than this need-filling function performed by the AUE/NZE lexicon, unnecessary lexical items are also transferred to Japanese, resulting in the coexistence of both lexical transfers and their native equivalents in the recipient language (see 3.2.1.2). Weinreich (1953: 58) says that there is a constant need for synonyms because borrowings 6 satisfy euphemistic needs. The use of unnecessarily transferred items also has a function of signalling higher degrees of acculturation and group identity/solidarity (Higa 1975; Tanaka 1992).

5 In 1997 there were 10,890 Japanese nationals in Sydney and 5,467 in Melbourne (the Consulate-General of Japan at Sydney, 1997). According to the 1996 census, the Japanese population of the Canterbury region (Christchurch, New Zealand) was 1,536 (Statistics NZ, 1996).

6 In this thesis “borrowing” is seen as a type of transference. Note, however, that while transference involves both integrated and unintegrated items, borrowing implies that transferred items are to a greater or lesser degree integrated linguistically and socially (for the concept of integration, see 3.2.2.1); and that borrowing is usually thought of as a long-term process within the language of a social group (Hatch and Brown 1995: 172).
Whereas linguistic acculturation is connected with prestige motives, register\(^7\) differences can produce humorous or peculiar effects as well (McMahon 1994: 202; see also 6.4).

Through the constant exposure to English in everyday life, Japanese speakers go through varying degrees of linguistic acculturation according to their lifestyle and activities in Australia/New Zealand (Clyne 1991: 162). While Japanese in Australia/New Zealand are likely not to encounter fashionable loanwords currently used in Japan, they tend to develop a different type of register for everyday communication. If the transference patterns of first-generation Japanese are not random, it can be assumed that there is a communicative norm\(^8\) with regard to transference, which has developed in the Japanese communities\(^9\) in Australia/New Zealand, reflecting the predominant everyday use of English in these two countries (see Chapter 5).

As their knowledge of English increases, Japanese speakers tend to change strategies for transference and "re-borrow" (Haugen 1969: 394) some English loanwords familiar to them prior to their arrival in Australia/New Zealand. Adaptation strategies and rules for integrating English words into Japanese (see Appendix 8) start changing under the influence of the source language, that is, AUE/NZE. It can be supposed that not only at the lexical level but also at all the levels of the language (i.e., phonological, prosodic, grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic), Japanese tends to conform to the external norm of the dominant language and therefore to undergo varying degrees of linguistic acculturation.

---

\(^7\) The term "register" refers to "a variety of language defined according to its use in social situations, e.g. a register of scientific, religious, formal English" (Crystal 1997: 327).

\(^8\) For detailed discussion of the concept of "norm," see 3.3.

\(^9\) In this study the term "community" is used as "speech community," "referring to any regionally or socially definable human group identified by a shared linguistic system" (Crystal 1997: 357).
Prolonged language and culture contact is apt to weaken the monitoring\textsuperscript{10} effect on the speech of first-generation migrants (Gonzo and Saltarelli 1983). Under the influence of the dominant language, deviations from the standard norm (Haugen 1969: 60-63, 1977) and gradual shifts in forms and meanings of lexical items take place in migrants' speech. It is possible that first language attrition (Clyne 1986, 1991, 1997; Py 1986; Seliger and Vago 1991: 3-15; Bettoni 1991) affects the speech of first-generation Japanese residents in Australia/New Zealand as well, to a greater or lesser extent, though a longitudinal study of Dutch in Australia shows that “first-language attrition does not necessarily take place in an immigrant setting” (de Bot and Clyne 1994: 17). It can be supposed that transference plays a significant role in compensating for the weakened monitor effect as speakers resort to foreign lexical items to achieve their communicative intentions.\textsuperscript{11} The use of external language resources is thus considered to be a means for overcoming lexical difficulties ascribed to the weakened monitoring ability (see 8.3.4 and 8.3.5). In this sense, transference is a “communication strategy” (see Tarone 1980; Færch and Kasper 1983; Ellis 1985, 1994; Bialystok 1990; Kasper and Kellerman 1997).

\textsuperscript{10} “The monitor can be defined as the speaker’s own inspection device which enables him to check the utterance he is about to produce, is producing, or has already produced” (van Hest 1996: 2; see also 3.4.1.1.2).

\textsuperscript{11} The term “communicative intentions” refers to “the intentions that underlie speech acts (as well as some other acts of communication)” (Levelt 1989: 59). According to Levelt, a speaker’s communicative intention involves not only the intention to convey a thought, a wish and so on but also “the speaker’s ‘proximal’ purpose in planning a speech act,” that is, “intention recognition by the addressee” (ibid.: 108).
When deviations are noted and negatively evaluated by the speaker, "correcting strategies"\(^{12}\) are employed (Neustupný 1978: 243-57, 1985a, 1985b; see also 3.4.1.1.2). Deviations are repaired by the speaker himself/herself or the repairs are initiated by the interlocutor or the participant if comprehension difficulties arise (see Schegloff et al. 1977; Levelt 1983, 1989; Ozaki 1989; Hayashi 1994; van Hest 1996). If lexical transference or the use of foreign language resources gives rise to a communication problem, the transferred item may be given a negative evaluation and corrected because language norms are not shared between the interactants. As Jerunudd and Thuan (1983: 72) say, "partners in communication need to find out what norms of implementation the other person has, need to express each his own norms, and between them need to find a way to agree on what norms shall be used for a particular act of speaking."

As will be examined in this study, the use of monitoring strategies for lexical transference is considered as a device for exploring an ad hoc communicative norm between interactants with regard to the use of foreign lexical items in Japanese speech (see 8.3.4 and 8.3.5).

Taking into account the speaker's motives, cognitions and feelings, Giles and his associates propose a social psychological approach to study speech/communication "convergence" between the speaker and the interlocutor. Empirical research adopting this approach shows that the speaker "accommodates" his/her speech/communication style towards that of the interlocutor (e.g., Giles 1973; Giles and Smith 1979; Giles et al. 1973, 1977b: 307-48, 1987: 16-27, 1991b: 5-21; Giles and Coupland 1991: 60-93). It should, however, be noted that there

\(^{12}\) In this thesis the concept of "correction" is employed to refer to corrective adjustment of deviations towards L1 norms.
may be circumstances where the speaker employs transference or code-switching\textsuperscript{13} to “diverge” linguistically and/or psychologically from the interlocutor (Genesee and Bourhis 1988: 229; Giles et al. 1987: 27-34, 1991b: 8-11, 27-45; Giles and Coupland 1991: 65-71), and that deviations caused by transference are not always corrected because of a counteracting “social strategy” (see 3.4.1.1.3).

As noted earlier, transference and code-switching may be used to indicate the degree of acculturation to mainstream society (Grosjean 1982: 332). As Grosjean says, “lexical borrowing and code-switching are not only a reflection of the linguistic needs of individual speakers, they also characterize bilingual communities and their sociolinguistic norms” (ibid.). Code choices are intentional in the sense that the speaker chooses codes to achieve certain social ends (Myers-Scotton 1998c: 19). Note, however, that although the accommodation theory associates code choices with social psychological factors, the speaker’s choice does not simply reflect his/her social group membership. Myers-Scotton argues that “choices depend on the strategy that would optimize for self” (ibid.: 20; see also 3.3).

We have discussed above the scope of the present study. Before presenting the objectives of this thesis, we shall briefly survey some of the most relevant previous studies in Japanese-English contact and also discuss a number of issues relating to this research immediately below.

\textsuperscript{13}“Code-switching” can be defined as “production in more than one language, within one sentence or between sentences within a stretch of discourse” (Clyne 1997: 313). In this study intra-sentential code-switching and transference/borrowing are regarded as a continuum. Note that some linguists use “codes” as a cover term “for linguistic systems at any level, from separate languages to dialects of a single language to styles or substyles within a single dialect” (Myers-Scotton 1998: 3).
1.2. Some Previous Studies in Japanese-English Contact

1.2.1. Masumi-So’s Study

Masumi-So (1983, 1994) conducted a loanword study in Melbourne, Australia, adopting a sociolinguistic approach. In her research based on the analysis of tape-recorded interviews and "follow-up interviews" (Neustupný 1990), Masumi-So examined loanword usage by 10 first-generation Japanese living in Melbourne. Her initial hypothesis was that length of stay is a crucial variable promoting the subjects' use of loanwords; that is, the longer they live in an English-speaking environment, the more they use loanwords. Contrary to her assumption, however, she found out that length of stay is a promoting factor, but not a determinant factor for loanword usage and that networks (family network, work network, etc.) and identity as Japanese also play an important role in the use of loanword and are responsible for the relatively lower frequency rate of loanword usage in the speech of mid- and long-term residents. It should be noted that the results of her findings suggest that length of stay promotes linguistic awareness and that there are three phases of loanword usage that speakers may go through (i.e., an initial introduction phase, an awareness phase, and a correction phase). Notice further that by identifying "frames" for loanword

---

14 Masumi-So’s term "loanword" is equivalent to our "lexical transfer."

15 According to Masumi-So, the term "frames" refers to syntagmatic forms for message transfer. The types of these frames and their effects on loanword usage identified in her study are as follows: (i) introductory clause (softening effect); (ii) gradation (softening or highlighting effect); (iii) introductory formula (softening effect); (iv) request-for-involvement (softening effect); (v) prominence (highlighting effect); (vi) speeding (softening effect); (vii) laughter (softening effect); (viii) discontinuity (softening or highlighting effect) (see Masumi-So 1983: 183-203 for detail). The above frames appear to correspond to transference-marking strategies (TMSs) in the present study (see 3.4.1.1.2 and 8.3.5).
usage, Masumi-So clarified linguistic contexts where loanwords are used.

Despite her notable findings, however, because of the small number of subjects, and her failure to consider other independent variables such as age, sex, occupation and so on, further investigation is necessary, even employing a synchronic, cross-sectional approach. Interviews are a useful means for collecting spoken data, but some kind of compensatory method should also be adopted for obtaining various types of spoken data in order to observe subjects' linguistic behaviour in different situations. Furthermore, Masumi-So paid little attention to psychological effects the interviewer might exert on the interviewee. Socio-psychological factors which are of influence in the relationship between speaker and interlocutor in an interview situation must be taken into consideration (Giles et al. 1991b: 5-45; Giles and Coupland 1991: 60-93; see Chapter 4).

1.2.2. Natusch’s Study

Another study which should be mentioned here in connection with the present research is a sociolinguistic survey carried out by Natusch (1986). By means of interviews and language tests, Natusch investigated the cultural and linguistic adaptation of 76 Japanese women migrants in New Zealand. His study shows that there are marked differences between the two groups of subjects: those who are intra-culturally married (INTRA subjects) and those who are inter-culturally married (INTER subjects). The findings of his study include the following points: (i) the INTER subjects have adapted themselves to New Zealand life to a greater extent than the INTRA subjects, the latter having a strong cultural identity as Japanese; (ii) the different patterns of cultural
adaptation between the two groups of women are considered to be due to the age of exit from Japan and the status of residence (i.e., permanent or temporary) in New Zealand; (iii) the INTRA subjects use only Japanese when conversing with other Japanese while the INTER subjects who identify themselves less strongly as Japanese do not use Japanese exclusively; (iv) the Japanese language is not transmitted to the children of the INTER subjects whose home language is English; (v) the INTER subjects achieved higher oral proficiency in English than the INTRA subjects and there is a correlation between the age at which the subjects left Japan and their attained oral proficiency in English; (vi) feelings of acceptance within New Zealand society correlate with oral proficiency in English for INTRA subjects; (vii) there are no strong correlations between the subjects’ oral proficiency in English and formal education or length of residence.

Although not designed to examine English transference phenomena in the Japanese language spoken in New Zealand, Natusch’s research has some significance for this project as very little is known about Japanese language use in New Zealand. As described above, Natusch argues that the type of marriage is an important factor for determining the degree of cultural and linguistic adaptation of Japanese women in New Zealand. Despite their continuous use of the Japanese language among themselves, the INTER subjects seemed to fail to transmit the language to their children. It may be supposed that even though exogamy promotes the use of English at home in an English-dominant environment, a shift from Japanese to English suggests not only the apparent lack of Japanese-speaking network but also the relatively lower status of the Japanese language as a cultural “core value” (Smolicz 1981: 76, 1985: 11-12). Smolicz (1985: 12) makes the point that “for minority groups that are language-centred, the preservation of their linguistic core is indispensable for
the transmission of their cultures to the next generation." Clyne (1991: 55) attributes varying degrees of language shift in different ethnolinguistic groups to such variables as "cultural similarity to the dominant cultural group, a relatively minor role of language in the respective cultural value system... exogamy, gender (masculinity), and age" (see also Holmes 1997: 22; Jamieson 1980: 107-9).

It appears that Natusch did not pay attention to Smolicz's theory of core values. Furthermore, no mention was made of the importance of cultural distance between languages/cultures in contact in determining language maintenance and shift (Fishman et al. 1986; Clyne 1991; Clyne and Kipp 1997: 459). Notice further that although Natusch conducted individual interviews in Japanese as well, he did not analyse micro-level interactional data in order to examine the English influence on the Japanese language in discourse. Even if identity as Japanese may be an inhibiting factor against linguistic acculturation, it is not necessarily true that the INTRA subjects who have a stronger identity tend to suppress lexical transference from English while the INTER subjects are likely to adopt more transfers. If value priority is not given to the native language, a Japanese-English mix and identity as Japanese may not be contradictory to each other. It is also worthwhile to bear in mind, as Smolicz (1981: 76) argues, that there are dialectal differences in the nature of cultural core values. It will be interesting to examine how people from Tokyo, Osaka and other regions treat English lexical transfers in terms of their cultural heritage (see 7.2.7).

16 The term "discourse" refers to "a continuous stretch of (especially spoken) language larger than a sentence" (Crystal 1997: 118).
1.2.3. Higa's Study

Higa (1974, 1975, 1976, 1979a, 1979b, 1983) investigated the use of English loanwords among Japanese in Hawaii. According to Higa, one of the characteristics of Hawaiian Japanese is that it contains a large number of loanwords unnecessarily transferred from English. Higa's study focuses on the types of loanwords rather than the frequency of loans. Through the taxonomic analysis of loanwords collected by means of observation, Higa attempted to clarify the sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic principles underlying loanword usage among Japanese immigrants in Hawaii. His hypotheses about these principles are as follows:

(i) the use of loanwords among the nikkeijin\(^{17}\) is a linguistic device to create a new Japanese dialect;
(ii) the loanwords used by the nikkeijin reflect the process and the degree of their social and psychological adjustment to the new cultural environment;
(iii) words of conjunctive concepts are individually borrowed to meet various lexical needs, whereas words of relational concepts are borrowed as conceptual systems;\(^{18}\)
(iv) from the sociolinguistic point of view the most important words in a language are those related to kinship relations, social relations, time, and quantity (Higa 1975: 81-86).

As Higa notes, Japanese immigrants in Hawaii attempt to avoid the use of loanwords when they speak to visitors from Japan. Rather than using their dialect,\(^{17}\) A person of Japanese descent
\(^{18}\) "'Conjunctive concepts' are usually concrete, like *table* and *violin*, and have a definite set of simultaneously present attributes"; and "'relational concepts' are those that exist only in relation to other concepts, such as *father, son, cousin, east* and *west" (Higa 1975: 85).
they try to speak standard Japanese with Japanese visitors (see Neustupný 1995: 65-66). This kind of dialect-switching behaviour of Japanese immigrants in Hawaii made Higa hypothesize the existence of a new Japanese dialect in Hawaii. According to him, words in certain categories (e.g., kinship, personal reference, time and quantity) are more susceptible to borrowing and in these categories the highest degree of linguistic acculturation is achieved in the case of Japanese. Words of relational concepts also tend to be Anglicised in Hawaiian Japanese. Note further that, as Higa points out, these trends are observed in Brazilian, Peruvian, and Argentinean Japanese as well (cf. Satoo-Amelia 1981; Tanaka 1992). The following are some examples of Hawaiian Japanese taken from Higa (1976: 125):

(1) a. *Yuu no nanbaa wan booi wa ima doko ni oru?*  
   *you Gen number one boy Top now where in is*  
   ‘As for your eldest son, where is he now?’

   b. *Mii no booi wa noo ima Jappan ni ittoru.*  
   *me Gen boy Top Prt now Japan in is*  
   ‘As for my son, he is in Japan now.’

   c. *Yuu no misesu wa too matchi yangu noo.*  
   *you Gen Mrs Top too much young Prt*  
   ‘As for your wife, she is very young.’

As shown above, English words: “you,” “number one boy,” “me,” “Japan,” “Mrs,” “too much,” “young” are unnecessarily transferred to Japanese.¹⁹

¹⁹ Inoue (1991) lists address terms such as *mit-ra* (me + ra [plural suffix]) ‘we’ and *yuu-ra* (you + ra [plural suffix]) ‘you’ used in Hawaiian Japanese. Yano (1967: 134) reports that first-generation Japanese speakers in Los Angeles also use these address terms.

For Japanese pidgin English in Hawaii, see Nagara (1972).
According to Higa, when they are not sure if a Japanese person is a local-member, Hawaiian Japanese usually ask, “You roko ‘local’?” The address terms they use for non-local members are normally “anta” ‘you’ and “washi” ‘I’ (Higa 1975, 1976; Kurokawa 1976). It is also interesting that in spite of their own use of loanwords, Hawaiian Japanese are offended at the excessive use of English loanwords by Japanese visitors (Pinkerton 1991: 12). Foreign loanwords in common use in Japan such as echiketto ‘etiquette’ are rarely used in Hawaiian Japanese (Higa 1976: 132).

It is not clear if Higa examined the degrees of integration of loanwords used by Japanese immigrants in Hawaii when they speak to visitors from Japan. Even if Hawaiian Japanese try to avoid loanword usage in speaking with non-local members and to switch to standard Japanese, there may be situations where transference from English must be employed as a communication strategy. In such situations, what types of loans are most susceptible to transference? Although Higa does not make this point clear, it may be that in these hypothetical situations, among the word categories mentioned above the most resilient to transference are personal reference words, and that time and quantity expressions are more susceptible to transference than address and kinship terms.

1.2.4. Points to Note

While this is a study of the Japanese language spoken in Australia/New Zealand, studies in other overseas varieties of Japanese provide us with invaluable data for comparison (other data include: Ervin-Tripp 1964, 1967;

It is important to note that there is a fundamental difference between the Japanese communities in Australia/New Zealand and the other overseas Japanese communities mentioned above. Unlike the fairly large and established Japanese communities in Hawaii, California, Brazil, and Argentina, which contain immigrants of the pre-war period (a “static” type of bilingual community), their Australian/New Zealand counterparts are rather new, small, and always in a state of flux, accepting newcomers from Japan every year (a “dynamic” type of bilingual community) (Clyne 1967: 10; 2.2.4.2) (see Curson and Curson 1982; Atsumi 1992; McNamara and Coughlan 1992; Mizukami 1993; Kipp et al. 1995; Australian Bureau of Statistics 1998).

Owing to the compulsory education in Japan and the Japanese media, Japanese residents in Australia/New Zealand normally have a good command of standard Japanese no matter what region they come from (Pinkerton 1991: 12). On the other hand, the pre-war immigrants in Hawaii, who came from diverse dialect areas of Japan, first used the Chuugoku dialect for a common speech as the majority of the Japanese population were from the Chuugoku area (e.g.,

---

20 According to Shibuya (1991: 145), about 28% of the total Hawaiian population (about 770,000) were Japanese immigrants and their descendants at the time of the 1970 Census.
Hiroshima, Yamaguchi, etc.)\textsuperscript{21} (Higa 1975; Kimura 1988: 30-32). Then, gradually adopting English loanwords to overcome difficulties caused by dialectal differences, they created a new Japanese dialect. Or rather, to establish their own identity as Japanese immigrants in Hawaii, it was necessary for them to develop a dialect which contained English loanwords (Higa 1974, 1975, 1976, 1979a, 1979b, 1983). This difference between the above-mentioned two types of bilingual communities (i.e., static vs. dynamic) must be taken into account in the present study.

If the use of lexical transfers is a prominent feature of migrants’ speech, it is worthwhile to compare the JAU/JNZ data with those of Hawaiian Japanese collected by Higa (1983) and Inoue (1991) so as to investigate interdialectal similarities and differences in lexical transference patterns between overseas Japanese communities, taking account of the aforementioned difference in the nature of the Japanese communities concerned. As noted earlier, Higa (1975, 1983) points out some similarities in the types of lexical transfers used in the same types of static bilingual Japanese communities in Hawaii, Brazil, Peru, and Argentina. Although not as dramatic as with Hawaiian Japanese, in the case of the Japanese language as employed by native Japanese speakers in Australia/New Zealand also, transference of English lexical items may be creating new varieties, reflecting the norms of particular locales. The issue of interdialectal comparison will be discussed in 5.4.

\textsuperscript{21} Inoue (1971) reports that the total number of Japanese population in Hawaii was 116,615 at the time of the 1924 Census and of the total, 30,534 (26.2%) were from Hiroshima, 25,878 (22.2%) Yamaguchi; 19,551 (16.8%) Kumamoto; 16,536 (14.2%) Okinawa; 7,563 (6.5%) Fukuoka; 5,036 (4.3%) Niigata; 4,936 (4.2%) Fukushima.
It should be borne in mind that the use of lexical transfers in Hawaiian Japanese serves as an identity/solidarity marker for Japanese immigrants living in multilingual/multicultural Hawaii. Since norms of Japanese language use in overseas Japanese communities are usually influenced by socio-cultural factors prevailing in those overseas Japanese societies, it can be supposed, according to High, that some features of standard Japanese developed in a one-race one-language country like Japan (e.g., honorific expressions, women's language, etc.) do not play a significant part in Hawaiian Japanese (High 1979b: 158-59). In the case of JAU/JNZ too, these features may be weakened through prolonged language/culture contact, but this issue is not dealt with in this thesis.

Another issue relating to the present thesis is linguistic typology and universals (Greenberg 1963; Comrie 1989). Clyne (1991: 157) argues for “the theoretical gains that could be derived from studying languages of different typologies all in contact with the same language (English)” (e.g., Clyne 1967, 1972a, 1991 [German/Dutch in Australia]; Pauwels 1991 [Dutch in Australia]; Bettoni 1981 [Italian in Australia]; Tamis 1988, 1990, 1991 [Greek in Australia]; Stoffel 1981 [Serbo-Croatian in New Zealand]; Surus 1985 [Polish in New Zealand]; Kinder 1987 [Italian in New Zealand]; Xu 1993 [Cantonese in New Zealand]; Haugen 1956, 1969 [Norwegian in America]; Scotton and Okeju 1973 [Ateso in Africa]). Although some attention is paid to linguistic typology in reference to strategies (see 2.2.2), the issue of language universals and typology is not investigated in depth in this study.
1.3. Objectives

The present thesis has the following four major objectives:

(i) to describe and analyse the types of transference and integration phenomena based on the spoken data collected from the subjects (i.e., first-generation Japanese adults living in Australian and New Zealand) (Chapters 5 and 6);

(ii) to identify and analyse the types of strategies employed by the subjects in Japanese-AUE/NZE contact and to investigate the relationship between lexical transference and strategies (Chapters 5, 6 and 8);

(iii) to investigate the types of lexical transfers which occur in JAU/JNZ, and to make a brief comparison of these types with those adopted in Hawaiian Japanese, based on the data gathered by Inoue (1991) and Higa (1983) (Chapter 5);

(iv) to investigate the relationship between the incidence of lexical transference and individual backgrounds (i.e., sex, age, occupation, hometown, length of stay, type of stay, and so on) (Chapter 7).

1.4. Organisation of the Thesis

The main body of this thesis is composed of nine chapters, there being a major division between Chapters 1-4 and Chapters 5-9. Following the present introductory chapter, in Chapters 2 and 3 the theoretical framework of this study is discussed: Chapter 2 deals with some general issues relating to language contact and bilingualism, while Chapter 3 examines three major concepts:
transference, integration, and strategy, and also proposes a contact strategy hypothesis for the analysis of the JAU/JNZ data. In Chapter 4 the subjects and the methodology are described.

Chapter 5 presents and analyses the data (i.e., 87 interviews, 40 follow-up interviews, discussions, observation, and participant-observation) by focusing on cultural and core lexical transference phenomena; strategies associated with these two types of lexical transference are also identified. The types of lexical transfers used by the subjects are classified according to various aspects of Australian/New Zealand life, and the transfers peculiar to JAU/JNZ are identified. A brief interdialectal comparison is also made between JAU/JNZ and Hawaiian Japanese with regard to the types of lexical transfers.

Chapter 6 is concerned with the description and the analysis of the types of integration and transference phenomena (other than lexical transference) identified in the corpus. The types of strategies at work behind these integration and transference phenomena are examined. The five main functions of lexical transference/code-switching identified in the corpus are also presented.

In Chapter 7 the relationship between the incidence of lexical transference and the subjects' backgrounds is investigated based on the interview data collected from 44 Japanese adults in Australia, while Chapter 8 examines the relationship between the incidence of lexical transference and two contact strategies (lexical and monitoring) employed by the 44 subjects in the interviews.

Chapter 9 is the Conclusion, summarising the findings of this study. The main body of the thesis is supplemented by information in a series of appendices, this being followed in turn by the Bibliography.
CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK (I)

2.1. Introduction

The present chapter discusses some general issues concerning language contact and bilingualism particularly relevant to this study. These issues include language contact paradigms, native vs. contact situations, typology of language contact, the definition of bilingualism, and the contact setting.

2.2. Language Contact and Bilingualism

2.2.1. Language Contact

Uriel Weinreich defines language contact as follows:

...two or more languages will be in contact if they are used alternately by the same persons. The language-using individuals are thus the locus of the contact (Weinreich 1953: 1).

As stated above, individual speakers who have command of more than one language, viz., bilinguals, play a central role in language contact. In other words, language contact relies on a certain degree of competence in two or more languages in the individual (see McMahon 1994: 200). Note that contact languages here include dialects or varieties of the same language. Clyne (1991: 159-60, 1997: 303) observes that the language contact paradigm which used to focus on “language as a system” has been expanded to “speech” through
the works of Weinreich (1953) and Haugen (1953, 1956). It is only after the systematisation of language contact studies by these two linguists that psychological and socio-cultural factors have come to be taken as significant for research. Following this language contact paradigm, Clyne (1967, 1972a, 1982, 1991) has developed “community language”\textsuperscript{1} research in Australia. The present study adopts this same approach, taking into account socio-cultural/socio-psychological factors prevailing in an interactive situation.

There are basically two kinds of situations for language contact, that is, “contact (or foreign) situations” where inter-cultural communication takes place and “native (or internal) situations” where intra-cultural communication occurs (Neustupný 1985a, 1985b; 1987a: 9-11). It can be supposed that norms operating in JAU/JNZ differ from those in standard Japanese. Although native situations may be possible irrespective of the geographical location (e.g., Japan, Australia, New Zealand, etc.), as a study of overseas varieties such as JAU/JNZ this study deals with the so-called “pseudo-contact situation” (see 3.3).

2.2.2. Typology\textsuperscript{2} of Language Contact

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the basic assumption underlying the present study is that there are principles which we may call strategies operating behind contact phenomena and that these strategies affect contact processes such as

\textsuperscript{1} According to Clyne (1991: 3), the term “community language” denotes “languages other than English and Aboriginal languages employed within the Australian community.”

\textsuperscript{2} The term “typology” refers to: (i) “typological classification” which is concerned with cross-linguistic comparison, (ii) “cross-linguistic patterns”, or (iii) (common definition) “classification” (Croft 1990: 1-2). In the present study the concept of typology is used as a tool to help explain patterns of language contact phenomena which occur under the influence of a set of principles operating in contact processes.
transference and integration (see 3.2). According to Clyne (1991: 162), "there are tendencies in the development of each community language which are related to linguistic and cultural distance, linguistic typology..., and general sociolinguistic factors." In this study these tendencies are regarded as strategies operating in language contact processes.

Neustupný (1987b: 301-5, 1989: 358-61) proposes the hypothesis that there are four main principles which determine typological patterns of language, culture, society, and behavioural modes. These principles are determinants, maxims, strategies, and rules. Determinants are the highest/most general principles (e.g., economic/geographical factors, etc.), which influence a large number of lower principles; maxims are the second highest principles, and these affect a wide range of behaviour, contributing to determining typological features; strategies are specific to some particular areas of interaction, showing general tendencies that generate rules; finally, rules (ordinary and listing) specify details (see 3.4.1.1). The higher principles affect the lower principles. It can therefore be supposed that strategies at work behind language contact phenomena are influenced by the more general principles of maxims and determinants. Neustupný's model, which constitutes an important part of our framework, provides a theoretical basis for the above assumption.

It should be noted that even though each language may be categorised into a certain typological group (e.g., Japanese as an agglutinative language), it contains other features that belong to other language types (Neustupný 1989: 361-62). In fact it is difficult to make sharp divisions between linguistic systems (Bettoni 1981:

\[ \text{3 Neustupný's concept of "maxim" is different from that of Grice (1975) and Myers-Scotton (1998c). For Grice maxims are conversational principles; for Myers-Scotton they are principles for code choice.} \]
21). Each linguistic system contains “central and peripheral” elements to that language (Danes 1966; Vachek 1966). Based on this centre and periphery distinction, Neustupny (1978: 41-57) argues for linguistic vagueness of a system. Chomsky (1981: 1-16) has developed notions such as “core and periphery” and “marked and unmarked” to explain L1 acquisition processes. According to him, the core grammar is unmarked while the peripheral grammar is marked. With respect to the order of acquisition, it is argued that the child normally learns unmarked rules before marked ones (ibid.: 9).

The notion of markedness plays a significant role in language contact. Clyne (1991: 165-69, 177) demonstrates that unmarked English forms tend to result in lexical transference to German and Dutch in Australia. Based on her markedness model, Myers-Scotton argues that “all linguistic codes or varieties

---

4 “Peripheral” elements refer to insufficiently integrated elements of the system of language. Some elements are assimilated to the more “central” elements of the system. Vachek (1966: 23) points out that “some elements lack this integration or possess it to a relatively low degree.” According to him, the degree of integration of an element means “the degree of its participation in the relations characterizing the given system seen as an ensemble of its elements” (ibid.). On the lexical level “peripheral phenomena are represented by non-domesticated loanwords” (ibid.: 24).

5 With regard to the concepts of “core and periphery,” Chomsky (1995: 19-20) states: “We may make a rough and tentative distinction between the core of a language and its periphery, where the core consists of what we tentatively assume to be pure instantiations of UG [Universal Grammar] and the periphery consists of marked exceptions (irregular verbs, etc.).... A reasonable approach would be to focus attention on the core system, putting aside phenomena that result from historical accident, dialect mixture, personal idiosyncrasies, and the like.”

6 The concept of “markedness” was first developed by Prague School linguists such as Trubetzkoy and Jakobson (Croft 1990: 69). In generative linguistics “an unmarked property is one which accords with the general tendencies found in all languages; a marked property is one which goes against these general tendencies – in other words, it is exceptional” (Crystal 1997: 234).
come to have social and psychological associations in the speech communities in which they are used” (Myers-Scotton 1998b: 5). She employed the unmarked versus marked distinction to explain whether the use of a particular code matches community norms. According to Myers-Scotton, language users are innately equipped with the competence to assess if their code choices are marked or unmarked. Exposure to language use in their speech community only enables such competence to be activated and thus to develop a sense of markedness for code choices (ibid.: 6).

Based on natural speech data taken from Finnish-English, a typologically different language pair, Poplack et al. (1989) suggest that conflicting typologies tend to result in “nonce borrowing” (i.e., a type of borrowing which shows morphological and syntactic patterns of the recipient language, but is not recurrent in the speech of an individual or widespread in the speech community)⁷ (ibid.: 403; Sankoff et al. 1990; Romaine 1995: 153; Weinreich 1953: 11) rather than code-switching. According to them, in Finnish-English

---

⁷ Observe the following examples of nonce loans given by Poplack and her associates:

**Finnish-English** (Poplack et al. 1989: 400)

(1) **Mä kerran lähetin sen tuonne dry cleaneriin.**
   I once sent-1p it-gen there-al -il
   ‘I once sent it to the dry cleaners there.’ (1p=first person; gen=genitive; al=allative; il=illative)

**Tamil-English** (Sankoff et al. 1990: 96)

(2) **Parents-nuDaya support irukkum arranged marriage-la.**
   -gen be (3p-neut-fut) -loc
   ‘In the arranged marriage, there will be parents’ support.’ (gen=genitive; 3p-neut-fut=third person-neuter-future; loc=locative)

Note that the term none borrowing is not adopted in this study, as it is considered to be lexical transference.
bilingualism nonce borrowing occurs five times as frequently as code-switching (Poplack et al. 1989: 392-93). On the other hand, typologically similar language pairs such as Spanish-English and French-English are more likely to code-switch (ibid.: 404). Poplack and her associates suggest that linguistic typology plays a part in determining the propensity for code-switching or borrowing. Note that they distinguish between code-switching and borrowing as different processes (ibid.: 403; Sankoff et al. 1990: 72).⁸

2.2.3. Bilingualism

Bilingualism occurs as a result of language contact. With their English knowledge increasing, Japanese residents in Australia/New Zealand begin to change their strategies for transference as well as to develop their English competence. They tend to use more English lexical items in Japanese interaction and even to code-switch to English according to the interlocutor and the situation, adopting strategies different from those they used to employ in Japan prior to their arrival in Australia/New Zealand. In the present study our subjects (first-generation Japanese adults) are all regarded as bilinguals in that they have the ability to use both English and Japanese in everyday life. The subsequent section will elaborate on this point.

⁸ Azuma (1997: 18) makes the point that “although some researchers have noted the importance of differentiating code-switching from borrowing…, the distinction is often difficult to make in practice.” Actually, there is still no agreement among researchers of language contact with respect to the relationship of (intra-sentential) code-switching to borrowing/transference. Some scholars distinguish between these two processes (e.g., Paff 1979; Poplack 1980; Schaz 1989), whereas others think of them as related processes to which the same structural constraints can apply (e.g., Myers-Scotton 1993a; Romaine 1995).
2.2.3.1. Definition

The definition of bilingualism is problematic, as this concept has open-ended semantics (Bearsmore 1982: 1). Various definitions have been proposed. According to Bloomfield (1933: 56), bilingualism is "native-like control of two or more languages." This is considered as a perfectionist or maximalist stance (Hoffmann 1991: 21). Since it is quite rare that second language learners can achieve monolingual native-like competence in the target language, this definition is unrealistic. Macnamara (1967: 59-60), on the other hand, says that a person who possesses at least one of the four second language skills (i.e., speaking, listening, reading, writing) even to a minimum degree is considered as a bilingual. His minimalist stance represents another extreme variant. Haugen (1973: 505) states, "By considering bilingualism as a relative rather than an absolute concept, writers found it possible to classify bilinguals along several parameters and to study the correlation of various background factors with the observed variety of linguistic behavior." Haugen (1969: 6-7) defines bilingualism as the ability to "produce complete and meaningful utterances in the other language."

Adopting a function-based definition, Weinreich (1953: 1) regards bilingualism as "the practice of alternately using two languages." In a similar vein, Mackey (1970a: 555) says that bilingualism is "the alternate use of two or more languages by the same individual." For Mackey, "bilingualism is not a phenomenon of language; it is a characteristic of its use. It is not a feature of the code but of the message." (ibid.: 554; cited also in Hoffmann 1991: 24).
In this thesis, preference is given to a relative and sociological definition rather than a psychological one which contains the problem of finding a general norm or standard for proficiency (see Appel and Muysken 1987: 3). The present study employs the criteria of both competence and function and defines (individual) bilingualism as the ability to produce intelligible messages in more than one code and to use those codes for social interaction (cf. Titone 1989b: 14; Oksaar 1983: 19). Our subjects (first-generation Japanese adults) arrived in Australia/New Zealand with some prior knowledge of English. Although the degree of language contact varies according to their lifestyles and activities, these Japanese speakers, being exposed to direct contact with AUE/NZE in everyday life, have both active (or productive) and passive (or receptive) abilities to use English. In this sense, they are taken to be bilinguals. Since most of our subjects started learning English at the age of puberty, their bilingualism can be described as “adult” bilingualism.

2.2.3.2. Individual vs. Societal Bilingualism

The type of bilingualism discussed above is “individual” bilingualism. Notice, however, that the term bilingualism also refers to the language situation in a society or nation. In the latter case, it is “societal” bilingualism, and this involves the use of more than one language in a community or society. Loveday (1996: 16) argues that “the communities involved in language contact are categorized according to their degree of bilingualism: ‘no’, ‘little’, or ‘widespread’ societal bilingualism.”

According to Hamers and Blanc (1989: 265), bilingualism is defined as “the state of the individual or a community characterised by the simultaneous presence of two languages.” They also use the term “bilinguality” to refer to
“the psychological state of the individual who has access to more than one linguistic code as a means of social communication” (ibid.; see also Hoffmann 1991: 10). In the present study their concept of bilinguality is included in individual bilingualism. Note that the concept of “multilingualism” is subsumed under bilingualism at the individual level (Clyne 1997: 301).

Ferguson (1959) introduced the term “diglossia” to refer to a situation where two contrasting varieties of the same language (i.e., a high (H) variety and a low (L) variety) co-occur throughout a speech community (Crystal 1997: 116). These two varieties have compartmentalised social functions in the community. The H variety is employed in relatively formal domains9 while the L variety is used for everyday interaction.

Fishman (1967, 1971, 1980) extended the concept of diglossia to bilingual/multilingual situations (see Loveday 1996: 24). What is to be noted here is that diglossia is related to societal bilingualism rather than individual bilingualism (Holmes 1992: 36). Fishman (1971: 83) remarks, “Bilingualism is essentially a characterization of individual linguistic versatility whereas diglossia is a characterization of the societal allocation of functions to different languages or varieties.” According to Fishman (1967), the possible relationships between diglossia and bilingualism can be categorised into the following four types: (i) both bilingualism and diglossia; (ii) bilingualism without diglossia; (iii) diglossia without bilingualism; and (iv) neither diglossia nor bilingualism. The present study, dealing with the Japanese language spoken by Japanese expatriates in an

---

9 The term “domain” refers to “a group of institutionalized social situations typically constrained by a common set of behavioural rules, e.g. the domain of the family is the house, of religion is the church, etc.” (Crystal 1997: 124).
Australian/New Zealand environment, focuses on the second category, namely bilingualism without diglossia.

Finally, it should be noted that, as discussed in Chapter 1, unlike the established Japanese communities in Hawaii and Brazil, the Japanese communities in Australia/New Zealand are in a state of flux with newcomers coming and going. In these communities, communicative norms are also in a state of constant development. Hence it can be said that the bilingual situation of the Japanese communities in Australia/New Zealand is a dynamic type of bilingualism, not a static type of bilingualism characteristic of the established Japanese communities in Hawaii and Brazil.

2.2.4. Contact Setting for This Study

Employing Fishman’s classification of the relationships of bilingualism and diglossia, the contact setting for the present research is characterised by “bilingualism without diglossia.” It can, however, be supposed that like any other ethnic language spoken in an English dominant society, the Japanese language also goes through some kind of diglossic stage as the Low language before English influence creeps into Japanese-speaking domains (see Loveday 1996: 23). Notice that “as role compartmentalization and value complementarity decrease under the impact of foreign models and massive change, the linguistic repertoire also becomes less compartmentalized” (Fishman 1971: 87). Bilingualism without diglossia is thus regarded as characteristic of a transitional contact setting for immigrants’ shift to the dominant language.

Loveday (1996: 12-25) suggests the following six archetypal language contact settings: (i) “the distant or dominant non-bilingual setting”; (ii) “the
distant but institutional setting”; (iii) “the bounded and/or subordinate community”; (iv) “the equal bilingual setting”; (v) “the diglossic bilingual setting”; (vi) “the language-shifting community.” Adopting Loveday’s classification, the Japanese communities in Australia/New Zealand are types of “language-shifting communities” which are located within the English-dominant countries.

Loveday makes the point that “language-shifting communities tend to generally appear in diglossic settings where the donor language belongs to a socially higher-group” (ibid.: 23). In general, the language-shifting community is composed of subordinate groups such as culturally dislocated and disadvantaged indigenous minorities and immigrants. Our Japanese subjects are temporary or permanent expatriates currently living in Australia/New Zealand. Both these sojourners and migrants from Japan are constantly under the influence of English norms and values in mainstream society. It is therefore assumed that English influence gives rise to a change in the subjects’ Japanese lexically, phonetically, semantically, and even grammatically, depending on their English-speaking network. It can further be supposed that prestige motives and their desire to be assimilated into the dominant community can play a negative role in their Japanese language maintenance efforts, promoting the incorporation of features of the dominant language into Japanese. Those who seek upward social mobility are likely to attempt to identify themselves with the socially and culturally dominant community (ibid.: 24). It should, however, be kept in mind that permanent and temporary residents are two distinct groups and that their contact strategies may therefore be different as well (see Chapters 7 and 8).

The contact setting of the Japanese communities in Australia/New Zealand is quite different from the linguistic setting in Japan, where Japanese language
use predominates.\textsuperscript{10} Loveday argues that "the distant non-bilingual setting"\textsuperscript{11} has no community-wide relations with speakers of the source language (e.g., English in Japan). One of the features of this setting is that because of the indirect contact pattern and no social requirement of the acquisition of the source language, language contact is usually limited to the lexical level. Here the source language is not introduced directly through personal interaction (ibid.: 17). By the same token, Haarmann (1989) refers to the use of foreign languages in Japan as "impersonal bilingualism." According to him, the use of English in Japan symbolises a modern lifestyle, but it "remains beyond the range of practical communication or intercultural relations" (ibid.: x) (see also Stanlaw 1982, 1987; Morrow 1987; Takashi 1990a, 1990b; Inoue 1997; Maynard 1997: 66-72).

From a language acquisition perspective we can suppose that in the case of our subjects, the indirect contact pattern employed in Japan will be replaced by the direct contact pattern in a natural acquisitional setting of Australia/New Zealand. Physical access to adequate input is possible here. Hence this research may also be considered as an examination of second-language (L2) acquisition in natural contexts and its effect on the use of the first language (L1), though focus falls on the effect on the use of L1, especially transference from L2 to L1. As will further be discussed in Chapters 3 and 5, different contact strategies are employed

\textsuperscript{10} Azuma (1997: 2) says that there are "bilingual situations in Japan which involve ranging from various ethnic groups to returnees such as kikoku-shijo (returning students to Japan from abroad)." Long (1998: 108-13) also discusses language contact and bilingual situations in Japan. See also Maher and Yashiro (1995).

\textsuperscript{11} In the other non-bilingual setting proposed by Loveday, viz., the dominant non-bilingual setting, the source language is not employed by the majority of a dominant community while it is spoken by a subordinate group (e.g., Aborigines in Australia, Maoris in New Zealand, etc.) within the territory of the dominant group. In such a setting the source language used by the dominant recipient group is normally just lexical items such as place names, culturally significant words, and so on (Loveday 1996: 18-19).
as contact settings vary. As Higa (1979: 279) says, English words immigrant languages have borrowed in the United States seem to be different from those borrowed by these languages in their fatherlands. Finally, note that "social and psychological distance" between the learner and the users of the target language (Schumann 1978) may restrict access to input, and thus lead to the adoption of different contact strategies.

2.3. Summary

In this chapter we have examined several issues on language contact and bilingualism relevant to this study. The following points were discussed:

(i) There are two types of situations for language contact, viz., native and contact situations. Whereas native situations appertain to intra-cultural communication, contact situations are related to inter-cultural communication. The situation to be investigated is regarded as a pseudo-contact situation, as communicative norms of JAU/JNZ are different from those of standard Japanese.

(ii) The basic assumption of this thesis is that there are principles called strategies operating in contact processes such as transference and integration. Following Neustupný (1987b, 1989), it was further hypothesized that these strategies are influenced by the more general principles of maxims and determinants. Linguistic typology is considered as affecting language contact phenomena.

(iii) Bilingualism is defined as the ability to produce intelligible messages in more than one code and to use those codes for social interaction. Based on this definition, the first-generation Japanese residents in Australia/New Zealand who participated in this project are regarded as bilinguals.
(iv) The contact setting of the Japanese communities in Australia/New Zealand (language-shifting communities) is characterised by dynamic bilingualism without diglossia. In these dynamic bilingual communities, communicative norms are in a state of constant development. This contact setting is different from the static type of bilingual Japanese community in Hawaii or the distant non-bilingual setting of Japan. It was assumed that strategies vary with contact settings.
CHAPTER 3
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK (II)

3.1. Introduction

In the present chapter a contact strategy hypothesis is proposed, based on the examination of three key concepts: transference, integration, and strategy. Transference from one language to another is a natural consequence of language contact. As a result of transference, linguistic acculturation occurs. Lexical transfers from the source language are integrated into the recipient language and the linguistic repertoire of the recipient speech community through the frequent use of these transfers among members of that community. Several contact strategies appear to be operating in the process of transference and integration. In this chapter we shall first examine the notions of transference and integration in connection with the notion of strategy, then discuss briefly the issue of norms and deviations, and finally present the contact strategy hypothesis for the analysis of the linguistic behaviour of first-generation Japanese-English bilinguals in Australia and New Zealand.

3.2. Transference and Integration

3.2.1. Transference

Clyne (1967) proposed the term transference to replace the term
“interference”\(^1\) that may carry a negative connotation. To repeat Clyne’s (1991: 160) definition, transference is employed for “the process of bringing over any items, features or rules from one language to another, and for the results of this process. Any instance of transference is a transfer.” Transference works in both ways: transference from L1 to L2 (i.e., proactive inhibition)\(^2\) and transference from L2 to L1 (i.e., retroactive inhibition) (Clyne 1967: 19). In this thesis the latter case in Japanese bilingual speech is examined. Transferred items occur with complete, partial or no integration into the recipient language. Hence, as noted in Chapter 1, transference (or borrowing) and intra-sentential code-switching are regarded as a continuum in this study.

Under the contact strategy hypothesis, strategies affect transference. Cross-linguistic/cultural differences in transference patterns derive from the adoption of different linguistic and social strategies. It can be supposed that when Japanese (agglutinative language) and German (inflectional language) are in contact with English (inflectional language), the two languages tend to show some different patterns in transference. Note that not only linguistic strategies but also socio-cultural/socio-psychological factors prevailing in a given situation play a part in the transference process.

---

\(^1\) Weinreich (1953: 1) defines “interference” as “those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e. as a result of language contact.”

\(^2\) “Proactive inhibition” is the effect of earlier learning on later learning while “retroactive inhibition” is the effect of later learning on earlier learning (Richards et al. 1985: 229).
3.2.1.1. Types of Transference Examined in This Study

The types of transference dealt with in the present study are lexical, phonological, prosodic, grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic transference. Transference phenomena are induced by a set of strategies (and rules) through which lexical, phonological, prosodic, grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic features are realised as transfers. It can therefore be supposed that each type of transference is related to the corresponding strategy (i.e., lexical transference is affected by lexical strategy; phonological transference by phonological strategy; and so on). When these strategies change, the patterns of transference go through changes accordingly. It is important to note that when a lexical item is transferred, several strategies, not only one, are normally working together behind the transference phenomenon. In this study, the different types of transference are defined as follows (cf. Clyne 1967: 28-41; Bettoni 1981: 54-55; Kinder 1987: 17-18):

(a) Lexical transference: the transference of words in form and meaning;
(b) Phonological transference: the transference of phonemes or allophones;
(c) Prosodic transference: the transference of stress or intonation;
(d) Grammatical transference: the transference of morphological/syntactic rules;
(e) Semantic transference: the transference of words in meaning only;
(f) Pragmatic transference: the transference of rules/features of (social) interaction.
Cultural vs. Core Lexical Transference

With respect to the types of lexical transference, following Myers-Scotton (1993a: 168-176), this study makes a distinction between two types of lexical transfers, namely, cultural and core lexical transfers. Cultural lexical transfers stand for objects or concepts new to the recipient culture while core lexical transfers represent objects or concepts whose equivalents already exist in the recipient culture. Cultural lexical transference occurs abruptly to fill the lexical gap between L1 and L2. Culture-specific lexical items are most likely to be transferred from L2 to L1. Core lexical transference, on the other hand, takes place when adopting L2 items for L1 core-vocabulary despite the existence of L1 equivalents. Since core lexical transfers do not have to meet lexical needs, they are usually adopted over time.

Romaine (1995: 142) reports on the use of English core lexical transfers by Panjabi-English bilinguals. These bilinguals use English words such as “parents,” “children,” “language,” and so on, though their L1 equivalents exist and are used in the community. As Li (1996: 10) says, “Languages or distinct linguistic varieties are seen as resources for the individual in the speech community to express his or her ideas.” Note that the frequency of core vs. cultural lexical transference varies with the speaker’s background. For instance, according to Scotton and Okeju (1973: 883), in the case of the speech of non-standard speakers of Ateso, core lexical transfers are more frequent than in the speech of standard Ateso speakers (see also Romaine 1995: 66). The present study also investigates whether this tendency towards greater use of lexical transfers of the core type can be seen in the speech of Japanese expatriates in Australia from various regions of Japan (see 8.3.3).
Clyne (1967: 12) points out that “Haugen’s investigations reveal that the vocabulary of cars and bicycles and of city life is where the percentage of English ‘loanwords’ is highest, while few words are borrowed in the lexical field of time, place, and direction, parts of body, folklore, and the farm.” In the case of the Norwegian language in the US, core lexical items such as time expressions are resilient to transference. As noted in Chapter 1, this fact contrasts with Higa’s observation on Hawaiian Japanese where the use of time expressions from L2 is one of the characteristics of the linguistic behaviour of Japanese immigrants in Hawaii. This difference may be attributable to the degree of acculturation of these two immigrant groups.

Under the contact strategy hypothesis, it can be supposed that maxims and determinants play a part in giving rise to the above difference. The maxim “Americanisation” contributes to generating lexical strategy (LS) 1.1: “Adopt foreign cultural lexical items” (see 3.4.1.1.1). This strategy promotes the adoption of cultural lexical transfers to fill lexical gaps between L1 and L2. When the above maxim becomes stronger, it also generates lexical strategy (LS) 1.2: “Adopt foreign core lexical items” (see 3.4.1.1.1). With respect to the above two ethnic languages, Hawaiian Japanese is influenced by a stronger maxim than that of American Norwegian, and therefore it tends to employ core lexical transfers such as time and quantity expressions, kinship terms, and so on through the adoption of LS 1.2. Note, however, that LS 1.1 and LS 1.2 can operate concurrently.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, cultural core values may be involved in the choice of strategies. It can therefore be hypothesized that the maxims “ethnic identity” and “language loyalty” generate lexical strategy (LS) 2: “Use native (core) lexical items” (see 3.4.1.1.1). In some communities the use of a certain
core vocabulary is still a marked choice while in others it is an unmarked choice. This difference can be ascribed to the difference in the maxims concerned. Due to the conflict existing between these maxims (i.e., Americanisation vs. ethnic identity/language loyalty), different lexical strategies are employed respectively in the aforementioned two immigrant communities.

Another point to be noted here is that determinants such as the natural environment, the geographic setting, and the socio-economic setting of the immigrant communities in question affect the choice of lexical transfers. For example, depending on whether the setting is urban or rural, and whether the climate is wet or dry, each community adopts different types of lexical items from L2. It can thus be supposed that determinants prevailing in each community affect to some degree the types of lexical transfers to be adopted.

In terms of interdialectal differences, Surus (1985) reports that in the case of Polish-English contact, the types of lexical transfers and lexical areas identified in her New Zealand corpus show a fundamental similarity with those of other Polish-English contact studies. It appears that a similar type of maxim operates in the dynamic bilingualism of the Polish-English communities Surus examined. In this study it is hypothesized that the dynamic nature of bilingualism of the Japanese communities in Australia/New Zealand shows different lexical transference patterns from those of the static bilingual communities in Hawaii and Brazil, as determinants, maxims, strategies, and rules working in the process of transference vary between these dynamic and static bilingual communities (see 5.4).
3.2.1.3. Reasons for Transference/Code-Switching

Several reasons for transference/code-switching have been identified by researchers. Clyne (1991: 165), for instance, proposes two principal reasons for lexical transference, viz., contextual factors and speech economy (cf. Weinreich 1953: 56-61).

Contexts play a crucial role in lexical transference. It is natural that a new environment for immigrants promotes transference of cultural lexical items accompanying new objects or concepts peculiar to that milieu such as “milk bar” ‘Australian corner-shop’ and “Vegemite” ‘Australian yeast extract’ in Australia (Clyne 1991: 165), and “All Blacks” ‘the New Zealand national rugby team’ and “haka” ‘a Maori war chant accompanied by gestures’ in New Zealand, to give just a few examples. As argued above, determinants and maxims operate behind lexical strategies and play a part in determining what strategy to be employed by the speaker. Whereas L2 contexts and domains trigger transference of L2 lexical items, L1 references tend to give rise to the use of native lexical items. In L1 contexts, different determinants, maxims, strategies, and rules are working in transference processes.

For example, “Westernisation” is taken to be a maxim still prevailing under the socio-cultural environment in contemporary Japan. This maxim generates the following borrowing strategy: “Adopt things Western.” On the linguistic level, the same maxim generates LS 1.1: “Adopt foreign cultural lexical items,” but can also triggers LS 1.2: “Adopt foreign core lexical items,” although to a lesser degree than in an L2 setting. LS 1.1 is employed to fill the lexical gap, while LS 1.2 is used to transfer synonymous lexical items in spite of the existence of their native counterparts. The use of fashionable lexical items from Western languages, associated with prestige motives, creates the kind of fictitious world the general
public wishes to dream of (see Appendix 8 (3.3)). Symbolic values of lexical transfers from English and other Western languages promote the selective adoption of these items, boosted by commercialism. Japanese neologisms are also coined after the model of these Western lexical items. Since there is no threat to Japanese ethnic and cultural identity in the indirect contact setting of Japan, the maxims “ethnic identity” and “language loyalty” are not as evident there as the maxim “Westernisation.”

Lexical strategies change with their corresponding maxims and determinants. Hence, the types of lexical items to be adopted also vary according to these higher principles. As seen above, Australian/New Zealand contexts generally trigger transference of lexical items referring to these environments. Topics relating to Australia/New Zealand also play a part in giving rise to lexical transference. In contrast, native references are likely to promote the use of L1 lexicon. Note that although Australian/New Zealand settings affect the types of cultural lexical transfers in a different way, it can be assumed that JAU and JNZ are similar in transference patterns because of the common nature of dynamic bilingualism of the Japanese communities in Australia and New Zealand.

As mentioned above, another main reason for lexical transference is speech economy. Bilinguals have more than one code as resources and often subconsciously choose less complex forms from one of the codes in their linguistic repertoires. Clyne (1991: 167) makes the point that German-English bilinguals in Australia tend to select an English transfer in preference to several German equivalents due to its unmarked semantic feature (e.g., “put” for legen, setzen, stellen, hängen, and stecken) (see Surus (1985: 63) for examples from Polish-English bilinguals in New Zealand). Lexical transference is also
employed to avoid the use of regionally different forms (Clyne 1991: 168). According to Salmons (1991), German immigrants living in Indiana, USA, who came from different regions of Germany use new register for practical communication rather than becoming bidialectal (see Hatch and Brown 1995: 134).

Also considered to be a reason for lexical transference is the creation of new forms of expression (Surus 1985: 64-65). Note again that as part of the linguistic repertoire of bilinguals, synonymous loans or core lexical transfers serve as a stylistic/rhetorical device.

It should also be kept in mind, as already noted in Chapter 1, that bilinguals resort to lexical transference as a communication strategy so as to overcome lexical difficulties they might have in an interactive situation. Lexical transference from L2 is employed to achieve a communicative goal when the bilingual speaker does not recall the L1 equivalent.

Not only lexical transference but also phonological transference from English is considered by some Japanese as a marker of sophistication, education, or status (Weinreich 1953: 27; see also Appendix 8 (1.4.2.)). It appears that the (conscious) use of foreign moras (i.e., bilingual mora strategy) (see 3.4.1.1.1) is ascribed to the speaker's prestige motive through the maxim Westernisation. As Weinreich (ibid.: 46) points out, "a desire to display the learning associated with the knowledge of the source language, or the prestige of the source language itself, underlies the practice."

With regard to code-switching, it is worthwhile to mention here Clyne's psycholinguistic notion (1967, 1972a, 1980, 1987, 1991) of "triggering" as one of the reasons for code-switching (and transference). According to Clyne (1991: 193), triggering "is promoted by trigger words – words at the intersection of two language systems which, consequently, may cause speakers to lose their
linguistic bearings and continue the sentence in the other language.” Trigger words can be lexical transfers or loanwords, bilingual homophones (e.g., German *hier* vs. English *here*), proper nouns, and “compromise forms” (or hybrid compounds) (Clyne 1980: 401, 1991: 193-96). Note that Clyne identifies two types of switches, viz., “anticipational” and “consequential” switches, depending on whether a switch occurs before (i.e., anticipational) or after (i.e., consequential) a trigger word.

Other than the above-mentioned triggering effect, Clyne (1991: 191-93, 1997: 308-9) suggests eight factors as possible reasons for code-switching. They are interlocutor, role relationship (e.g., a family friend vs. an ethnic school teacher), domain (e.g., home, work, school, religion, etc.), topic, venue (e.g., street, garden, home, etc.), channel of communication (e.g., face-to-face vs. telephone communication, speaking vs. writing), type of interaction (formal vs. informal), and phatic function (e.g., dramatic effect). From a functional perspective, Gumperz (1982: 75-84) gives the following six reasons for conversational code-switching: quotations, addressee specification, interjections, reiteration, message qualification, and personalisation vs. objectivisation. Appel and Muysken (1987: 118-20), also using a functional framework, proposes six reasons or functions for code-switching. They are referential, directive, expressive, phatic, metalinguistic, and poetic functions. According to Gibbons (1987: 80-82), intra-sentential code-switches are classified by their rhetorical effects, that is, emphasis, clarification, avoidance of repetition, and quotation. For the functions of transference/code-switching identified in the present JAU/JNZ corpus, see 6.4.

Gumperz (1982: 66) makes a distinction between a “we code” and a “they code.” According to him, for minority language speakers “the tendency is for
the ethnically specific, minority language to be regarded as the ‘we code’ and become associated with in-group and informal activities, and for the majority language to serve as the ‘they code’ associated with the more formal, stiffer and less personal out-group relations” (ibid.). It can be said that the “we code” implies privacy, intimacy, solidarity, and subjectivity whereas the “they code” suggests authority, dominance, distance, and objectivity (see Nishimura 1995: 158; Gumperz and Hernández-Chavez 1971: 124).

Kamwangamalu (1992: 177-78) argues that the use of code-mixing (i.e., intra-sentential code-switching) marks in-group identification in bilingual communities across cultures and languages. It is reported that Japanese-English bilinguals in the United States code-switch within a sentence among themselves, although they do not employ intra-sentential code-switching in the presence of monolingual speakers of English or Japanese (see Hatch 1976; Kamwangamalu 1992: 177). This example illustrates that intra-sentential code-switching serves as a marker of in-group identification.

3.2.2. Integration of Transfers

Lexical transfers from the source language are integrated into the recipient language and the recipient speech community by the frequent use of these transfers. The degree of integration of a lexical item at the time of interaction is determined by the bilingual speaker, according to various psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic factors prevailing in the context of the interaction. Under the contact strategy model, contact strategies consciously or subconsciously employed by the speaker play a role in the integration of lexical transfers. The centrality or peripherality of a given item in the speaker’s linguistic system is
determined by a combination of these strategies affecting the patterns of both linguistic and social integration of transfers (cf. Clyne 1991: 169). This section discusses the nature of linguistic and social integration and the types of integration dealt with in the present study.

3.2.2.1. Linguistic vs. Social Integration

Haugen (1956: 40) considers integration to be “the use of ‘assimilated’ elements from another language.” For Clyne (1967: 20), integration is “the adaptation of a morphological (or morphosemantic) transfer to the phonological and/or grammatical system of the recipient language.”

Integration is considered to be a phenomenon which can occur with respect either to language or to speech. The distinction in this regard has been taken up by Grosjean, who refers to “language borrowing” and “speech borrowing” (Grosjean 1988: 235-36). The former is concerned with established loans that are an integral part of the recipient language and widely spread across the speech community while the latter involves linguistically integrated but socially unintegrated transfers. Since language borrowings have gained currency in the community, these lexical items can be taken to be both linguistically and socially integrated into the recipient system and the linguistic repertoire of the community in question. On the other hand, lexical transfers used by bilinguals in speech are, even if phonologically and grammatically integrated, often not used or recognised by the members of that community. It is therefore important that the notion of integration should be considered both at the linguistic and social level (see Hasselmo 1969, 1970; Kinder 1987: 19). Linguistic integration
refers to the phonological, prosodic, grammatical or semantic adaptation of transfers from the source language into the recipient language, while social integration indicates that transferred items are established as loans and widespread across the community.

The degree of social integration of transfers has been examined by researchers (e.g., Hasselmo 1969; Clyne 1972a; Poplack and Sankoff 1984; Kinder 1987) with reference to different language pairs. Kinder (1987), for instance, gathering spoken data from Italian-English bilinguals in New Zealand, investigated how transference from English is metalinguistically signalled in speech by the bilingual speaker, based on the hypothesis that “clues to the integration of transference may also be found in the production of spontaneous and relatively unstructured bilingual speech” (ibid.: 22). Kinder refers to markers of integration in speech as “transference markers” (ibid.: 23). These markers are “vocal markers, prosodic and paralinguistic features; hesitation markers, silent and voiced pause, false start and repeat; hedges,” direct and

---

3 According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 145), “a ‘hedge’ is a particle, word, or phrase that modifies the degree of membership of a predicate or noun phrase in a set; it says of that membership that it is partial, or true only in certain respects, or that it is more true and complete than perhaps might be expected...” (see also Crystal 1997: 182). Kinder (1987: 103) makes a distinction between “direct” and “indirect” hedges. “Direct hedges are those addressed explicitly and directly to the interlocutor. Every hedge which is not direct is indirect” (ibid.). Typical examples of direct hedges are tags (e.g., Italian si ‘yes?’, sai/sa ‘you know’ (ibid.: 113-14); Japanese sentence-final particle ne ‘isn’t it?, is it?, etc.’ (Brown and Levinson 1987: 147)), while examples of indirect hedges include Italian praticamente ‘practically’, insomma ‘in sum’, cosidetto ‘so-called’, cosi ‘of that kind’ (Kinder 1987: 103-6); English sort of (ibid.: 106; Brown and Levinson 1987: 145, 272), more or less, approximately, roughly, and so on (Crystal 1997: 182). The term “pragmatic particles” is also used to refer to hedges (ibid.: 301).
indirect; and glosses,\(^4\) synonymous and explicative” (ibid.: ii). Poplack et al. (1989) use the term “flags” for transference markers. According to Kinder, the incidence of these transference markers serves as an indicator of social integration of transferred items. The use of transference markers shows the reduced degree of acceptability of the item in question by the members of the community. Note that code-switches as well as transfers are sometimes signalled by metalinguistic discourse markers or explicative glosses (e.g., \textit{come si dice in inglese} ‘as is said in English’) to indicate lack of integration or “to avoid ‘mixing languages’” (Clyne 1991: 191). These markers “also have a communicative function in that the speaker’s awareness of the foreign origin of marked items is signalled, more or less consciously, to the interlocutor” (Kinder 1987: 7).

In this thesis, these devices for integration in contact discourse (i.e., transference markers) are regarded as types of monitoring strategies which we may call “transference-marking strategies” (TMSs): viz., “change a tone of voice

\(^4\) As Kinder (1987: 116) writes, unlike hedges, glosses “consist of the explicit signalling of the fact that the marked item is a transfer.” A characteristic of a synonymous gloss is what Gibbons (1987: 80-81) calls “‘bilingual echoing’ in which there is an immediate translation or near equivalent in the other language” (e.g., \textit{parti}, \textit{FESTE}; an English lexical transfer glossed with an Italian term) (Kinder 1987: 118). An explicative gloss, on the other hand, “involves the speaker making a statement about the discourse itself, in particular about a transfer which they have just used or are about to use” (ibid.: 122). Examples include \textit{come lo chiamano qua} ‘as they call it here’ (ibid.), \textit{das kann ich auf deutsch nicht sagen} ‘I can’t say that in German’ (Clyne 1991: 191). Note that explicative glosses may be used for introducing quotation switches (e.g., \textit{loro dicono} ‘they say’) (Kinder 1987: 124).
for a transfer”; “insert a pause before or after a transfer”; “make a metalinguistic commentary on a transfer”; “provide a gloss from L1 (or L2) before or after a transfer”; “laugh after a transfer”; and so on. The use of TMSs signals to the interlocutor the foreign status of transferred items and the speaker’s awareness of the degree of social integration of these transfers (see 3.4.1.1.2).

Correcting strategies (CRSs) are also considered to be integration strategies. The use of CRSs in contact discourse involves a corrective adjustment towards L1 norms, giving an indication of the speaker’s perception of the degree of social integration of lexical transfers concerned or his/her puristic attitude towards lexical transference. As part of the correction process, “pre-correction” strategy may be employed to avoid core lexical transference, leading to the adoption of L2 that promotes the use of native lexicon. That is, the use of a core foreign lexical item is “pre-corrected” toward the use of its L1 synonym before the utterance by the speaker in interaction. When lexical transference occurs, “in-correction” strategy may be used in the middle of producing a core lexical transfer, or “post-correction” strategy may be employed after producing a core item. These two correcting strategies are activated if the use of core lexical items is negatively evaluated by the speaker because of a possible communication problem (see 3.4.1.1.2).

Finally, not only verbal but also nonverbal devices for signalling transference are considered as markers of integration. With regard to nonverbal signs of transference, videotaping interviews with some German-English bilinguals, Clyne (1972b: 20-21) remarks: “It is hoped that non-verbal phenomena (eye movements, facial gestures, hand gestures) will indicate degree of acceptability of their own transfers and their consciousness of switches, ie if a subject transferred an English word and pulled a face or laughed, this transfer might be regarded as more ‘peripheral’ than one which was overlooked.”
3.2.2.2. Types of Linguistic Integration Examined in This Study

According to Clyne (1972a: 14), “There are two factors relevant to a discussion of the place of transferred items within the system of the recipient language – type of integration (phonological, morphological, semantic, graphemic) and degree of integration...” The issue of degree of integration has already been discussed above. In this study types of linguistic integration of transfers are examined in terms of phonological, prosodic, grammatical (i.e., morphological/syntactic), and semantic aspects. Types of linguistic integration are defined as follows (cf. Clyne 1967: 41-53, 1972a: 14-17, 1982: 96-99, 1991: 169-74):

(a) Phonological integration: the “substitution, loss, addition or redistribution of phones both at phonetic and phonemic level...”

(Bettoni 1981: 59; cited in Surus 1985: 9) to conform to L1 syllable structure and phonological norms;

(b) Prosodic integration: the substitution of L1 accent or intonation patterns for their L2 counterparts;

(c) Grammatical integration: the adaptation of a lexical transfer to L1 morphological/syntactic structure;

(d) Semantic integration: the establishment of a specific semantic place for a lexical transfer in L1 lexical field.5

5 “Lexical field” is defined as “an area of vocabulary into which related words and expressions are organized to show their relationship to each other, e.g. outstanding, excellent, good, mediocre, defective, etc.” (Clyne 1991: 264). As Clyne (1997: 312) points out, “when a transfer is integrated semantically, the lexical field of the recipient language changes” (see also 3.4.1.1.1).
For the basic strategies and rules employed by Japanese speakers when integrating English lexical items into Japanese, refer to Appendix 8.

3.3. Norms and Deviations

The incidence of transference may be taken to be a deviation from the L1 norm, but, as Haugen (1977: 91) says, “the concept of ‘norm’ in reference to language is highly ambiguous and slippery.” According to Bartsch (1987: 75), “linguistic norms are the social reality of concepts of linguistic correctness; this social reality secures the coordination concerning form and use of linguistic means in a speech community.” Deviations from linguistic norms are thus considered as violations of the social reality that is accepted by the speech community.

It is often pointed out that transference and code-switching serve as a solidarity marker and a community norm for bilingual speakers (Wardhaugh 1992: 108). Based on his investigation of American Norwegian bilinguals, Haugen argues for the existence of bilingual norms that show “the remarkably high degree of uniformity of practice with respect to the adoption of English materials” (Haugen 1969: 60). These norms are “communicative norms” for bilinguals (Haugen 1977: 93). It is inevitable that the communicative norms of bilingual communities conflict with the rhetorical norms of the standard languages (ibid.: 101).

As discussed in Chapter 2, the kind of situation where overseas Japanese residents and Japanese monolinguals living in Japan or newcomers from Japan are in contact is considered to be a “weak contact situation” (Neustupný 1985b: 48) because of the different norms existing between these two types of speakers.
in the situation. In this pseudo-contact situation deviations from the norm of standard Japanese may be noted as violations and then negatively evaluated by one of the participants in the situation. As a result, the inadequacies may be corrected by the speaker himself/herself or another participant in interaction. Although the use of transference/code-switching serves as a communicative norm and identity marker for overseas residents, the norm difference in communication between Japanese migrants and newcomers from Japan may give rise to a shift in lexical strategies on the part of the migrants. The avoidance of transference/code-switching is therefore considered as "convergent strategy" (see 3.4.1.1.3) employed by overseas residents when communicating with Japanese speakers who are not members of the local community.

If the use of transference and code-switching matches the communicative norm of a bilingual community, it is an "unmarked choice" in the community (Myers-Scotton 1993b, 1998c). The bilingual speaker in interaction can resort to external language resources as an unmarked choice as long as the interlocutor shares the same community norms. On the other hand, transference and code-switching may be used to convey social meanings beyond referential meanings. As Eastman (1992b: 1) states, "Where people invoke another language in an obvious way, position of relative social, political or economic strength is often being negotiated and codeswitching represents a marked choice."

According to Myers-Scotton (1998c: 19), "the goal of speakers is to enhance rewards and minimize costs; in two words, the goal is to optimize." To avoid the potential costs (e.g., group disapproval, personal distress, etc.) resulting from violations of norms, unmarked choices are frequently made. "When the switch is a marked choice, the message is that the speaker is attempting to construct a new social meaning for the speaker's own persona or the import of the ongoing discourse, thereby negotiating a new norm" (Myers-Scotton 1999: 1259).
Transference and code-switching can be marked or unmarked choices according to shared norms between the speaker and the interlocutor. As will be discussed below, under the contact strategy model, lexical strategies dealing with code choice are responsible for the use of transference and code-switching, though several other strategies are also involved in these processes.

3.4. Strategy

As noted in Chapter 1, the notion of strategy adopted in this study is based on that of Neustupný (1987b, 1989, 1992). Neustupný states:


The present study is the first attempt to employ the notion of strategy with a view to investigating Japanese-AUE/NZE contact phenomena in a systematic way.

3.4.1. Contact Strategy Theory

The theory of contact strategies has been developed on the basis of a typological theory delineated by Neustupný (1987b, 1989, 1992). The contact strategy model is a kind of variation theory. As Li (1996: 9) says, “Variation in language use starts with the individual. The totality of such variations within the same individual is often termed ‘idiolect’.” Weinreich et al. (1968: 101)
claim that “nativelike command of heterogeneous structures is not a matter of multidialectalism or ‘mere’ performance, but is part of unilingual linguistic competence.” Under the contact strategy hypothesis, strategies are mainly responsible for these intra-speaker variations in idiolect. Likewise, inter-speaker variations are ascribed to differences in the use of strategies among individuals. In this sense, strategies are regarded as variations. The types of strategies to be adopted by the speaker are affected by the higher principles of maxims and determinants. Dynamic strategies determine tendencies in the speaker’s behavioural mode and generate rules that in turn specify its details.

As discussed in Chapter 2, Japanese expatriates in Australia/New Zealand begin to change their strategies for transference as a result of language/culture contact. Deviations from standard Japanese norms come to take place. Some of the normative rules disappear, conforming to the norms of the given speech community, while others remain intact despite these external norms. Those rules susceptible to transference from the dominant language are likely to change and become strategies, losing their categorical nature. Whereas rules are used subconsciously, strategies are employed consciously as well as subconsciously (Neustupný, personal communication 1993). Strategies and rules are in a state of constant interaction. Sometimes it is difficult to distinguish between rules and strategies, as what are rules for some people can be strategies for others. However, the strategies and rules for integration used by Japanese speakers in the predominantly Japanese setting in Japan (see Appendix 8) go through changes in the Australian/New Zealand context. The following discussions will provide a theoretical basis for analysing the spoken data gathered from Japanese-English bilinguals in Australia and New Zealand.
3.4.1.1. Contact Strategy Hypothesis

According to Neustupný (1987b, 1989), there are four general principles which generate "types" of language, culture, society, behavioural modes, and so on. The term type here refers to "a set of socio-cultural features which are interconnected because they have been generated by a similar set of general principles" (Neustupný 1989: 348; cf. Croft 1990: 27; Shibatani and Bynon 1995: 3-9). As already mentioned in 2.2.2, the four general principles proposed by Neustupný are determinants, maxims, strategies, and rules. These principles are interrelated through the "typological network of interdependencies" (Neustupný 1989: 358) and differ from one another in the degree of generality.

Determinants are the most general principles that include socio-economic environments, geographical factors, and so on. They affect a large number of less general/lower principles. Neustupný points out that "these determinants 'determine' only the selection of some socio-cultural features and do not, therefore, constitute a strict deterministic system" (ibid.). Maxims are the next level of general principles which affect a wide range of behaviour. Japanese is considered to be a language of the agglutinative type, and the maxim of "agglutination" affects a variety of principles of a lower rank (i.e., strategies and rules) in Japanese (e.g., the system of Japanese declension (noun + particle)).

---

6 Neustupný categorises types into "universal" and "particular"; "personnel" and "texture" (i.e., the structure/texture of a culture or society); "major" and "minor." Textural types are further categorised into: (i) "developmental" (e.g., modern, post-modern); (ii) "interactional" (e.g., Westernisation); (iii) "common denominator" (e.g., agglutinative, inflectional) (for detail, see Neustupný 1987b, 1989: 347-67).
Strategies are principles of a higher rank than rules. Placed between maxims and rules in the typological network, strategies determine ordinary rules while being affected by more general maxims. Whereas strategies are sometimes employed intentionally or consciously by the speaker, most ordinary (categorical) rules are used subconsciously. Ordinary rules “have the form of ‘for all x y’” (ibid.: 360). Exceptions to ordinary rules, if any, are dealt with by listing (singular) rules which “specify all behaviour that concerns one particular item” (ibid.).

These four principles contribute to the generation of a type. Each language, culture or society contains more than one type. A prominent, major type is only seen as a characteristic of that language, culture or society. New maxims and new strategies are generated as society changes. New ordinary and listing rules are therefore also created under the influence of new higher principles. According to Neustupný, “normally several principles of a higher rank contribute to the formation of a principle of a lower rank. Seldom are rules derived from a single maxim or strategy” (ibid.: 361).

The present study focuses on the principles of strategies operating in language contact processes. On the basis of Neustupný’s typological model described above, the following three main contact strategies have been hypothesized in this study: (i) processing strategies which deal with transfer reception and production in interaction; (ii) monitoring strategies which are concerned with corrective processes in transference and also with the social integration of transfers; (iii) social strategies which involve accommodation and politeness in the use of transference in interaction. Each of these strategies is further subcategorised in order to explain transference and integration phenomena.
These three types of strategies are affected by the more general principles of determinants and maxims. As noted earlier, determinants can directly influence to some degree register variation and kinds of lexical transfers used in a given community. Regional and social differences in language use are partly attributable to the role played by determinants. Maxims also contribute to determining a set of linguistic and socio-cultural features that constitute major types and affect the formation and use of contact strategies.

3.4.1.1.1. Processing Strategies

Processing strategies are applied to transference and integration processes when the speaker perceives and produces lexical transfers. Social and monitoring strategies co-occur with processing strategies, the latter being directly concerned with the formation of lexical transfers. It is unlikely that the processing or any other single strategy is employed alone without activating other strategies. It can be said that these three types of strategies are interconnected with each other, contributing to the production and use of lexical transfers. The use of a particular form of lexical transfer by the speaker in interaction normally involves the identity of the interlocutor or addressee, the perception of various contextual factors, the assessment of shared norms and/or the establishment of ad hoc communicative norms for conversation, and so on, which are also associated with social and monitoring strategies. The form of a lexical transfer is determined by processing strategies. Since processing strategies are affected by the more general principles of maxims which contribute to the formation of a major linguistic type, language-specific patterns in transference and integration are manifested through these strategies.
Processing strategies are classified into the following six types: lexical, phonological, prosodic, grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic. These strategies operate together in the process of transference and integration of foreign lexical items. Some of these strategies are peculiar to Japanese while others are universal and applicable to any other language.

(a) Lexical Strategies (LSs)

As already introduced in 3.2.1.2, the lexical strategies hypothesized in this study are as follows:

LS 1. Adopt a lexical transfer.
   LS 1.1. Adopt a cultural lexical transfer.
   Examples: busshuwookingu ‘bushwalking’ (I: S14); miruku baa ‘milk bar’ (I: S43)
   LS 1.2. Adopt a core lexical transfer.
   Examples: buruu ‘blue’ (I: S3); mairudo ‘mild’ (I: S19); kyasshu ‘cash’ (I: S26)

LS 2. Employ a native/Sino-Japanese lexical item rather than a lexical transfer.
   Examples: ima ‘living room’ (I: S11); chuukagai ‘Chinatown’ (I: S15), (I: S31)

---

7 (I: S14) denotes the data source (I = Interview) and the subject code (S14). See Chapter 5 for detail.
The selection of one of the two primary lexical strategies, viz., LS 1 or LS 2, is a matter of code-choice. According to the community norms and social/psychological factors prevailing in a given situation, the speaker selects an appropriate code for interaction, resorting to LS 1 or LS 2. Weinreich (1953: 46) makes the point that “a choice is often made by the speaker between integrating and not integrating the transferred words.” It is important to note that “the choice itself would appear to depend not on the structures of the languages in contact, but rather on individual psychological and socio-cultural factors prevailing in the contact situation” (ibid.). As discussed in 3.3, whether a choice is marked or unmarked primarily depends upon norms in a given speech community. The unmarked choice is safer than the marked one as it follows the community norm. The marked choice, on the other hand, conveys a new social meaning and contributes to constructing a new norm. A choice is made so as to “optimize one’s returns” (Myers-Scotton 1999: 1259). As already noted, lexical transfers with less complex semantic components than their native equivalents are likely to be selected because of the principle of speech economy (Clyne 1991: 167).

LS 1.1 is employed to fill lexical gaps. As linguistic acculturation progresses in Australian/New Zealand settings, Japanese speakers transfer core lexical transfers from L2 to Japanese via LS 1.2, though they also use L1 equivalents via LS 2 according to interlocutor and situation.

Finally, as noted in 3.2.1.2, lexical strategies are affected by the more general principles of maxims (and determinants). For instance, during World War II, when the prominent maxim was “super-nationalism,” the use of foreign words/loanwords (LS 1) was completely banned. LS 2 was the only strategy employed during this period. After the War, however, LS 2 was replaced by LS 1.
under new maxims such as "Americanisation," "Westernisation," "modernisation," and so on.

(b) Phonological Strategies (PSs)

The following phonological strategies are considered to be operating in the transference and integration process of Japanese-English contact (cf. Neustupný 1992):

PS 1. Employ the mora as a unit of timing.
Example: /straik/ (one syllable) vs. /su.to.ra.i.ku/ (five moras)
'strike (baseball term)'

PS 2. Insert an epenthetic vowel /i, o, or u/ between consonants and/or after the word-final consonant to make an open syllable (epenthesis).
Examples: biichu 'beach'; toramu 'tram'

PS 3. Insert a mora obstruent /q/ before an obstruent and devoice a voiced obstruent.
Examples: betto 'bed'; bakku 'bag'

PS 4. Substitute a native sound for an L2 sound.
Example: [jiti:] for [siti] 'city'

PS 5. Adopt an innovative/bilingual mora (i.e., new moras such as si, ti, tu, du, etc.) to fill phonological gaps between L1 and L2.
Examples: siiizu 'season'; tiiimu 'team'

PS 6. Pronounce an L2 morpheme based on the sound.
Example: mejiaa 'major'

8 According to Kamwangamalu (1989, 1992), code-mixing (i.e., intra-sentential code-switching) cross-culturally serves as a marker of modernisation.
PS 7. Pronounce an L2 morpheme based on the spelling.
   Example: buz'aa ‘buzzer’

PS 8. Adopt the pronunciation of Standard British English as a model.
   Example: korijji ([kɔlɪdʒ]) ‘college’

   Example: karejji ([kɔlɪdʒ]) ‘college’

PS 10. Adopt the original L2 sound or a sound close to the original one.
   Example: [tiːpaːtɪ]/[tiːpaːtiː] ‘tea party’

According to Neustupný (1966, 1978: 134-46), Japanese phonology is of an agglutinative type. The maxim of agglutination influences phonological strategies in Japanese through which some of the agglutinative features are realised (e.g., PS 5) (Neustupný 1992: 7).

PSs 5, 6, and 10 are considered to be strategies for transference. It can be assumed that as the degree of contact increases, PSs 5, 6, and 10 are more likely to be employed than PS 4. It can also be supposed that in the case of Japanese-English bilinguals in Australia/New Zealand, PS 8 and PS 9 commonly used by Japanese speakers living in Japan may be replaced by a new strategy (i.e., adopt the pronunciation of the “general” or “broad” variety of AUE/NZE) (cf. Hovarth 1985). For details of the first nine strategies (PSs 1–9), see Appendix 8 (1).

(c) Prosodic Strategies (PRSs)

PRS 1 is adopted in the transference process while PRS 2 is employed as an integration strategy.
PRS 1. Adopt L2 prosodic features or features close to L2 prosody for a lexical transfer.
Example: *Me’ruborun* (cf. *Meruborun*) ‘Melbourne’ (preservation of the original accent location)

PRS 2. Employ L1 prosodic features for a lexical transfer (e.g., a pitch accent rather than a stress accent).
Examples: *risalachi* ‘research’; *ibento* ‘event’

By means of PRS 2, the following ordinary prosodic rule is generated: place a pitch accent on a syllable which contains the third mora from the last or make the word unaccented. For detailed discussion, refer to Appendix 8 (1.6).

(d) Grammatical Strategies (Syntactic Strategies (STSs)/Morphological Strategies (MSs))

STS 1 is a strategy for syntactic transference from L2 to L1, while STS 2 is a strategy for syntactic integration which substitutes L1 rules for L2 counterparts.

STS 1. Adopt L2 syntactic/morphosyntactic rules for a lexical transfer.
Examples: *Oojii ruuruzy* ‘Oz rules’ (plural morpheme); *saabisuto apaatomento* ‘serviced apartment’ (past participle morpheme)

STS 2. Employ L1 syntactic/morphosyntactic rules for a lexical transfer.
Example: *Sebun dee oopun de yatte masu* ‘We are open seven days.’ (I: S30) (deletion of L2 plural morpheme [i.e., *sebun dee* ‘(lit.) seven day’]; use of L1 word order [i.e., the time adverbial *sebun dee* precedes the verb]; category conversion [i.e., the English adjective
open is recategorised as the Japanese adjectival noun *oopun*]

The following morphological strategies for integration are discussed in Appendix 8 (2.2-2.6):

**MS 1.** Truncate part of a free morpheme or morphemes to conform to the native or Sino-Japanese prosody (clipping).

Example: *konbiniensu-sutoa* → *konbini* ‘convenience store’

**MS 2.** Combine the initials of two or more L2 free morphemes (initialisation/acronyms).

Examples: *LDK* ‘living-dining-kitchen’; *AMEDAS* ‘automated meteorological data acquisition system’

**MS 3.** Combine L2 free morphemes or clipped elements; combine L2 free morphemes or clipped elements with native or Sino-Japanese free morphemes (compounding).

Examples: *afutaa-saabisu* (after + service) ‘after-sales service’; *deji-kame* (digital + camera); *asa-shan* (morning + shampoo)

**MS 4.** Combine two elements that do not normally co-occur to create new free morphemes (blending).

Example: *obatarian* (obasan + battalion) ‘a middle-aged woman who does not care what others say’

**MS 5.** Append an L2 affix to a native or Sino-Japanese free morpheme (or a native or Sino-Japanese affix to an L2 free morpheme) (affixation).

Examples: *maruchi-ningen* (multi- + human being) ‘multifaceted person’; *dai-nyuusu* (big + news); *memo-ru* (memorandum + -ru [verb-forming suffix]) ‘take notes’
Note that MS 1 functions as a prosodic strategy also.

(e) Semantic Strategies (SSs)

The following semantic strategies are hypothesized in this study. SS 1 is used for semantic transference while SSs 2-8 are employed for semantic integration.

SS 1. Transfer a word in meaning only.
Example: *kuruma* (wheel) ‘car/automobile’

SS 2. Specialise or restrict the original meaning.
Example: *biru/birudingu* (building) ‘Western-style high rise’

SS 3. Extend the original meaning.
Example: *bootfurendo* (boyfriend) ‘male friend’

SS 4. Change the original meaning.
Example: *rookaru* (local) ‘rural’

SS 5. Assign a semantic place to a lexical transfer to avoid a conflict with its native equivalent.
Example: *raisu* (rice) ‘cooked rice to be served on a flat plate, especially in a Western-style restaurant’; cf. *gohan* ‘cooked rice to be served in a rice-bowl’

SS 6. Adopt a core lexical transfer in a compound.
Example: *kyatto fuudo* ‘cat food’

Example: *setsumei-sekinin* (説明責任) vs. *akauntabiritii* ‘accountability’
SS 8. Play up the [+ prestigious] or [− direct] semantic feature of a core lexical transfer.

Examples: *bebii kaa* (baby + car) ‘perambulator’ vs. *ubaguruma,*
*demeritto* ‘demerit’ vs. *tansho*

Note that the employment of SS1 activates the use of LS 2 (i.e., use of native/Sino-Japanese words rather than lexical transfers) (see 6.3.4 and Appendix 8 (3.1-3.3).

(f) Pragmatic Strategies (PMSs)

PMS 1 is responsible for transference of L2 rules/features of interaction while PMS 2 involves the use of L1 rules/features of interaction.

PMS 1. Adopt L2 rules/features of interaction in an L 1 context.

Examples: use of a first name rather than a family name;
use of English editing words (e.g., *uh, uhm*); use of English non-verbal behaviour (e.g., handshaking rather than bowing)

PMS 2. Employ L1 rules/features of interaction rather than L2 counterparts

Examples: use of a family name rather than a first name;
use of Japanese editing words (e.g., *ano, sono*); use of Japanese non-verbal behaviour (e.g., bowing rather than handshaking; use of *aizuchi* ‘back-channels’ (Mizutani and Mizutani 1987: 17-21; Maynard 1993: 158-60; Horiguchi 1997: 37-79))
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In this section we have discussed the processing strategies. What should be kept in mind is that no priority is given to any single strategy mentioned above. These strategies (or several of them) operate concurrently under the influence of social and psychological factors activated in a given situation and realise the form of a lexical transfer.

3.4.1.1.2. Monitoring Strategies

Monitoring strategies are subdivided into correcting and transference-marking strategies. Associated with cognitive and social dimensions of transference and integration, these strategies operate in monitoring processes in the use of lexical transfers in interaction.

(a) Correcting Strategies (CRSs)

Correction processes in an interactive situation have been investigated by various researchers (e.g., Jefferson 1974; Schegloff et al 1977; Neustupný 1978: 243-57, 1985a, 1985b; Levelt 1983, 1989; Hayashi 1994; van Hest 1996). As these earlier studies reveal, corrections or repairs in conversation are rule-governed processes. "They are subject to strict linguistic rules and strict conversational rules" (Levelt 1989: 460).

Levelt (1983, 1989) classifies repairs into two types: covert and overt. "Covert repairs" are made in inner speech prior to articulation while "overt repairs" are made after errors (or inadequacies) have been produced in overt speech. He further categorises overt repairs into the following three main types:

(i) "different-repairs" which are concerned with a different ordering of messages;
(ii) "appropriateness-repairs" which are associated with intentional and
contextual appropriateness; (iii) "error-repairs" which involve linguistic correctness (Levelt 1983: 51-56; see also van Hest 1996: 3, 6).

Within the contact strategy framework, CRSs are employed so as to prevent communication problems from occurring among participants in interaction owing to "inadequacy marking" (Neustupný 1978: 248). For instance, when the use of lexical transfers is noted as a violation of the native language norm and negatively evaluated as inadequate, CRSs are activated in interaction. The occurrence of corrective adjustment depends on whether or not participants in an interactive situation share the same communicative norm. If they do not share the norm, it is likely that a certain communicative act (e.g., the use of LS 1) by the speaker is seen as a marked choice and may be negatively evaluated by the interlocutor who does not share the same norm. Research shows that self-corrections or self-repairs by the speaker are preferred (Schegloff et al. 1977), but other-repairs or requests for clarification can be initiated by the interlocutor or one of the participants other than the speaker. It can be assumed that correction processes are a kind of hypothesis-testing carried out by participants in interaction for establishing a shared norm for their future conversation.

Following Neustupný (1978: 248-50, 1985a, 1985b), in this study a repair operation is treated as being carried out by CRSs which are classified into the following three categories: (i) pre-correction, (ii) in-correction, and (iii) post-correction (for examples of these strategies, see 8.3.4).
CRS 1. Correct a core lexical transfer to its native/Sino-Japanese/well-integrated Western loan equivalent prior to articulation (pre-correction strategy).

Generally, pre-correction strategy (CRS 1) (or "prearticulatory editing" (Levelt 1989: 466) or "pre-articulatory monitoring" (see van Hest 1996: 2)) operates at the pre-articulatory stage of speech production and plays a role in the choice of a lexical strategy and other processing strategies and social strategies (see below) as well. The adoption of LS 1 can be intercepted by CRS 1 before producing an inappropriate form that may be considered as a deviation from the standard language norm. In this case, the use of CRS 1 leads to the selection of LS 2 (i.e., employ a native lexical item rather than a lexical transfer). As Neustupný (1978: 249) says, careful speech and hypercorrection are considered to be a type of pre-correction. With respect to the speech of immigrants, however, as noted in Chapter 1, there is a case where the weakened monitoring effect forces the speaker to adopt LS 1.2 (i.e., adopt a core lexical transfer) in order to fulfill his/her communicative intention. If the use of LS 1.2 gives rise to a comprehension difficulty on the part of the interlocutor, post-correction strategy is activated to remedy the interactive situation.

CRS 2. Correct a core lexical transfer to its native/Sino-Japanese/well-integrated Western loan equivalent in the middle of articulation (in-correction strategy).

---

9 The term "well-integrated" means that a given Western loanword is recurrent and widely used across the speech community.
With self-monitoring failing in correction prior to articulation, an inappropriate form is overtly uttered. There is, however, a case where in the middle of the utterance, the speaker successfully corrects a non-terminal string before an inadequate surface form is realised. In-correction strategy (CRS 2) is thus employed when the speaker notices inadequacy marking before completing a lexical item.

CRS 3. Correct a core lexical transfer to its native/Sino-Japanese/well-integrated Western loan equivalent after articulation (post-correction strategy).

Sometimes inadequacy marking in the utterance escapes both CRSs 1 and 2. In such a case, post-correction strategy (CRS 3) (or “postarticulatory editing” (Levelt 1989: 474) or “post-articulatory monitoring” (see van Hest 1996: 2)) can take place when the speaker or one of the co-participants in interaction notes a deviation and evaluates it in a negative way as an inappropriate surface string which has caused a communication problem. As argued above, if the interactants do not share the same communicative norm, self-corrections or other-initiated corrections occur.

It is possible that the speaker and co-participants in conversation intentionally or subconsciously disregard inadequacies, employing a kind of non-correction strategy. It is reasonable to assume that other-initiated corrections may be avoided out of politeness. On the other hand, the speaker can adopt this strategy in order to convey an affective meaning to the interlocutor. If the speaker is not cooperative in constructing contexts for creating an ad-hoc communicative norm, he/she may be considered to be rude or offensive to the interlocutor. Divergence from the communicative norm of the interlocutor is
therefore a marked choice and may be negatively evaluated. It is noteworthy that the intentional adoption of non-correction strategy, which may lead to the abundant use of LS 1 and PS 10, can also achieve the effect of "instrumental rudeness" (Beebe 1995).

Finally, correcting strategies are integration strategies in that deviations from the native language norm are corrected in order to avoid potential communication problems.

(b) Transference-Marking Strategies (TMSs)

Transference-marking strategies (i.e., use of transference markers) are regarded as integration strategies for lexical transfers. Transference markers employed by the speaker via these monitoring strategies highlight lexical transfers in interaction, signalling to the interlocutor the speaker's judgment of the degree of social integration of these items in a given speech community so as to explore ad hoc norms with co-participant(s) in interaction. There are four types of TMSs as shown below (see 8.3.5):

TMS 1. Change a tone of voice (or prosodic features) for lexical transference. This strategy includes the occurrence of laughter accompanying a lexical transfer.

Example: A, zuu (h) zuu wa ikimashita, ni sankai. (I: S8)

'Ah, zoo, I've been to the zoo, twice or three times.'

TMS 2. Hesitate before lexical transference. This strategy includes the use of a pause, an editing phrase, a false start, or a repeat accompanying a lexical transfer.
Example: Daitai ju-jukkagetsu kana. Ano wan sukuuru iyaa desu ne. (I: S15)
‘I wonder it’s about ten-ten months. It’s, uh, one school year, you know.’

TMS 3. Use a hedge before lexical transference.
Example: Iwayuru ruuchin waaku ga nai wake desu. (I: S28)
‘I don’t have what is called routine work.’

TMS 4. Provide a gloss after lexical transference. A gloss may be a one-word synonym, a phrase, or an explanation in L1 or L2 or a combination of the two.
Example: Raundo desu ne. Ano Oosutoraria no tabi desu ne. (I: S3)
‘It is called “round,” you know. Uh, it’s a trip around Australia, you see.’

There are cases where an L1 item is glossed by its synonymous L2 item. In such cases the “multiple identity” of the speaker may be reflected (Scotton 1983: 126-7).
Example: Suki na basho ne yappari kooen desu ne, paaku. (I: S86)
‘My favorite place is also park, y’know, park.’

TMS 4 includes a metalinguistic commentary on lexical transference (Kinder 1987: 122-24; Clyne 1991: 191).
Example: Ookurando tte iu no wa motto iwayuru eigo de iu maruchikaruchuraru de,... (I: S48)
‘Auckland is more, what is called, as is said in English, multicultural...’
3.4.1.1.3. Social Strategies

Social strategies start operating with a set of other contact strategies as soon as an interaction begins. Based on his/her communicative intention and/or perception of various socio-cultural factors prevailing in a given interactive situation, the speaker chooses the most appropriate social strategy applicable to that situation. The speaker’s awareness of possible costs or rewards resulting from the choice of a certain strategy plays a role in the selection of social strategies. Social strategies dealt with in this study in terms of the use of lexical transfers are “accommodation strategies” (Giles et al. 1991b; Giles and Coupland 1991) and “politeness strategies” (Brown and Levinson 1987).

(a) Accommodation Strategies

Accommodation strategies are subdivided into two categories as below:

Convergent Strategy: Accommodate one’s communication style towards that of the interlocutor;

Divergent Strategy: Do not accommodate one’s communication style towards that of the interlocutor.

As Li (1996: 3) argues, among several factors affecting language choice, that of interlocutor or addressee is considered to be most important (see Clyne 1991: 191). If the “cooperative principle” (Grice 1975) plays a significant part in conversation, the speaker’s accommodation to the interlocutor’s linguistic behaviour is construed as an essential communicative act. It is possible, however, that not only convergence toward the interlocutor’s linguistic features (i.e.,
pronunciation, prosody, lexical choice, etc.) but also divergence away from
them takes place. According to the “communication accommodation theory”
advanced by Giles and his associates (Giles et al. 1991b; Giles and Coupland
1991), convergence is defined as “a strategy whereby individuals adapt to each
other’s communicative behaviors in terms of a wide range of linguistic-
prosodic-nonverbal features including speech rate, pausal phenomena and
utterance length, phonological variants, smiling, gaze, and so on...” (Giles et al.
1991b: 7). On the other hand, divergence is referred to as “the way in which
speakers accentuate speech and nonverbal differences between themselves and
others” (ibid.: 8).

In inter-group encounters the former strategy is employed to de-emphasize
the speaker’s personal/social/ethnic identity or to gain the interlocutor’s approval
and cooperativeness or to seek social rewards, whereas the latter strategy is
adopted to assert the speaker’s personal/social/ethnic identity or to accentuate
intergroup distinctiveness. The choice of a convergent or divergent strategy is
determined by the speaker, based on his/her perception of the cost or reward for
the choice in interaction.

(b) Politeness Strategies

Following Brown and Levinson (1987), politeness strategies are subdivided
into the following three categories:

Positive Politeness Strategy: Show closeness and intimacy to the interlocutor;
Negative Politeness Strategy: Keep social distance from the interlocutor;
Off-Record Politeness Strategy: Play up indirectness and euphemism in
language use.
Brown and Levinson (1987) postulate universal principles relating to polite language usage. According to them, there are basically two types of “faces” (i.e., individuals’ self-esteem), viz., “negative face” and “positive face.” The former is defined as “the want of every ‘competent adult member’ that his actions be unimpeded by others” while the latter “the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others” (ibid.: 62).

When “face-threatening acts” occur, one of the three main politeness strategies mentioned above may be activated as redressive action. Positive politeness is “redress directed to the addressee’s positive face, his perennial desire that his wants... should be thought of as desirable” (ibid.: 101). Negative politeness is, on the other hand, “redressive action addressed to the addressee’s negative face: his want to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded” (ibid.: 129). Whereas these strategies are employed “on record” (i.e., “there is just one unambiguously attributable intention with which witnesses would concur”) (ibid.: 68-69), off-record strategy is used if a communicative action “is done in such a way that it is not possible to attribute only one clear communicative intention to the act” (ibid.: 211). Off-record politeness strategies are indirect uses of language for which more than one interpretation is possible, so that the interlocutor can decide how to interpret them in a given context. Note that the uses of politeness strategies “are tied to social determinants, especially the relationship between speaker and addressee and the potential offensiveness of the message content” (ibid.: 2, 71-84).

Under the contact strategy hypothesis, it is assumed that with the use of lexical transfers, the speaker can use LS 1 (i.e., adopt a lexical transfer) as a
positive politeness strategy when he/she sees the interlocutor as an in-group member or a friend. If the speaker and the interlocutor share the same communicative norm of a bilingual speech community, a positive politeness strategy is most likely to be employed to enhance group solidarity. As noted above, however, the excessive use of LS 1 or non-correction strategy may receive a negative reaction from the interlocutor. On the other hand, it is supposed that if the interlocutor is seen as an out-group member, the avoidance of LS 1 and the adoption of LS 2 (i.e., use a native lexical item) are likely to occur due to the bilingual speaker’s negative politeness strategy to respect the interlocutor’s negative face wants (i.e., to be unimpeded in his/her actions).

As mentioned in Chapter 1, for instance, Hawaiian Japanese attempt to speak standard Japanese to visitors from Japan. To repair face-threatening acts such as the use of communication styles peculiar to Hawaiian Japanese, Japanese immigrants in Hawaii seem to pay negative politeness to non-local members. The choice of native lexical items rather than lexical transfers or the use of standard language in an overseas setting denotes convergence towards the native language norm and also divergence away from the communicative norm of an immigrant speech community. It can, however, be supposed that a linguistically convergent strategy adopted by Hawaiian Japanese is a psychologically divergent strategy (i.e., to increase social/psychological distance) for the maintenance of their own social identity as immigrants in Hawaii.

With respect to off-record politeness strategy, SS 8 may be used in order to play up the [−direct] feature of a lexical transfer. Semantic opacity of a transfer can serve as a politeness strategy. Depending upon whether the speaker shares a norm with the interlocutor, the speaker changes his/her social strategies (and
other contact strategies). It can be said that social strategies contribute to establishing an ad hoc communicative norm between speaker and interlocutor with respect to the use of lexical transfers in an interactive situation.

3.5. Summary

In this chapter we have examined three important concepts, namely transference, integration, and strategy, and discussed the contact strategy hypothesis.

First, the definitions of transference and integration were given and the types of transference and integration examined in this study were presented. The issue of cultural vs. core lexical transference and the reasons for transference/code-switching were also discussed.

Second, in order to explain transference and integration phenomena in a systematic way, three main contact strategies were hypothesized: (i) processing strategies (i.e., lexical, phonological, prosodic, grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic) which are related to the process of transference and integration of foreign elements; (ii) monitoring strategies (i.e., CRSs and TMSs) which are associated with monitoring processes taking place in the production and use of transfers; (iii) social strategies (i.e., accommodation and politeness) which are concerned with the accommodation process and polite language use in interaction with respect to transference. These strategies concurrently operate and generate rules for transference and integration under the influence of the higher principles, that is, maxims and determinants prevailing in a given contact setting. Transfers may be taken to be deviations and negatively evaluated unless the speaker and the interlocutor share the same communicative norm. Under the
proposed hypothesis, interdialectal and cross-linguistic/cultural variability in transference patterns is attributable to differences in these contact strategies that affect transference processes.
CHAPTER 4
METHODOLOGY

4.1. Introduction

In order to investigate linguistic acculturation of sojourners and migrants in a bilingual/multilingual setting, several different methods for data collection can be employed, depending upon research objectives. As the present study deals with Japanese-AUE/NZE contact in an interactive situation, use of audio equipment such as tape recorders is essential for gathering good spoken data for the analysis of these contact phenomena. For the purpose of examining inter-speaker variability in transference phenomena in a single situation, one of the most convenient methods is a tape-recorded interview by the same interviewer. As will be discussed below, the subject’s consciousness at the time of an interview should be investigated by means of a “follow-up interview” (Neustupný 1990). Collecting background information about subjects through follow-up interviews is also vital for exploring the relationship between various variables (i.e., age, education, length of stay, relationship with the interviewer, etc.), transference, and strategies.

Thus, in the present study both interviews and follow-up interviews were employed with a view to investigating interpersonal variation in the incidence of lexical transference used by interviewees. More naturalistic spoken data in other situations were also collected through group sessions (with tape recording) and participant-observation (with and without tape recording) so as to supplement the interview data that make up the main corpus for this study. Along with gathering
spoken data from JAU and JNZ, a questionnaire survey was carried out in Japan in order to examine the acceptability of certain lexical transfers adopted in JAU and JNZ.

4.2. Subjects for This Study

4.2.1. Subjects

The subjects who participated in this research are first-generation Japanese adults (over 20 years old) who are temporary or permanent residents in Australia and New Zealand. The subjects were recruited in Sydney and Melbourne, Australia, and in Christchurch, New Zealand.

4.2.2. Subject Recruitment and Selection

4.2.2.1. Subject Recruitment

The subjects were recruited first and foremost through the personal network of the investigator (i.e., the present writer). When the present writer contacted potential subjects who were his friends and acquaintances, he provided information about the project and invited them to participate in it. At that time, it was made clear to them that their participation in the research was voluntary and that all the information provided by them was strictly confidential. The subjects were later asked to introduce their friends who might cooperate in the study. In order to obtain spoken data from a diverse range of people, however, the investigator attempted to recruit not only his friends, most of whom were postgraduate students, but also people from all walks of life.
To approach Japanese businessmen in Melbourne, the present writer first requested an acquaintance in Japan to contact a banker in Tokyo. An introduction was obtained to a representative in the Melbourne branch office, who provided a further introduction to his business acquaintances.

After visits to several Japanese restaurants, restaurant workers were invited to take part in the interview session. Approaching these workers as a customer, it was not difficult to conduct interviews.

The Japan Club of Sydney was contacted for cooperation. Following this approach, the investigator was allowed to attend the trustee members’ monthly meeting as an observer. Through these people, attendance at a monthly meeting of the Senior Club (a Japanese club for permanent residents over 50 years of age) was arranged, this being held in a community centre in Chatswood (North Sydney).

Mention must also be made here of the cooperation of the principal of the Japanese School of Sydney. The initial contact with him was in writing. Afterwards the present writer rang him and requested his help for subject recruitment. In response to this request, an introduction was obtained to the president of the PTA ‘parent-teacher association’, who in turn organised an interview meeting with her friends in her home.

Thanks to the cooperation of the above-mentioned contacts, the investigator was able to collect spoken data from 77 first-generation Japanese adults of different backgrounds residing in Sydney and Melbourne.

With a view to examining similarities and differences in lexical transference patterns between JAU and JNZ, spoken data were also gathered in Christchurch, New Zealand. The present writer first visited a couple of Japanese restaurants and a Japanese bakery for cooperation, and the owners of these restaurants and the bakery agreed to participate in the interview session. Some members of staff
in the Asian Studies Department at Canterbury University also helped the
investigator to find long-term residents. As a result, 10 interviews were
conducted in Christchurch.

4.2.2.2. Criteria for Subject Selection

Based on the background information provided at the time of the interviews
or follow-up interviews, 44 subjects were selected from the 77 subjects who
participated in the Australian section of this project. Interview data obtained from
these 44 subjects were used as the main corpus for this study.\(^1\)

The following criteria were used for subject selection: sex, age, occupation,
education, hometown, length of stay, and type of stay (i.e., temporary or
permanent). Among these variables, attention was paid to length of stay in
Australia, as this variable was assumed to be a promoting factor for lexical
transference (see Masumi-So 1983). Length of stay of our subjects in Australia
ranged from three months to 36 years and seven months. With regard to sex, an
equal number of both sexes (22 males vs. 22 females) was selected. Unfortunately,
no long-term male subjects (over 25 years' stay) could be recruited. The age range
of these subjects was from 22 to 64. Various occupations were also taken into
account for selection. The subjects were grouped into four work categories, viz.,
administrative/office worker, self-employed/service worker, tertiary participant,

\(^1\) Interview data collected from the remaining 33 subjects were also utilised, to
complement the data obtained from the 44 subjects in describing and analysing transference
and integration phenomena.
and other. Part-time workers, working-holiday people, and housewives were included in the “other” category. Educational levels of the subjects included high school, technical/junior college, and university/graduate school. In order to investigate the influence of dialects upon use of transference, subjects from different regions of Japan were selected. However, priority was given to people from the Kanto area (especially Tokyo) and from the Kansai area (especially Osaka), although people from other regions were included. In this study “hometown” represents a town where the subjects spent from age five to 15, as this period is considered to be crucial for language development (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1981a: 71-72). Finally, both temporary and permanent residents were selected. As noted in Chapter 2, these two groups are assumed to employ different contact strategies.

With respect to the New Zealand data, essentially the same criteria were employed for subject recruitment. All the ten interviews conducted in Christchurch were used for lexical comparison with the Australian data.

4.2.2.3. Background Information on Subjects

The background information about the 44 subjects in Australia is presented in the two tables below:
Table 4.1.--Subject Background: Australia (I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject code</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Hometown</th>
<th>Length of stay (y.m)&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>university student</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Tokyo/HK</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>chef</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Nagasaki</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>working holiday</td>
<td>junior college</td>
<td>Hyogo</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>working holiday</td>
<td>technical college</td>
<td>Hyogo</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>ESL student</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Osaka</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>researcher</td>
<td>graduate school</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>researcher</td>
<td>graduate school</td>
<td>Osaka</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>researcher</td>
<td>graduate school</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>graduate student</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Kagoshima</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>housewife</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Okayama</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>teacher (part time)</td>
<td>graduate school</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>office worker</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>graduate student</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Ehime</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>housewife</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Akita</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>graduate student</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Hokkaido</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>housewife</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Okinawa</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>graduate student</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>shop assistant</td>
<td>junior college</td>
<td>Kyoto</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>banker</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Chiba</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>graduate student</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>student adviser</td>
<td>junior college</td>
<td>Osaka</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>2</sup> y = year; m = month
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>banker</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Hokkaido</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>shop assistant</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>office worker</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Hyogo</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>chef</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Fukuoka</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>chef</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Hyogo</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>student counsellor</td>
<td>technical college</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>managing director</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>restaurant owner</td>
<td>junior college</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S30</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>restaurant owner</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S31</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>radio producer</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S32</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>managing director</td>
<td>graduate school</td>
<td>Hyogo</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S33</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>housewife/teacher</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Gifu</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>publisher</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Hokkaido</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S35</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>engineer</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S36</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>restaurant manager</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Gifu</td>
<td>15.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S37</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>housewife</td>
<td>junior college</td>
<td>Hyogo</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S38</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>housewife/assistant</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Osaka</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>chef</td>
<td>seamen’s school</td>
<td>Nagasaki</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S40</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>restaurant owner</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Kyoto</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S41</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>shopkeeper</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Osaka</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S42</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>housewife</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Fukuoka</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S43</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>shop assistant</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Hyogo</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S44</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>shopkeeper</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject code</td>
<td>Type of stay</td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>In-group belonging score</td>
<td>Language at home/work</td>
<td>Previous overseas experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E/E</td>
<td>Holland, HK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>J/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>J/J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>J/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E/E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>J/E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>J/E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>J/E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>J/E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>J/ USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E, J/E, J</td>
<td>USA, NZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>J/E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>J/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E/E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>J/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>J/E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>J/E, J</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>E, J/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>J/E, J</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>J/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>J/E, J</td>
<td>India, China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>J/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following tables show the background information about the 10 New Zealand subjects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Code</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Hometown</th>
<th>Length of Stay (y.m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S45</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>working holiday</td>
<td>technical college</td>
<td>Tokushima</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S46</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>working holiday</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Shizuoka</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S47</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>university student</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Osaka</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3.—Subject Background: New Zealand (I)
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S48</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>student counselor</td>
<td>graduate school</td>
<td>Chiba</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S49</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>restaurant owner</td>
<td>junior college</td>
<td>Osaka</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S50</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>restaurant owner</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Osaka</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S51</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>bakery</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S52</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>restaurant owner</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Osaka</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S53</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>tour guide</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Niigata</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S54</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>tour guide</td>
<td>technical college</td>
<td>Aomori</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject code</th>
<th>Type of stay</th>
<th>Spouse</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>In-group belonging score</th>
<th>Language at home/work</th>
<th>Previous overseas experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S45</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S46</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>J/J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S47</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E/E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S48</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>J/E</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S49</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>J/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S50</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>J/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S51</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>J/J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S52</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>J/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S53</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E, J/J</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S54</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E/E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4.--Subject Background: New Zealand (II)

In the above tables, M stands for male and F for female; T for temporary, P for permanent, and Ci for citizen; J for Japanese, A for Australian, and E for English. Note that 12 subjects in Australia and two subjects in New Zealand had an overseas experience prior to their arrival in Australia/New Zealand. Only those who stayed in a foreign country for some reason other than travelling are
listed here. The information on the subjects' family network (i.e., children, parents, etc.) was collected through the interviews or follow-up interviews, but it is not included in these tables. Most of the subjects' background information presented above was collected by means of a simple questionnaire (see Appendix 1) immediately after the interview session or at the time of the follow-up interview.

With respect to the subjects' competence in English, assessment was made by the present writer, based on the observation of their performance and also the background information provided. Attention was paid to proficiency in English as a means of communication. The subjects are classified as low, moderate, and high competence groups, on the basis of the proficiency level. In order to investigate the effect of the relationship between the subjects and the interviewer on lexical transference, a five-point in-group belonging score was formulated. Depending on how many features (i.e., (i) acquaintance/friend, (ii) common acquaintance/friendship network, (iii) same type of stay, and (iv) same occupation), are shared by both the subject and the interviewer, each subject was assigned in-group belonging score 0-4. For instance, if the subject and the interviewer had one common feature, the subject received one point. If they shared all four features in common, the subject received four points.

4.3. Methods for Data Collection

In order to collect samples of various types of transference, a broad range of speech was elicited, employing several data collection methods (i.e., interviews, follow-up interviews, group sessions, participant observation, and observation). A questionnaire survey technique was also used with a view to examining the degree of acceptability or integration of some lexical transfers
used by Japanese residents in Australia/New Zealand. Owing to the limited time frame, however, as mentioned above, the 44 Australian interviews were selected as the main corpus for the statistical analysis of interpersonal variation in lexical transference in an interview situation (see Chapters 7 and 8). The 10 New Zealand interviews were employed to investigate similarities and differences in the types of lexical transference between Australian and New Zealand data. The rest of the spoken data were used as supplementary data to give additional examples of transference and integration phenomena. The following subsections discuss the methods adopted in the present study.

4.3.1. Interviews

According to Labov (1972a: 209), “the only way to obtain sufficient good data on the speech of any one person is through an individual, tape-recorded interview: that is through the most obvious kind of systematic observation.” The interview was judged to be an appropriate method for data collection for the present research, as one of the objectives of this study is to examine interpersonal variability in the frequency of lexical transference and contact strategies employed by the subjects when interacting with the same speaker.

Interviewing as a survey technique has been researched by many scholars (e.g., Cicourel 1982; Suchman and Jordan 1990; Gordon 1992; Briggs 1996). An interview is one type of speech event. As Milroy (1987: 86) states, “the speech events characteristically occur subject to specific situational constraints such as those imposed by participant, setting, topic, channel of communication, and many others.” Some significant differences between

---

3 The term “speech event” refers to “a particular instance when people exchange speech, e.g., an exchange of greetings, an enquiry, a conversation” (Richards et al. 1985).
naturally occurring conversations and interviews as speech events have been pointed out. Hinds (1985: 73-74) argues that interviews are asymmetrically structured speech events, with the interviewer assuming more conversational responsibility. The question-answer-feedback pattern is the canonical form of interaction peculiar to interview discourse (Hinds 1978: 83-84). Unlike conversations with a more symmetrical structure of interaction between both participants, in the interview, topics are introduced by the interviewer. “The question/answer rule of the interview prevents the speaker from introducing topics of narratives which is,..., the way they occur in everyday conversation” (Wolfson 1976: 192).

Because of these characteristics of the interview, a negative view of institutional interviews as a data collection method has been voiced by researchers of an interactional approach in sociolinguistics. Gumperz (1970: 208), for instance, writes as follows: “The very artificiality of settings where linguists interview a single informant, and where speech samples must be produced in isolation of the customary circle of friends and family is hardly likely to bring forth the subtleties in selection of speech forms, shifts in formality and informality, which characterize everyday interaction.” Rather than conventional interviews, “sociolinguistic interviews” have been proposed (Labov 1984: 32-42), where “not only can both interviewer and interviewee introduce topics, but both can ask and answer questions, tell stories, and so on” (Schiffrin 1993: 231-32).

With regard to her loanword research in Africa, Myers-Scotton (1993a: 165) makes the following comment: “The interview process was designed to produce as near to naturally occurring conversations as possible. Most importantly, interviewees were not aware that the real purpose of their being interviewed was to study their use of English loan words.”
In the present study also, in order to prevent the subject’s pre-correction of lexical transference, the subject was informed that the aim of the interview was to survey lifestyles of overseas Japanese. Topics dealt with in the interview concern the subject’s life in general (i.e., “life in Australia/New Zealand,” “city and people,” “work,” “sports,” and so forth; for detail, see Appendix 1). Although the interviewer (i.e., the present writer) attempted to include these topics, the interview was not rigidly structured and attention was paid to a natural flow of conversation (Saville-Troike 1982: 125). If the interviewee tried to develop the topic, it was not interrupted by the interviewer. An effort was made so that the asymmetrical structure of conventional interviews was reduced. When it was possible, the subject’s speech after the interview session was also tape-recorded so as to examine differences in his/her speech style (see Labov 1972a) and use of contact strategies.

As Wolfson (1976: 198) points out, “the distribution of power and/or solidarity among participants in a conversation is always an important determinant of their verbal behavior.” As mentioned in 4.2.2.3, in this study the relationship between interviewer and interviewee was taken into consideration, as also the question of how it affected the subject’s use of strategies was investigated (see Chapters 7 and 8).

The interviews were carried out at various places (e.g., the subject’s home, office, university, coffee shop, restaurant, etc.). The interview time varied according to the subject, ranging from 20 to 80 minutes. The total interview time for the 44 subjects was approximately 27 hours 40 minutes, giving a mean interview time of about 37 minutes.

The 44 Australian interviews were all transcribed by the present writer, producing a total of 1263 pages. All the words in each interview were counted in order to calculate the relative frequency of lexical transfers used by the subject.
For some sample interviews, the criteria for word count adopted for this study (cf. Kabashima 1989; Ishii 1989; Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1980), and transcription conventions (cf. Psathas and Anderson 1990), see Appendices 2 and 5, and TRANSCRIPTION SYMBOLS, respectively.

4.3.2. Follow-up Interviews

Some time after the interview session, a follow-up interview was carried out unless the subject declined to participate in it. The aim of the follow-up interview is to investigate the subject’s awareness of the linguistic behaviour of himself/herself or other participants in interaction (see Neustupný 1990).

In this study the follow-up interview was used to examine the subject’s metalinguistic awareness of different processes taking place in the interview situation. The subject was asked a number of questions concerning his/her treatment of various types of transference and integration (e.g., lexical/phonological/prosodic/semantic, etc.). However, what should be noted about the follow-up interview is that, as Neustupný (1990: 31) points out, it “can only reveal aware norms: participants in speech acts cannot be expected to report on processes which remain for them unconscious.” Actually, there were cases where the subjects were unable to explain their own linguistic behaviour. “The discrepancies between actual speech behavior and the speaker’s opinion of his actual behavior may be surprisingly large” (Gumperz 1970: 207). Despite this shortcoming, the follow-up interview is still considered to be a useful technique for eliciting the subject’s metalinguistic commentary, and therefore investigating his/her strategies employed at the time of the interview or other interactive situations.
For this study, the present writer was able to conduct 40 follow-up interviews in Australia. If necessary, during the follow-up interview part of the original taped interview was played for the subject's comment. All the 40 follow-up interviews were tape-recorded and analysed by the present writer. As already mentioned in 4.2.2.3, the subjects' background information was collected at the time of the follow-up interview or after the interview session.

4.3.3. Participant-observation/Observation

Although the main corpus for this study consists of the interview data, some spoken data in other situations were also gathered for supplementary purposes. Adopting the participant-observation method, the present writer collected some data as a participant as well as an observer in everyday interactive situations. At the same time just as an observer without participating in conversations, the investigator made notes of some samples of lexical transference every time he encountered the occurrence.

Labov (1972a: 209) comments on what he calls "observer's paradox" as follows: "The aim of linguistic research in the community must be to find out how people talk when they are not being systematically observed; yet we can only obtain these data by systematic observation." It is true that the tape-recorded interview enables the investigator to observe the subject's verbal behaviour in a systematic way, but due to the artificial and experimental nature of the situation, the subject is likely to pre-correct or self-monitor his/her speech. Hence, in order to obtain data in informal settings, participant-observation was employed as a supplementary data collection method. Lunch/dinner time conversations were tape-recorded without the subjects' awareness that their speech was being observed. For practical reasons, however, tape-recording was
not always used. When coming across a lexical transfer, the investigator took a note of it along with a description of the speaker’s background information (i.e., sex, age (estimated), the situation, etc.). In this way, the present writer collected a number of lexical transfers used by Japanese residents in Australia/ New Zealand in everyday conversational settings as well.

4.3.4. Group Sessions

Other supplementary data sources for this study include the group sessions conducted in Sydney, Australia. Four temporary residents (S1, S9, S15, S20) who participated in the interview also agreed to take part in the group session. Two males and two females, who were students at the University of Sydney, talked about topics similar to those used in the interviews such as Australian cuisine, fashion, education, and sports. Four twenty-minute discussions were videotaped in the audio-visual room at Sydney University. Likewise, another discussion session (four twenty-minute discussions), whose participants were two male temporary residents (S6, S9) and one male permanent resident (S30), was also videotaped. Similar topics relating to Australian life were discussed. The present writer further videotaped four more twenty-minute discussions by two female permanent residents (S41, S43). In the latter two of these discussions the investigator himself participated. Like the other group sessions, all the topics discussed in the third group session concerned Australian life in general.

4 The initial intention of videotaping discussions was to examine nonverbal signs for transference (cf. Clyne 1972b), but this aspect of research was not pursued in the present study.
More naturalistic discussion data were collected in the trustee members’ monthly meeting of the Japan Club of Sydney and also in the discussion session organised by the Senior Club of Sydney. Out of the nine trustee members, six of them were also interviewed by the present writer and five (S28, S31, S32, S34, S37) of these six individual interviews were included in the main corpus for this study. With respect to the discussion session held in the Senior Club meeting, eight volunteers participated in it. Three of them took part in the individual interview sessions as well and two (S35, S42) of these three were included among the 44 subjects in Australia. These two group discussions by Japanese migrants in Sydney were tape-recorded with permission.

4.3.5. Questionnaire

In order to examine the degree of acceptability or social integration of some lexical transfers used by the subjects in Australia/New Zealand, a small questionnaire survey was carried out in Japan. The primary aim of this survey was to establish criteria for assessing the local usage of some lexical transfers in the Japanese speech communities in Australia/New Zealand. The questionnaire was designed on the assumption that the types of lexical transfers used in Australia/New Zealand differ from those in use in Japan.

The multiple-choice type of questionnaire lists 110 Japanese sentences. These sentences were chosen at random chiefly from the interviews, but some of the sentences were also taken from those data gathered through participant-observation, observation, and group sessions. Each of these sentences contained at least one lexical transfer. The procedure involved in the questionnaire was to choose an appropriate answer from two sections (A) and (B) respectively as to
the acceptability of each lexical transfer, and to enter the numerical response in each case into the spaces in parentheses on the questionnaire sheet (see Appendix 3).

The questionnaire sheets were first sent to two research assistants in Nagoya, Japan, who in turn distributed these sheets to potential informants in Nagoya and also in the Kanto and the Kansai areas. As a result, 68 people from these three regions voluntarily participated in the survey. The background information on these Japanese informants (i.e., sex, age, occupation, birthplace, place of residence, and previous overseas experience) was also collected through the questionnaire.

Once obtained in the above manner, the survey data were employed for distinguishing between lexical transfers adopted in Japan on the one hand and Australia/New Zealand on the other.

4.4. Summary

The main corpus for the present study consists of the interviews conducted in Australia and New Zealand. For the statistical analysis of inter-speaker variation in lexical transference and contact strategies, 44 Australian interviews were selected. It was argued that the follow-up interviews played a significant role in collecting information on the subjects’ awareness of verbal behaviour in the original interviews. To supplement the interview data, samples of transference in other situations were also gathered by means of participant-observation, observation, and group sessions. A questionnaire survey was conducted in Japan with a view to investigating the acceptability of 110 lexical transfers used by Japanese residents in Australia and New Zealand.
CHAPTER 5
DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF TRANSFERENCE PHENOMENA (I)

5.1. Introduction

In the present chapter lexical transference phenomena identified in the corpus are described and analysed. First, some examples of cultural and core lexical transfers are presented and analysed on the discourse level. The use of lexical transference by the subjects in the interviews is examined in connection with monitoring strategies (i.e., CRSs and TMSs) (see 8.3.4 and 8.3.5). Second, taking into account the results of the questionnaire survey conducted in Japan (on the intelligibility/acceptability of lexical transfers used by the subjects in Australia/New Zealand), lexical transfers are selected and classified in terms of various aspects of Australian/New Zealand life such as human categories, occupation, education, physical environment, food and drink, social life, and so on. Lexical transfers peculiar to the Australian/New Zealand environment are also identified. Third, a brief comparison is made of these lexical transfers with those of Hawaiian Japanese gathered by Higa (1983) and Inoue (1991) so as to examine interdialectal similarities and differences in the types of lexical transfers employed.

The examples presented in this chapter and Chapter 6 are mainly taken from the interviews, but also from the follow-up interviews, participant-observation,
5.2. Lexical Transference Phenomena Identified in the Corpus

5.2.1. Cultural Lexical Transference

It is assumed that because of LS 1.1, culturally specific lexical items peculiar to the new environment are transferred to the recipient language. When there are no native equivalents for new objects and concepts, lexical transference abruptly takes place via LS 1.1 to fill the lexical gap between the two languages. Proper nouns for L2 references also enter L1, owing to this lexical strategy. Note that in the contact strategy theory, LS 1.1 is adopted when there are no native, Sino-Japanese, or well-integrated Western loan equivalents. Some examples of cultural lexical transfers identified in the corpus are presented below.

Busshuwookingu ‘bushwalking’ is a common cultural lexical transfer in JAU/INZ. Examine the example below:

---

1 The data sources of the examples given in the present study are shown as follows: I: S1 (Interview: Subject 1); I: S55 (Interview: Subject 55; The subjects who are not included among the 54 subjects (see 4.2.2.3) are numbered from 55 to 87); FI: S1 (Follow-up interview: Subject 1); PO: S1 (Participant-observation: Subject 1); PO: NS1 (Participant-observation: Non-subject 1; The subject is not included among the subjects who participated in the interviews); O: S1 ( Observation: Subject 1); O: NS2 (Observation: Non-subject 2; The subject is not included among the subjects who participated in the interviews); D: S1 (Discussion: Subject 1); D: NS3 (Discussion: Non-subject 3; The subject is not included among the subjects who participated in the interviews).
(1) S: ...kodomoo no onaji gurai no nenrei datta koto mo arimashite,
   2 I: hai
   
3 S: busshuwooku ni busshuwookingu ni ikanai ka to sasowarete,
   4 I: ee ee ee ee

(I: S14)

'1 S: ...our children were about the same age as their children,

2 I: yes

3 S: so our neighbour invited us to go for a bushwalk,
   bushwalking with them,

4 I: mm hmm uh-huh'

S14 was a temporary resident in Sydney. After saying busshuwooku, the subject replaced it with busshuwookingu while laughing as if to apologise for her imperfect realisation of the transfer, though the former was also a correct form. The accompaniment of laughter and the increase in volume (TMS 1) suggest that the subject was conscious of the use of this newly acquired lexical transfer.

Miruku baa 'milk bar' is a cultural lexical transfer peculiar to JAU as seen in example (2):

(2) Ano atari wa nan ka kofuu na resutoran to yuu ka...miruku baa ka

resutoran ka nan ka atta to omou n desu ga. (D: S43)

'I think somewhere around there, there used to be an old-fashioned restaurant...a milk bar or a restaurant or something.'

---

2 “A shop selling, in addition to milk, basic provisions and other items” (Collins English Dictionary, 3d Australian ed., 1991).
This example was taken from a discussion by two female migrants (S41 and S43) living in Sydney. As *miruku baa* was an established lexical transfer in their speech community and therefore a shared item for these subjects, no employment of a gloss (TMS 4) was necessary for S41 in the use of this lexical item (see 8.3.5).

*Furattomeito* ‘flatmate’ is a common cultural lexical transfer in JAU/JNZ as shown in example (3):

(3) Iya, anoo hitori ja nakute, *furattomeito*imasu kedo ne. (I: S24)

‘No, uhm, I don’t live alone, but I have a flatmate, you know.’

S24, who was a permanent resident in Melbourne, used this lexical transfer as a well-established item in the Japanese community. The non-use of TMSs indicates that S24 was aware that this item was widely used across the community. It is worthwhile to note that the Japanese-coined word *shea-meito* (share-mate) ‘flatmate’ is in common use in both JAU and JNZ.

*Furattingu* ‘flatting’ was used by the New Zealand subjects only, as “flatting” is peculiar to NZE. Observe the example below:

(4) I: Daigaku no chikaku ni sunde irassharu n desu ka?

S: Hai, *furattingu* desu. (PO: S49)

‘I: (Does your son) live near the University?’

S: Yes, (he) is flatting.’

3 “The practice of sharing a house with people who are not members of one’s own family” (ibid.).
Note that in JAU sheaa ‘to share’ was adopted instead of furattingu to express the same concept.

As might be expected, Maori-related cultural lexical transfers such as haka⁴ and pakeha⁵ were used by some subjects in New Zealand. Consider the following examples:

(5) 1 S: Tatoeba ragubii o ano...ragubii no shiai o yaru toki ni,
   2 I: un
   3 S: toku ni Ooru Burakkusu tte itte koko no nashonaru chiimu ga
   4 I: un fun un
   5 S: sono shiai o suru mae wa,
   6 I: un fun
   (dec)<
   7 S: ano haka tte itte sono Maori no...ano sentoo no inori o su-
   8 I: un
   9 S: ano odori o suru n desu ne. (I: S48)

‘1 S: For instance, rugby, uh, in a rugby game
   2 I: yeah
   3 S: especially the All Blacks, the national rugby team here
   4 I: mm hmm yeah
   5 S: uh, before a rugby match,
   6 I: mm hmm

---

⁴ “A Maori war chant accompanied by gestures”, “a similar performance by a rugby team” (ibid.).
⁵ “A person who is not of Maori ancestry, esp. a White person” (ibid.).
7 S: they demonstrate, uh, haka, er, the Maori..uh, war chant-
8 I: mm
9 S: uh, dance, you know.

In order to introduce the Maori lexical transfer *haka* in line 7, S48 adopted TMS 2 (i.e., the editing word or the voiced/filled pause *ano* ‘uh’) immediately prior to the transfer. Then the subject employed TMS 1 (i.e., a change in prosodic features: a slower tempo and an increase in volume) to articulate the transfer and also used TMS 4 (i.e., use of the gloss *Maori no sentoo no inori/odori* ‘the Maori war chant/dance’) after the item. Notice that in line 3 *Ooru Burakkusu*, another cultural lexical transfer is also accompanied by a gloss from L1 (i.e., *koko no nashonaru chimu* ‘the national rugby team here’) (TMS 4). Examine another example below:

(6) 1 S: ...Nyauuirando kookuu tte iu ano kookuugaisha ga=
2 I: un fun
3 S: =arimasu yo ↑ ne
4 I: un fun fun
5 S: Sore no senden toka o miru to,
6 I: un fun
   (dec) <
7 S: kochira de iu *pakeha* tte iu n desu kedo,
8 I: un fun
9 S: hakujin to *Maori no ainoko no onna no ko ga=
10 I: un
‘1 S: ... There is, uh, an airline called Air New Zealand,  
2 I: mm hmm  
3 S: you know.  
4 I: mm hmmm  
5 S: In their advertisement  
6 I: mm hmm  
7 S: as they call it here, a pakeha,  
8 I: uh-huh  
9 S: a Caucasian, a girl who is half-white and half-Maori=  
10 I: yeah  
11 S: =appears as a symbol.  
12 I: Ohhhh.’

Unlike example (5), when using the Maori lexical transfer pakeha, the same subject employed TMS 4 (i.e., use of the explicative gloss kochira de iu ‘as they call it here’) instead of TMS 2 (hesitation markers). However, the rest of his strategies were the same, that is, TMS 1 (i.e., a slower tempo and an increase in volume) and TMS 4 (i.e., use of the gloss hakujin ‘a Caucasian’).

As the above examples illustrate, cultural lexical transfers are often accompanied by TMSs. Since there are no native equivalents for the transfers of cultural type, pre-correction strategy (CRS 1) cannot operate in the case of LS 1.1. Hence cultural lexical transference tends to occur along with a gloss (TMS 4) at its first occurrence in conversation. It can, however, be assumed
that whether or not the speaker adopts TMSs primarily depends on how he/she sees the interlocutor in a given interactive situation. The relationship between speaker and interlocutor is considered to be important for an examination of the speaker’s use of lexical and other contact strategies. Although as argued in Chapter 3, cultural lexical transfers are introduced abruptly and integrated immediately into the L1 lexicon to fill lexical gaps between L1 and L2, the speaker’s perception of the degree of social integration of a cultural lexical transfer in question also plays a role in determining the types of contact strategies needed in a given situation.

Other cultural lexical transfers employed by the subjects include Bejimaito ‘Vegemite’\(^6\), Oojii ruuru ‘Oz rules’\(^7\), Medikea ‘Medicare’\(^8\), and so on (for more examples, see 5.3).

5.2.2. Core Lexical Transference

“The life of a core borrowing into Language X begins as a form which occurs in CS [codeswitching] between Language X and Y” (Myers-Scotton 1997: 228). As discussed in Chapter 3, unlike cultural lexical transference, core lexical transference deals with unnecessary transfers for rhetorical/stylistic effect or due to lexical difficulties. Since there are native, Sino-Japanese, or well-integrated Western loan equivalents, the adoption of core lexical transfers in Japanese normally takes place over time rather than overnight. In the contact strategy

\(^6\) “A vegetable extract used as a spread, flavouring” (ibid.).

\(^7\) “A game resembling rugby football, played in Australia between teams of 18 men each on an oval pitch, with a ball resembling a large rugby ball...” (ibid.).

\(^8\) “A government-controlled general health-insurance scheme” (ibid.).
theory, core lexical transference occurs via LS 1.2 (i.e., adopt a core lexical transfer). LS 1.2 promotes core lexical transference from L2 in L1-based interactions, though not many such lexical transfers/code-switches are likely to gain general currency in the speech community. As already noted, one significant characteristic concerning core lexical transfers is that CRSs can be applied to these items, as they have their native counterparts. This section describes some examples of core lexical transference identified in the corpus.

*Gamuturii* ‘gumtree’ is a culturally significant lexical transfer in JAU and can be regarded as a cultural item, but because of the existence of its well-integrated Western loan equivalent in Japanese (i.e., *yuukari* ‘eucalyptus’), this item is treated as a core lexical transfer in this study. Observe the following example:

(7) < <
1 S: Dakedo anoo iwayuru *gamuturii*? *yuukari* [no ki?
2 I: hai [un un
3 S: sugoku oo n desu tte ne, kono kunL (I: S40)
‘1 S: But, erm, what they call gumtrees, eucalypti
2 I: yes mm hmmm
3 S: they say there are really lots of them in this country.’

As the above example shows, in order to introduce the lexical transfer *gamuturii* ‘gumtree’, the subject employed three TMSs and one post-correction strategy (CRS 3): TMS 2 (i.e., the editing word *anoo* ‘erm’), TMS 3 (i.e., the hedge *iwayuru* ‘what they call’), TMS 1 (i.e., a rise in pitch and an increase in volume) and CRS 3 (i.e., post-correction to its well-integrated Western loan equivalent *yuukari* no ki [eucalyptus + Gen + tree] ‘eucalypti’). Notice that a
rise in pitch used as TMS 1 for the lexical transfer occurred with its corrected item as well. This rising shift in intonation or the "half-question intonation" (Inoue 1998a: 17) may invite feedback from the interlocutor. In fact, in line 2 the interviewer responded to the subject with aizuchi 'back-channels' (cf. Schegloff 1981) to express his understanding of the meaning of the item in question. The above-mentioned TMSs and CRS 3 accompanying LS 1.2 can be seen as a negative politeness strategy adopted towards the interviewer. After introducing the lexical transfer gamuturii, the subject did not have to resort to any TMS or CRS in the subsequent use of this item in the interview, as the subject had successfully "negotiated" the meaning of the item to the interviewer at its initial occurrence.

As noted in Chapter 3, the types of lexical transfers appertaining to the natural environments of Australia/New Zealand are influenced by different determinants operating in these geographical locations. For instance, Japanese residents in Melbourne, a city noted for occasional showers are more likely to adopt the lexical transfer shawaa 'shower', compared with Japanese living in the relatively dry city of Christchurch. In fact this core lexical transfer is one of the common items from L2 for Japanese residents in Melbourne. According to the observation by the present writer, the Japanese equivalent niwaka-ame was rarely used in JAU/JNZ. Observe the example taken from one of the Melbourne subjects:

(8) 1 S: Maa ame mo maa saikin wa chotto nagaame ga furimasu kedo mo,

2 motomoto wa sono shawaa da to.

3 Shower or two or (h)

4 I: ee (I: S22)

"1 S: Well, speaking of rain, well, we have had a long spell of rain these days,
but basically we have just, uh, a shower.

Shower or two or

I: uh-huh’

Before using the lexical transfer *shawaa* ‘shower’, the subject employed TMS 2 (i.e., the editing word *sono* ‘uh’) in line 2. Triggered by this transfer, he code-switched to English in line 3 like the weatherman forecasting a shower or two. This is a kind of bilingual humour. The uses of TMS 1 (i.e., laughter accompanying the code-switch) and also the preceding TMS 2 show that the subject consciously adopted this code-switch/lexical transfer.

Occupation promotes the adoption of core lexical transfers relating to work domains. Skills acquired in the new environment, names of occupations, and job-related words tend to be subject to lexical transference in spite of the existence of their Japanese counterparts. Consider the following example:

(9) (acc) (dec)

1 S: Eetoo maa *title wa suchuudento adobaizaa* to iu koto de,

2 I: un

(acc)

3 S: *[anoo koraretakata no enkuwaiarii ni kotaeru toka,*

4 I: [fun fuun un fun (I: S21)

‘1 S: Erm, well, my title is a student adviser,

2 I: yeah

3 S: [uhm, I answer enquiries by prospective students,

4 I: [mm hmm uh-huh’
Like several other subjects, S21 used some lexical transfers/code-switches to describe her job in Australia. The subject first employed the L2 item “title” which triggered the lexical transfer for her job title, viz., *suchudento adobaizaa* ‘student adviser’. Although the word “title” was pronounced quickly as a code-switch, *suchudento adobaizaa* was pronounced at a slower tempo (TMS 1). Notice that the interviewer signalled his listening to the subject’s utterance and also his understanding of its content by means of *aizuchi* ‘back-channels’ in lines 2 and 4. It may be that this cooperative device (i.e., *aizuchi*) employed by the interviewer helped the subject further use the work-related transfer *enkuwaiarii* ‘enquiry’. It is possible that certain frequently-used lexical transfers are automatised and adopted subconsciously. A slight increase in tempo in articulating the lexical transfer (TMS 1) in line 3 shows that the item may be frequently used by the subject. It also seems likely that the tendency for the subjects to adopt core lexical transfers relating to their employment in Australia/New Zealand partly reveals their subconscious desire to become assimilated into mainstream society.

By the same token, students who are studying in an English-speaking environment are likely to use lexical transfers appertaining to subjects, academic programmes, departments, degrees, and student life in general. Observe the example below:

(10) (dec)

1 S: ...kotoshi ni natte *Eishian Sutadizu*. ni
2 I: un
3 S: ee anoo ma, *toransufaa* shimas hi-
4 I: hai
5 S: ta kara, ee to imaa (1.0) imaa yatte ru no wa, kongakki yatte ru no wa
6 I: un
7 S: *indoneshiago* to [ee *risaachi peepaa* dake desu. 

8 I: [aaa  

I: ...this year I am in Asian Studies [Department]

2 I: yeah

3 S: uh, uhm, well, I have transferred-

4 I: yes

5 S: so, uh, now I’m doing, this semester I’m doing

6 I: yeah

7 S: only Indonesian and, [uh, a research paper.

8 I: [ohhh’

As a postgraduate student at an Australian university, the subject shared common knowledge about university life in Australia with the interviewer, namely the present writer. It is therefore natural that the shared norm for lexical choice led the subject to the adoption of lexical transfers such as *risaachi peepaa* ‘research paper’ and the departmental name used by students in everyday life. Notice again that the use of lexical transfers plays a role in in-group boosting as a positive politeness strategy if the communicative norm is shared by interactants. In line 1 the departmental name was pronounced with a slightly slower tempo (TMS 1), followed by a short silent pause (TMS 2). It appears that in this case TMS 2 was used for planning for the following utterance. Notice that, as the use of the two editing words *ee* ‘uh’ and *anoo* ‘uhm’ in line 3 shows, the subject attempted to pre-correct the use of the lexical transfer *toransufaa* ‘transfer’ and to adopt its native equivalent, though she was unsuccessful in her attempt and adopted the transfer after the use of the hedge *ma* ‘well’ (TMS 3).
There is always a conflict between core lexical transfers and their native counterparts. Under the influence of AUE/NZE and contextual factors prevailing in the new environments, many native lexical items in various lexical fields are likely to be replaced by lexical transfers from L2. Examine the following example:

(11)  
1 S: De *fuudo* wa dashite yopparratteta n da kedo,  
2   sore de kekkokyuyu..sore ga are de hore..*biru* dasu no doo koo yatteta  
    wake desho?  
3   Sore de kekkyoku sono are *fuudo* dasanai tame ni uttae o okoshite.  
4   "Kooto e uttaerareta n desu yo, *porisu* kara!

5 I: Haa-- (I: S30)  

'1 S: And we served (those policemen) the food they ordered and they were drunk,  
2   and after all, because of that, y'know, we asked them to pay the bill.  
3   And after all, because we didn’t serve them, uh, that thing, food (for free),  
    they filed a suit against us.  
4   They took the matter to court, those cops!  
5 I: Wow.'  

In example (11) four different core lexical transfers (i.e., *fuudo* ‘food’, *biru* ‘bill’, *kooto* ‘court’, *porisu* ‘police’) occurred via LS 1.2, despite the existence of their native counterparts. All these lexical transfers were pronounced with a faster tempo (TMS 1). The use of a faster tempo suggests that these items are an unmarked choice and may be frequently used by the subject. As can be seen
in lines 1 and 4, the subject did not employ any CRS or TMS 3 (i.e., hedges) or TMS 4 (i.e., glosses) for *juudo* ‘food’, *kooto* ‘court’, and *porisu* ‘police’. This fact may reflect the subject’s perception of the high degree of social integration of these core items and/or his subconscious desire for acculturation into the dominant society. Note, however, that the subject adopted TMS 3 (i.e., use of the hedge *hore* ‘you know’) before *biru* ‘bill’ in line 2. S30 appealed to the interviewer, using a direct hedge, as if he requested the interviewer’s involvement in the use of the lexical transfer (see Masumi-So 1983: 194-95); and after a short silent pause (TMS 2), the subject uttered the core transfer *biru* ‘bill’. Notice that S30 employed another TMS 3 (i.e., use of the hedge *are* ‘that thing you know’) prior to *juudo* ‘food’ in line 3. It seems that the use of these core lexical transfers contextualises the past incident that happened to the subject and also indicates his emotional involvement in it.

The aforementioned item *biru* ‘bill’ is a common core lexical transfer in both JAU and JNZ. Frequency of use plays a significant role in lexical integration. The follow-up interview with S30 reveals that the use of the lexical transfer *biru* ‘bill’ in Australia made him adopt *bia* for “beer” instead of the Dutch loanword *biiru* that is still in common use in Japan, because of the phonetic similarity between *biru* and *biiru*. It is also worthwhile to note that as *biru* can be a truncated form of *birudingu* ‘building’, he began to use the full form *birudingu* when referring to a “building” instead of the clipped form in order to avoid confusion. It can be said that a partial restructuring of the subject’s lexical system occurred owing to the transference and integration of the core lexical transfer *biru* ‘bill’.

In the case of core lexical transference, the adoption of pre-correction strategy (CRS 1) can suppress the use of lexical transfers. However, the
weakened monitoring effect on speech sometimes prevents correcting strategies from operating properly in Japanese-based interactions. As a result, deviations from the standard language norm occur. Consider the following example:

(12) (acc)
1 S: Atoo chuukagai mo chikai no de, anoo ↑ ne, anoo too- tooyoo=
2 I: un un
3 S: =anoo Eijan fiudo mo te ni hairu no de, hotondo nihonshoku desu ne.
4 I: un
5 Naruhodo ne-- (I: S15)
‘1 S: And Chinatown is nearby, so, uhm, y’know, uhm, East- Eastern=
2 I: yeah yeah
3 S: =uhm, Asian food is easy to get, so I almost always eat Japanese food.
4 I: yeah
5 I see.’

Pre-correcting her speech, the subject employed LS 2 (i.e., employ a native lexical item rather than a lexical transfer). By means of this lexical strategy, the native equivalent chuukagai was successfully used instead of the common lexical transfer Chainataun. Likewise, after resorting to two TMS 2s (i.e., the editing word anoo ‘uhm’) and TMS 3 (i.e., use of the direct hedge ne ‘you know’) the subject made an attempt to utter quickly the native lexical item equivalent to “Asian food.” Although the Japanese equivalent word was partially verbalised as tooyoo, the lexical difficulty or memory lapse at this point made the subject switch to LS 1.2 after the hesitation (i.e., anoo ‘uhm’) (TMS 2), yielding the code-switch/lexical transfer Eijan fiudo. However, she was successful in switching back to LS 2, and produced nihonshoku rather than “Japanese food.”
Observe another example below:

(13) S: Shuumatsu wa moo asa wa, nan ka moo. *betto* no naka ni haitte,
2 I: hai hai
3 S: [okite ru n desu kedo, koo nonbiri shite ru?
4 I: [ee hai
(dec)
5 S: [De anoo.. zettai kimatte ru no wa *Satadee...*mooningu* wa=
(ace)
6 =ano *Dizunii* *kaatuan* o miru n desu kedo, [son de,
7 I: [un
8 Nan desu ka?
<
9 S: *Dizunii* no ano manga ga aru n [desu yo.
10 I: [ee [aa soo desu ka.=
11 S: [Are o zettai ni miru [koto.
12 I: [=aa naruho no ne. [uun naruho no ne.
13 S: ([cough]) Sore kara=
14 =nichiyoo[b] no asa wa *Za Besuto Kiddo* o miru koto.
15 I: [hai [ee uun (I: S18)
‘1 S: On the weekend, well, in the morning, well, lying in bed,
2 I: yes yes
3 S: I am [awake, but, er, I stay in bed, feeling free.
4 I: [yeah yes
5 S: [And, uhm, what I always do on Saturday morning is=
6 =uh, to watch Disney cartoons, [and
7 I: [mm
I beg your pardon?

S: They broadcast Disney’s, uh, animated film, [you know.

I: yeah [oh, is that so?=

S: [I watch that [without fail.

I: =[oh, I see. [mmhm I see.

S: ((cough)) And=

I: =on Sun[day morning I always watch The Best Kid.

In the above example, the subject attempted to accommodate to the speech of the interviewer and used shuumatsu (the Sino-Japanese equivalent of the common core lexical transfer uiikuendo ‘weekend’), making the same lexical choice as the interviewer. The subject first employed a convergent strategy toward the interviewer’s speech, but she diverged away from the standard Japanese norm, as shown in lines 5 and 6. In line 5 the subject subconsciously adopted LS 1.2, which led to the use of the code-switch/lexical transfer Satadee ‘Saturday’. She employed a slower tempo (TMS 1) for the switched item and a short silent pause (TMS 2) before adopting another lexical transfer mooningu ‘morning’. It appears that the first transfer triggered the second one despite her momentary effort to pre-correct the second item. As repeatedly noted, the use of time expressions is one of the prominent features of core lexical transference in overseas varieties of Japanese (Higa 1975, 1983: 121). This issue will further be discussed in the section below.

Enthusiastic about what she was going to say, the subject adopted another lexical transfer Dizunii kaatuun ‘Disney cartoons’ in line 6, although she used
the editing word *ano* ‘uh’ (TMS 2) before the transfer. It is supposed that the adoption of the core lexical transfer *kaatuun* also functions as a semantic strategy (SS 8) for a euphemistic need. It seems that, as the Sino-Japanese equivalent *manga* has a childish association, S18 resorted to LS 1.2 (and SS 8). Notice that two TMS Is were employed for this transfer, that is, the use of a faster tempo and laughter. It appears that together with SS 8, these TMS Is adopted in this case served as a way for the subject to avoid embarrassment.

Not catching the word *kaatuun*, however, in line 8 the interviewer requested clarification of the transfer from the subject. In line 9, therefore, the subject post-corrected the item and used the Sino-Japanese equivalent *manga* with an increase in volume (TMS 1) after adopting the editing word *ano* ‘uh’ (TMS 2). Notice that after the interviewer’s request for clarification, the subject switched to LS 2 and avoided the use of lexical transfers except for the title of the TV programme in line 14.

As shown above, core lexical transference may be pre-corrected, but if it is realised in discourse, a post-correction strategy (CRS 3) may be employed by the speaker when a communication problem occurs. However, it is possible that “people switch registers in repeating something uttered by their partners” (Giles et al. 1991: 10) when there is no possibility of comprehension difficulty on the part of the interlocutor. Observe the example below:

(14) I: *Shiden* nado wa yoku noraremasu ka?

S: *Toramu*, yoku norimasu yo. (I: S74)

‘I: Do you often take a streetcar?

S: A tram, I often take it.’
The core lexical transfer *toramu* 'tram' is an item widely used in the Japanese community in Melbourne. Resorting to a divergent strategy, the subject switched registers and adopted the transfer frequently used in everyday life. It appears that the subject's perception of the degree of social integration of this item in the community made the subject employ the transfer which is more appropriate in a given context than its Sino-Japanese counterpart *shiden*.

As noted in Chapter 3, there is a case where a lexical transfer may be accompanied by its L1 or L2 equivalent as a discourse device. In such a case, a gloss (TMS 4) is normally employed by the speaker rather than a post-correction strategy (CRS 3) which is activated when a negative evaluation is given to the use of the transfer in question. The adoption of a gloss after a transfer suggests the speaker's uncertainty of the acceptability of the item by the interlocutor. By means of TMS 4 the speaker attempts to tentatively use a transfer from L2 along with a gloss and to establish a shared norm with the interlocutor. Note that this strategy can be employed with either LS 1.1 or LS 1.2.

LS 1.2 serves for rhetorical/stylistic purposes as well. To avoid repetition of the same item, an L2 synonym is sometimes employed through core lexical transference. TMS 4 plays a part in emphasizing and/or clarifying the meaning of a preceding L1 item. Examine the following examples:

(15) Soo ano sekkyokuteki na no ne, autogooingu. (FI: S37)
‘Yes, they are, uh, active, y’know, outgoing.’

(16) Reipu jiken hakken shimashita. Uittonesu shichatta no. (I: S64)
‘I saw someone raping a woman. I witnessed it.’

In (15) and (16) the L1 items *sekkyokuteki* and *hakken* are accompanied by the L2 synonyms *autogooingu* ‘outgoing’ and *uittonesu* ‘witness’ respectively.
In either case TMS 4 serves to emphasize or clarify the meaning of the L1 item with the corresponding L2 item. The use of the L2 gloss accompanying the L1 item reflects the multiple identity of the subject.

To conclude, core lexical transference occurs by means of LS 1.2 despite the existence of native/Sino-Japanese or well-integrated Western loan equivalents. Since L1 counterparts exist, there is always a problem of lexical choice between L1 and L2 items. The most significant feature of core lexical transference is that CRSs can be employed at its occurrence, depending upon the interlocutor and the situation. As noted earlier, in the case of cultural lexical transference where no CRSs apply, TMS 4 (i.e., use of glosses) plays a role in its use. The use of lexical, correcting, transference-marking, and other contact strategies depends on the speaker’s awareness of the degree of social integration of an item in question, his/her relationship with the interlocutor, and his/her communicative intentions. The adoption of a core lexical transfer without any CRS and/or TMS may cause a communication problem unless the communicative norm is shared among participants in interaction. Core lexical transference enables the speaker to achieve some metaphorical/rhetorical effects in discourse. The juxtaposition of items from two languages reflects the mixed identity of the bilingual speaker.
5.3. Classification of Lexical Transfers in Terms of Various Aspects of Australian/New Zealand Life

The types of lexical transfers used by overseas Japanese residents reflect the everyday life of these Japanese expatriates. This section presents both cultural and core lexical transfers employed by the subjects in terms of the following lexical fields appertaining to Australian/New Zealand life: (a) human categories; (b) occupation; (c) education; (d) physical environment; (e) home/housing; (f) food and drink; (g) finance and shopping; (h) social life; (i) recreation; (j) travel and transport; (k) time; (l) quantity; (m) miscellaneous. However, (n) English verbs and (o) adjectives (or equivalents) transferred to Japanese are classified separately irrespective of these semantic fields. Note that the lexical items in (a)-(m) consist of nouns (and noun phrases/compounds) except for some quantifiers in (l) and za ‘the’ in (m) that were transferred from English “determiners” (Burridge and Mulder 1998: 166-67).

Lexical items in all lexical categories (or parts of speech) transferred from the source languages (AUE/NZE) were included in the list presented below, though most examples were classified into noun, verb, and adjective categories. As mentioned above, the English determiner (the definite article) “the” transferred as the Japanese affix za for an emphatic purpose was included, although there was only one such example in the corpus.

Nouns are the most common lexical category for lexical transference (see Bettoni 1981: 93; Tamis 1988: 85; Clyne 1991: 165; Xu 1993: 46). However,

---

9 Note the following points: (i) lexical transfers are italicised and their original forms or meanings are presented next to the items; (ii) the symbol † indicates that an item was used in the questionnaire survey; (iii) cultural lexical transfers are denoted by **; (iv) those items peculiar to JAU/JNZ are shown by (AU)/(NZ) respectively; (v) Japanese-coined English words are presented as follows: e.g., shea-meito (JE. share-mate) ‘flatmate’.
proper nouns such as personal names, place names, country names, organisation names (i.e., names of schools, firms, etc.) were excluded except that if some place names were considered to be peculiar to the local usage in JAU/JNZ, these items were included. Names of fauna and flora and names of products were included, but only if these items were judged to be significant for inclusion owing to their uniqueness to the Australian/New Zealand environment (cf. Clyne 1967, 1972a, 1991) and for the frequent use of these lexical transfers by (some) members of the Japanese community. The titles of TV programmes, movies, musicals, and books were not dealt with.

Some lexical transfers which had not yet gained general currency in the community but which were used by some speakers were also included in the list. However, less attention was paid to “idiolectal transfers (that is, transfers made by the individual)” (Clyne 1991: 164) and code-switches. Note that lexical transfers in common use in Japan were excluded, based on the results of the questionnaire survey (see Appendix 3)\(^\text{10}\) and the following two dictionaries of loanwords recently published in Japan: *Horiuchi* 1996 and *Shoogakukan* 1998.

\(^{10}\) Only those transfers intelligible to less than 80 percent of informants are included in the list.

(a) Human categories

This field, the largest in the present corpus represents various human relationships, including kinship, social status, nationality, and so on.

\`Aborigine', *batcharaa* ‘bachelor’, \`bakkupakkaa* ‘backpacker’, *beibii* ‘baby’, *bijitaalbizitaa* ‘visitor’, *boodaa* ‘boarder’, *booifurendo* ‘boyfriend’,
gaarufurendo ‘girlfriend’, Guriiku ‘Greek’, hazubando ‘husband’, herupaa
‘helper’, hosuto famirii ‘host family’, hosuto mazaa ‘host mother’, hosuto faazaa
‘host father’, hosuto burazaa ‘host brother’, Itarian ‘Italian’, Japaniizu
‘mother’, † neitibu ‘native (speaker)’, † Nyuujii (JE. NZ) ‘New Zealander/Kiwi’
(AU), † Oojii ‘Aussie, Australian’, †** pakeha ‘a non-Maori person, especially
a Caucasian’ (NZ), purosutiyyuto ‘prostitute’, reishisuto/reisisuto ‘racist’,
† shea-meito (JE. share-mate) ‘flatmate’, Supanisshu ‘Spanish’, † suapaabaizaa
‘supervisor’, wooden ‘warden’, waifu ‘wife’

(b) Occupation

As illustrated in the previous section, work-related words show a tendency
to be transferred. Only the titles of occupations identified in the corpus are listed
below.

akauntanto ‘accountant’, buranchi maneejaa ‘branch manager’, dentisuto
‘dentist’, dokutaa ‘doctor’, furain(gu) dokutaa ‘flying doctor’, gaadenna
‘gardener’, (kaa) diiraa ‘(cat) dealer’, kyasshaa ‘cashier’, keateekaa ‘caretaker’,
† kitchin hando ‘kitchen hand’, maneejaresu ‘manageress’, maneejingu
dairekutaa ‘managing director’, † ofisu waakaa ‘office worker’, purofessaa
rekucharaa ‘lecturer’, † shoppu ashisutanto ‘shop assistant’, sorishitaa ‘solicitor’,
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suchuudento ‘student’, suchuudento adobaizaa ‘student adviser’, teraa ‘teller’,
tiichingu ashisutanto ‘teaching assistant’, chuutaalyyuutaa ‘tutor’

c) Education

Due to the recruitment of some students, teachers, and researchers as subjects in the present study, the education category has become one of the largest lexical fields for transference in the corpus. Note that subject names and departmental/programme names were excluded.

andaalandaagurajueeto ‘undergraduate’, asainmento ‘assignment’,
yuni ‘university’
(d) Physical environment

Words relating to natural environments, natural phenomena, local fauna and flora, place names, buildings, directions, and so on are classified in this category. It is noteworthy that the core lexical transfer shitii/sitii ‘city’ has almost completely replaced the Japanese equivalent word (i.e., machi) in the JAU data.

**autobakku ‘outback’ (AU), botanikku/botanikaru gaaden ‘botanic/ botanical garden’, chaachi ‘church’, †earia ‘area’, gaaden ‘garden’,

(e) Home/Housing

In this category words associated with home and types of housing, and names of household appliances are included.

**disshu-wosshaa ‘dishwasher’, †doraibuwei ‘driveway’, fanichaa ‘furniture’,

(f) Food and Drink

Many transfers in this lexical field (e.g., baabekyuu ‘barbecue’, chikin ‘chicken’, roosuto biifu ‘roast beef’, saamon ‘salmon’, etc.) are also used in Japan. Only the items of less common use in Japan are included here. Note that words such as Bejimaito ‘Vegemite’, fisshu ando chippusu ‘fish and chips’ which reflect eating habits in Australia/New Zealand are immediately integrated.


(g) Finance and Shopping

Finance-related words, names of shops, and words relating to shopping are listed below.

‘concession’, **Medikea ‘Medicare’ (AU), † **miruku baa ‘milk bar’ (AU),
suupaa-anyueeshon ‘superannuation’, takkusu ‘tax’

(h) Social life

Words associated with the social life in general and political/social systems
are classified in this lexical field.


11 “A time, usually in the early evening, when some pubs or bars sell drinks at reduced prices” *(Collins English Dictionary, 3d Australian ed., 1991).*
(i) Recreation

Words relating to sports and recreational activities are listed here. Many words for sports (e.g., banjii tanpu ‘bungey jump’, earobikusu ‘aerobics’, rafutingu ‘rafting’, sunoo boodo ‘snow board’, torekkingu ‘trekking’, etc.) are types of international words and these words were excluded as they are also used in Japan.

† **busshuwookingu ‘bushwalking’ (AU), futii ‘footy’ (AU/NZ), ikusukaajan ‘excursion’, † **kuriketto ‘cricket’, † kuruzu ‘cruise’, † muubii ‘movie’, † **Ooji/Oozii ruuru ‘Oz rules’ (AU), **Ooru Burakkusu ‘the All Blacks’, pantingu ‘punting’, puree ‘play’, puuru ‘pool, billiards’, tookubakku shoo ‘talkback show’

(j) Travel and Transport

As seen in 5.2, the core lexical transfer toramu ‘tram’ is widespread across the Japanese community in Melbourne. The Japanese equivalent such as romendenshal/shiden was rarely heard in Melbourne.

(k) Time

In the JAU/JNZ data, transference of time-related words normally occurs in compounds or noun phrases as shown in the examples below.

*minittsu* ‘minutes’, *awaa* ‘hour’; *dei/dee* ‘day’, *middodei* ‘midday’; *iyaa* ‘year’, *middoiyaa* ‘midyear’; *moongugu* ‘morning’, *afutanuun* ‘afternoon’;

*Sata dee* ‘Saturday’, *Sandee* ‘Sunday’

Examples: *ten minittsu* ‘ten minutes’, *happii awaa* ‘happy hour’; *sebun dei* ‘(lit.) seven day’ (e.g., *Kaimono nan te ittara hotondo sebun dei dekimasu kara ne.* ‘We can do shopping almost seven days a week.’ (I: S29)), *wan dei kuriketto* ‘one-day cricket’, *middodei* ‘midday’ (e.g., *Uiikudei de middodei ni ikeru tte iu no wa josei ni kagirarete kuru.* ‘Those who can go at midday during weekdays are limited to women.’ (D: S31)); *karentaa iyaa* ‘calendar year’; *Sata dee moongugu* ‘Saturday morning’, *afutanuun tii* ‘afternoon tea’, *reito afutanuun* ‘late afternoon’ (e.g., *Reito afutanuun* to iu koto de. ‘I’ll see you in the late afternoon.’ (PO: NS1));

*Sata dee sukuuru* ‘Saturday school’, *Sandee maaketto* ‘Sunday market’

(l) Quantity

The examples below show that quantity items normally enter Japanese in compounds or noun phrases, as many of them function as quantifiers which modify nouns.

124
wan 'one', tsuu/uu 'two', surii 'three', foo 'four', shikkusu 'six', se bun 'seven', nain 'nine', ten 'ten', wan-tuu-surii 'one-two-three'; kuootaa 'quarter', ooru 'all'; eekaa 'acre', yaado 'yard, a unit of length equal to three feet'

Examples: wan/tsuu/surii/foo beddoruumu 'one/two/three/four bedroom', wan sukuuru iyaa 'one school year', iyaa shikkusu 'year six', sebun dei '(lit.) seven day', (Channeru) Sebun (e.g., Daitai Sebun ga ooi desu ka ne. 'I usually watch Channel Seven.' (I: S11)), Channeru Nain 'Channel Nine', ten paasento 'ten percent', wan-tuu-surii de 'with one-two-three'; kuootaa eekaa 'quarter acre', ooru dei 'all day'

(m) Miscellaneous

This category lists the remaining items that are not classified into any of the above lexical fields. The emphatic use of za 'the' is included here as a rare example which occurred in spoken discourse, although it is used in Japan (normally in written discourse).

† doraggu 'drug', † hei fiiba 'hay fever', ikusukyuusu/ikusukyuuzu 'excuse', injekushon 'injection', jeiru 'jail', kokkuroochi 'cockroach', † konfurikuto 'conflict', kyuu 'queue', reishizumu 'racism', rifuto 'lift, ride', rinobeeshon 'renovation', samaa taimu 'summer time', sapuraizu 'surprise', tatuu/tatsuu 'tattoo', tii taoru 'tea towel', † za 'the' (e.g., za-shoosha fujin 'the wife of a representative of a Japanese trading firm' (I: S12))
(n) Verbs

While English nouns can be transferred as Japanese nouns without any morphological modification, English verbs and adjectives go through some syntactic and morphological readjustment. English verbs are usually recategorised as Japanese verbal nouns accompanied by the verb suru ‘to do’ (e.g., herupu suru ‘to help’) (see 6.2.3 and Appendix 8 (2.1)).

Transfers such as enjoi suru ‘to enjoy’, rirakkusu suru ‘to relax’ were used by many subjects, but these items are not included due to their common use in Japan.

apurai ‘to apply’, apuriishieito ‘to appreciate’, † atendo ‘to attend’, bukku ‘to book’, † herupu ‘to help’, konpurenin ‘to complain’, † kukku ‘to cook’, † kuroozu ‘to close’, † pikku (pick) ‘to pick up’, pikku appu ‘to pick up’, rinobeeto ‘to renovate’, sabusukuraibitu ‘to subscribe’, † **sheaa ‘to share’, soosharaizu ‘to socialise’

(o) Adjectives

In the case of the attributive function, English adjectives are recategorised as Japanese adjectival nouns with na (e.g., booringu na sensei ‘a boring teacher’) or no (e.g., rookaru no hito ‘a local person’). In the predicative function, they are accompanied by the copula da (e.g., Nihongo no kurasu wa booringu da. ‘Japanese classes are boring.’). Marked by ni, transferred English adjectives function as Japanese adverbs, (e.g., iijii mi ‘easily’) (see 6.2.3 and Appendix 8 (2.1)).
aguressibu 'aggressive', autogooingu 'outgoing', Betonamiizu 'Vietnamese (cuisine)', booringu 'boring', buradii 'bloody' (e.g., buradii Jappu 'bloody Jap' (I: S39)), † Chainizu 'Chinese (cuisine)', † Furenchi 'French (cuisine)', furuemento 'fluent', Guritku 'Greek (cuisine)', iijii 'easy', † iijii-gooingu/ iizii-gooingu 'easy-going', iisutan 'eastern' (e.g., iisutan sabaabu 'eastern suburb' (I: S44)), Japaniizu 'Japanese (cuisine)', konfidensharu 'confidential', konfotaburu 'comfortable', konparusorii 'compulsory', † meijaa 'major', oirii 'oily', oobaasii(zu) 'oversea(s)', pamanento 'permanent (residence)', paburikku 'public', puraibeeto 'private (school)', purein 'plain', retto 'late', ruuraru 'rural', serufisshu 'selfish', sutikkii 'sticky', reijii/reizii 'lazy', † rookaru 'local', † ritun 'written', Tai (fiando) 'Thai (food)', uesutan 'western' (e.g. uesutan sabaabu 'western suburb' (I: S33), † waido 'wide'

The above data (the total number of lexical transfers: 328)\(^\text{12}\) show that with respect to lexical categories, the majority of lexical transfers occurring as types belong to the noun category (82.01%), while the items constituting verb and adjective categories are 4.27% and 10.06% respectively. These are the percentages of the selected items in the list. The proportions of every lexical category with regard to all the lexical transfers which occurred in the 44 Australian interviews are presented in Chapter 8.

Bettoni (1981: 93) reports the incidence of English lexical transfers in Italian in Australia in terms of lexical categories, this being as follows: nouns 70%; verbs 4%; adjectives about 6%; adverbs about 1.6%; interjections\(^\text{13}\)

\(^{12}\) Only the lexical transfers presented in the list are counted.

\(^{13}\) Note that Bettoni (1981: 58) classifies transfers such as "yeah", "you know" as interjections. In this study, following Richards et al. (1985: 145), the term "interjection" is defined as "a word such as ugh!, gosh!, wow!, which indicates an emotional state or attitude such as delight, surprise, shock, and disgust, but which has no referential meaning."
15%. Although she included some second-generation bilinguals and first-
generation childhood bilinguals as subjects, Bettoni shows that interjection
transfers frequently occur among first-generation adult bilinguals as well (ibid.: 115). Considering that no examples of transference of interjections were found in the present corpus, differences in transference patterns between Italian and Japanese in Australia may be ascribed to differences in maxims which influence lexical strategies. It appears that the acculturation maxim prevailing in Italian in Australia is stronger than that in JAU/JNZ, and therefore is more likely to promote LS 1.2 (i.e., adopt a core lexical transfer) or PMS 1 (i.e., adopt L2 rules of interaction), leading to the more frequent use of English interjections in Italian speech.

With regard to lexical fields, the largest field in the above JAU/JNZ data is human categories (13.11%). Percentages of lexical transference in the other fields are as follows: education (10.67%); physical environment (10.37%); social life (9.45%); occupation (7.62%); finance and shopping (7.62%); miscellaneous (4.88%); home/housing (4.27%); food and drink (3.66%); quantity (3.96%); recreation (3.66%); travel and transport (3.35%); time (3.05%) (cf. Surus 1985: 55). The experiences and lifestyles of the subjects in Australia/New Zealand can be guessed to some degree from the types of lexical transfers in the above list. Contextual factors in the new environments appear to promote lexical transference in these domains. As will be examined below, some examples of lexical transference of time, quantity and direction words were identified in the JAU data, but not in the JNZ data.
5.4. Interdialectal Similarities and Differences in Lexical Transference

In the present section a brief comparison of JAU/JNZ with Hawaiian Japanese is made in terms of lexical fields for transference, based on Higa (1983), Inoue (1991), and on the JAU/JNZ data presented in the previous section. As noted in Chapter 1, one of the hypotheses Higa (1975: 86) formulates about the types of loanwords used by Japanese in Hawaii is that "from the sociolinguistic point of view the most important words in a language are those related to kinship relations, social relations, time, and quantity." As Higa (1983: 121) points out, words in these categories play an important role in the linguistic life of Japanese expatriates and in these categories the highest degree of linguistic acculturation is achieved in overseas varieties of Japanese. Higa further argues that the use of loanwords in these lexical fields is commonly observed in Brazilian, Peruvian, and Argentinean Japanese as well (ibid.). Although the types of these established Japanese communities differ from those in Australia/New Zealand (Chapters 1 and 2), it is worthwhile to examine interdialectal similarities and differences in types of lexical transfers between Hawaiian Japanese and JAU/JNZ, focusing on these semantic fields. Following the classification of the lexical fields adopted in the previous section (i.e., (a) human categories, (b) occupation, (k) time, and (l) quantity), lexical transfers used in both Hawaiian Japanese and JAU/JNZ are presented below.14

14 (H) represents Hawaiian Japanese data taken from Higa (1983) and (IN) from Inoue (1991). If the phonetic form of a Hawaiian Japanese loan differs from that of the corresponding transfer in the JAU/JNZ data, the latter form is given in parentheses for comparison.
(a) Human categories


(b) Occupation

dakutaa (H) (IN)/dokutaa (IN) ‘doctor’, denchisuto (H) (cf. dentisuto) ‘dentist’, kyasshiia (H), (cf. kyasshaa) ‘cashier’, puramaa (H) ‘plumber’

(k) Time

menitsu (H) (cf. minittsu) ‘minutes’, awaa (H) ‘hour’; iya (H) (cf. iyaa) ‘year’;
Saatadee (H) (cf. Satadee) ‘Saturday’, Sandee (H) ‘Sunday’

(l) Quantity

wan, tuu, turii...(H) (cf. wan, tsuu/tuui, surii...) ‘one, two, three...’; eekaa (IN) ‘acre’ (e.g., “handore eekaa” ‘a hundred acre’ (Inoue 1991: 11))

As noted above, these lexical transfers are only those included both in the Hawaiian Japanese data (Higa 1983; Inoue 1991) and the present JAU/JNZ
corpus. One of the most significant differences between Hawaiian Japanese and JAU/JNZ is that transference is realised based on different varieties of English. Whereas the source languages of JAU and JNZ are AUE and NZE respectively, the source language of Hawaiian Japanese is standard American English. Hence PS 9 (i.e., adopt the pronunciation of Standard American English as a model) (e.g., dakutaa ‘doctor’) is employed in Hawaiian Japanese. An examination of the above transfers shows that PS 6 (i.e., pronounce an L2 morpheme based on the sound) plays a part in transference (e.g., hezuben (H)/hazuben (IN) ‘husband’). Another point to be made here is that the influence of dialectal Japanese is evident in Hawaiian Japanese. For instance, the majority of Japanese immigrants came from the western part of Japan, especially Hiroshima (Inoue 1991: 1; see also 1.2.4), and this is reflected in the use of PS 2 (epenthesis strategy) as well (e.g., supanisshi ‘Spanish’ [cf. modern standard Japanese Supanisshii]) (see 3.4.1.1.1 and Appendix 8 (1.2)).

As shown in the lexical field of human categories, some lexical transfers are shared by both Hawaiian Japanese and JAU/JNZ. Nationality words are susceptible to transference. The kinship term burazaa-in-roo ‘brother-in-law’ occurred only once in the JAU interview data (e.g., ...watashi noo untoo ano burazaa-in-roo ga Aera to iu zasshi o... okutte kureru wake de,... ‘...my, uhm, uh, brother-in-law sends me a copy of a magazine called Aera,...’ (I: S43)), but it was included in the list. It appears that as the use of the two editing words (TMS 2) suggests, the Sydney subject (S43) adopted this core item as a code-switch rather than a socially integrated lexical transfer in order to overcome a lexical difficulty and achieve her communicative goal.

With regard to personal pronouns, mii ‘me’, which is in common use in Hawaiian Japanese (e.g., mii no mono [me + Gen + thing] ‘my thing’ (Inoue
1991: 20)), was used once as a code-switch by another Sydney subject (S18). However, as the following example shows, this is a different case and the word is not included in the above list: (e.g., ...nan ka mii mii mii toka...tte itte... ‘...they say something like “me, me, me,”’ (I: S18)).

Only four words of occupational titles were identified as items used in both the Hawaiian Japanese data and the JAU/JNZ data. Although some more items are commonly used, these items (e.g., shafi (H) (cf. shefit) ‘chef’, takishiizuraiba (H) (cf. takushii doraiba) ‘taxi driver’, etc.) are excluded, as they are also in common use in Japan (but in different phonetic forms).

With regard to time and quantity expressions, unlike Hawaiian Japanese, these transfers in JAU/JNZ occurred as constituents of compounds or noun phrases, as illustrated in the previous section. In the case of JAU/JNZ, SS 6 (i.e., adopt a core lexical transfer in a compound), which is a common semantic strategy for integration adopted in Japan, is likely to be employed. In other words, it can be said that time and quantity words normally occur in compounds in JAU/JNZ. It is unlikely that the following utterances observed in Hawaiian Japanese occur in JAU/JNZ: “Anofiishi wa me ga wan sai ni tuu aru” ‘That fish has two eyes on one side’; “Samu hito wa eberi iya Nihon ni iku” ‘Some people go to Japan every year’ (Higa 1983: 120).

As argued earlier, under the contact strategy hypothesis, these interdialectal differences in lexical transference are attributed to not only different strategies but also the higher principles, i.e., maxims and determinants operating behind these strategies. It can be supposed that in Hawaiian or North American society, a stronger maxim for acculturation (i.e., assimilation into mainstream society/culture) is at work than in its Australian or New Zealand counterpart. As this maxim tends to promote LS 1 rather than LS 2, lexical transference is more likely to take place. On the other hand, compared with American society, the
maxim of "multiculturalism" operating in Australian society is considered to be stronger and to activate to a greater degree maxims such as "ethnic identity" and "language loyalty" and therefore to promote language maintenance efforts by ethnic groups. It is thus possible that in JAU these maxims lead to LS 2 more frequently than in Hawaiian Japanese.

Different patterns in transference are also ascribed to the types of bilingual communities. While the Japanese community in Hawaii is an established static bilingual community, its Australian/New Zealand counterpart is a fluid, dynamic bilingual community. In the latter community, the communicative norm itself is in a constant state of flux.

No lexical transfers in the time and quantity categories were identified in the JNZ interview data. It may be supposed that the maxim for acculturation operating in JNZ is still weaker than that in JAU. However, because of the small number of subjects recruited in Christchurch, it is dangerous to jump to a conclusion. It may well be the case, however, that because of the similarities in the nature of the bilingual communities in Australia and New Zealand, JNZ spoken by the first-generation Japanese adults would show a similar transference pattern in the use of time and quantity words if sufficient data were collected.

With respect to direction words, neither Higa (1983) nor Inoue (1991) lists examples of direction words transferred from English.\textsuperscript{15} In the JAU data gathered

\textsuperscript{15} Higa (1975: 79) lists some examples including Hawaiian loans: \textit{Diamond Head} 'toward the Diamond Head, i.e., the east of Honolulu'; \textit{Ewa} 'toward the Ewa plantation, i.e., the west of Honolulu'; \textit{makai} 'toward the sea, i.e., the south of Honolulu'; \textit{mauka} 'toward the mountain, i.e., the north of Honolulu'. Inoue (1991) also lists the last three Hawaiian loans.
in Sydney and Melbourne, by contrast, several examples of direction words were identified, though in the JNZ data collected in Christchurch no such examples were found.

Although a stronger acculturation maxim may promote transference of direction words, an examination of the JAU/JNZ data reveals that determinants (i.e., geographical features, etc.) and LS 1.1 (i.e., adopt a cultural lexical transfer) play a significant role in the adoption of direction items. For instance, a large number of Japanese people in Sydney live to the north of the city. This area is called North Shore. Since many Japanese live in this area, place names such as North Shore and North Sydney are frequently used by Japanese residents in Sydney. As a result, these place names adopted through LS 1.1 are shortened to just *Noosu* 'North' owing to the principle of speech economy and prosodic strategy. It appears that the use of this direction word promotes transference of other direction words. As in this example, if direction words are employed as part of proper names (place names), due to LS 1.1 these items are immediately integrated and ready for use. As direction words are relational concepts, the use of “north” triggers the use of “south,” “east,” “west,” and so on. In Melbourne, too, there are some place names containing direction words such as South Yara. On the other hand, in Christchurch there are virtually no such place names. This fact explains the difference in the transference of these items between the JAU and the JNZ data. It should be noted that although direction words themselves are core items, direction words used as part of place names are instantly integrated as part of these proper names via LS 1.1 which deals with cultural lexical transference.
5.5. Summary

In this chapter we have described and analysed the lexical transference phenomena identified in the corpus. We have also investigated how the hypothesized lexical and monitoring strategies are related to the use of lexical transference in interaction.

First, some examples of cultural and core lexical transfers were presented. Through the analysis of these two types of lexical transfers, the difference between the two lexical strategies, viz., LS 1.1 (i.e., adopt a cultural lexical transfer) and LS 1.2 (i.e., adopt a core lexical transfer) was discussed in relation to monitoring strategies (i.e., CRSs and TMSs). The following three points were demonstrated: (i) due to the lack of a native/Sino-Japanese/well-integrated Western loan equivalent, a cultural lexical transfer cannot be corrected; (ii) a core lexical transfer, on the other hand, can be corrected owing to the existence of a native/Sino-Japanese/well-integrated Western loan counterpart; (iii) TMS 4 (i.e., use of a gloss) is a useful device for clarification, emphasis or amplification for both cultural and core lexical transference.

Second, lexical transfers peculiar to JAU/JNZ and/or in less common use in Japan were selected and classified according to the semantic fields. Then, based on Higa (1983) and Inoue (1991), the types of lexical transfers in JAU/JNZ were compared with those of Hawaiian Japanese. Unlike Hawaiian Japanese, address terms were not transferred in JAU/JNZ. Time and quantity expressions were adopted in JAU/JNZ, but normally in compounds or noun phrases. Finally, it was shown that there is some difference in the types of lexical transfers between JAU and JNZ.
CHAPTER 6

DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF TRANSFERENCE PHENOMENA (II)

6.1. Introduction

The present chapter presents a description and analysis of the transference phenomena other than lexical transference identified in the corpus (i.e., phonological, prosodic, grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic). Attention is also paid to integration phenomena. As the lexical items transferred from L2 are integrated, these items establish their functions and places in L1. In this thesis, focus falls on the degree of integration of lexical transfers in interaction rather than the process of integrational development of these items. As discussed in Chapter 3, under the contact strategy hypothesis, it is through contact strategies that transference and integration phenomena are manifested for performing certain functions in an interactive situation. Processing, monitoring and social strategies operate concurrently in the process of transference and integration.

In this chapter through the description and analysis of the transference and integration phenomena identified in the JAU/JNZ corpus, it will be shown how the above-mentioned strategies operate. First, the integration phenomena are examined in terms of phonological, prosodic, grammatical, and semantic aspects, then the types of transference phenomena other than lexical transference are dealt with, and finally the functions of transference/code-switching identified in the corpus are discussed.
6.2. Integration Phenomena Identified in the Corpus

6.2.1. Phonological Integration

Lexical transfers from English are normally fully or partially integrated into the Japanese phonological system by means of the following phonological strategies for integration: PS 1 (i.e., employ the mora as a unit of timing); PS 2 (i.e., insert an epenthetic vowel /i, o, or u/ between consonants and/or after the word-final consonant to make an open syllable), PS 3 (i.e., insert a mora obstruent /Q/ before an obstruent and devoice a voiced obstruent), and PS 4 (i.e. substitute a native sound for an L2 sound) (see 3.4.1.1.1). The use of PS 4 leads to a higher degree of integration. It is, however, possible that the original phonetic form is employed through PS 10 (i.e., adopt the original L2 sound or a sound close to the original one). PS 10 will be discussed as a phonological strategy for transference in 6.3. For the interlingual identification of vowels and consonants between AUE/NZE and Japanese, see Appendix 8 (1.4).

The JAU/JNZ corpus shows that PSs 1-4 play a part in the integration of lexical transfers, although there were some exceptions to the above strategies. Clyne (1991: 173-74) makes the point that “there is a great deal of individual variation” in the phonetic realisation of a lexical transfer. The following are some examples of variations which were identified in the JAU/JNZ corpus:¹

[kɪʃɪdɛnɪto] (I: S43) ~ [akʊʃɪdɛnɪto] ‘accident’; [ʊːːziː] ~ [oːziː] (I: S19)
‘Aussie’; [kaːzwaɾu] ~ [kɑːzwaɾu] (I: S12) ‘casual’; [ʃɪː] (I: S30) ~ [ʃɪː] ~ [ʃɪː] (I: S12), (I: S14), (I: S19), (I: S44), (I: S70) ‘city’; [ɛkɪʃɪte3jɔn]
(I: S 43) ~ [ɛkʊʃɪte3jɔn] ‘extension’; [dʒʊkkiŋu] (I: S36) ~ [dʒʊkkiŋu]

¹ The items without any indication of data sources were commonly used by the subjects.
As Clyne (1991: 174) argues, “the most important factor determining degree of variation is level of competence, but base dialect in the community language and attitude to transference are also significant.” The follow-up interview reveals that S13 whose level of competence in English is high, for instance, intentionally adopts a more integrated form [tsū:rakkū] for the place name “Toorak” in speaking to a Japanese person. It is recognised that proper nouns are phonologically less assimilative than common nouns (see Appendix 8 (1.4.2.12)). Rather than employing the innovating mora [tü], however, the subject uses the traditional mora [tsū] even for the proper noun, despite her good command of English. This fact illustrates that attitude towards transference plays a significant role in phonological integration of transferred items.

6.2.2. Prosodic Integration

As discussed in Chapter 3, prosodic integration represents the substitution of L1 accent or intonation patterns for L2 counterparts. Prosodic integration occurs through PRS 2 (i.e., employ L1 prosodic features for a lexical transfer). Note again that MS 1 (i.e., truncate part of a free morpheme or morphemes to conform to the native or Sino-Japanese prosody) is also an important strategy for prosodic integration. Observe the following example:
(1) Anoo chotto tsuite buratto aruite, Kin-kuro no ushirokkawa o tamatama aruita n desu yo ne. (I: S38)

‘Uhm, I walked a little on arrival. I happened to walk in the area behind Kings Cross, you know.’

Kin-kuro\(^{-}\) [kiŋkuro] (I: S38), (O: S30), (O: NS1) is a clipping compound form of the place name Kingusu Ku\(^{1}\)rosu [kiŋ\(^{2}\)us\(^{3}\)kus\(^{4}\)u\(^{5}\)ros\(^{6}\)] ‘Kings Cross’. In this case, together with MS 1, MS 3 (i.e., combine L2 free morphemes or clipped elements) is employed. The frequent use of this place name and the principle of the least effort have activated these strategies, generating the four-mora word Kin-kuro from the seven-mora word Kingusu Kuros\(^{1}\). Note that this shortened form is pronounced as an unaccented word due to the ordinary prosodic rule generated by PRS 2. It is also noteworthy that Kin-kuro was used by the subjects with a moderate or low level of competence in English, and that no examples of this clipping compound were observed in the speech of the subjects with a high level of competence. The subject (S31) with a near-native command of English employed the English shortened form, i.e., “(the) Cross” for Kings Cross, although his pronunciation (Ku\(^{1}\)rosu [ku\(^{2}\)ros\(^{6}\)]) was phonologically and prosodically integrated into the Japanese sound system.

Another frequently used clipping compound that is realised by means of PRS 2, MS 1, and MS 3 is waak\(^{1}\)hor\(^{1}\) (I: S18), (I: S37) for waakingu hor\(^{1}\)ridee ‘working holiday’. Waak\(^{1}\)ingu\(^{-}\) (I: S30), (I: S81) is another truncated variant of waakingu hor\(^{1}\)idee that is formed through PRS 2 and MS 1.

As discussed in 5.4, the place name Noosu Shi\(^{1}\)donii [noːs\(^{1}\)uʃi\(^{2}\)dɔn\(^{2}\)] ‘North Sydney’ is shortened to the three-mora word No\(^{1}\)losu [noːs\(^{1}\)ʊ] as a result
of clipping the second free morpheme in the compound (MS 1). This item has gained general currency in the Japanese community in Sydney. The ordinary prosodic rule at work via PRS 2 places the accent on the syllable which contains the antepenultimate mora. Another example of this type of transfer is a\ndaa for andaagurajue\eto ‘undergraduate’ (e.g., andaa no hito [under + Gen + person] ‘undergraduate’ (I: S13)). It is also noteworthy that Chaachi, the clipped form of the place name Kuraisutocha\achi ‘Christchurch’ is used by some Japanese residents in Christchurch (O: NS5). This lexical item is often unaccented.

With respect to accent assignment rules, it can be said that as lexical integration progresses, transferred items tend to become unaccented. Examples: chippusu− ‘chips’ (I: S1), (I: S9), (I: S18); doraiba− ‘driver’ (I: S54), (O: NS6), raundo− ‘round’ (I: S3), (I: S4), (I: S72); suchuudento− ‘student’ (I: S2), (I: S18), (O: NS7). Note that frequency of use is a significant factor for prosodic integration (see Appendix 8 (1.6)). An examination of these examples reveals that the unaccented feature serves as a marker of group membership, as each of these unaccented items is frequently used by a certain group of people (i.e., chippusu− by students or young people, doraiba− by tour guides, raundo− by people on working holiday, suchuudento− by students or young people).

6.2.3. Grammatical Integration

Grammatical integration occurs by means of STS 2 (i.e., employ L1 syntactic rules for a lexical transfer) and/or MSs 1-5 (see 3.4.1.1.1). Via STS 2, L2 syntactic rules that are different from those of L1 are likely to be omitted or replaced by L1 counterparts. Examine the example below:
(2) Sore de sebun dee oopun ni naru to...kekkyoku rento ga appu ni natta eikyoo de. (I: S30)

'So, we are open seven days a week...after all, because the rent has been put up.'

As shown above, the plural morpheme (-s) in English tends to be deleted as in sebun dee ' (lit.) seven day', as it has no grammatical function in Japanese. Due to the lack of nominal inflections in terms of gender, person, number, and case, Japanese can easily transfer English nouns without any morphological readjustment as in rento in example (2) above (see Appendix 8 (2.1)). Any articles preceding English nouns are normally deleted by means of STS 2. With regard to the word-order, the noun phrase sebun dee which serves as a time adverbial precedes the verb in the above example. This word-order differs from the customary word-order in English where a time adverbial usually follows the verb.

As the above example shows, STS 2 converts lexical categories of transfers. Due to this strategy, the English adjective “open” is recategorised as the Japanese adjectival noun oopun. When this transfer oopun is followed by the particle ni, oopun ni functions as an adverb modifying the intransitive verb naru ‘to become’. By the same token, the English adverb “up” becomes the Japanese adverb appu ni. In the case of verbs, the English verb “to share,” for instance, is transferred as a verbal noun sheaa accompanied by the verb suru in Japanese (e.g., ...sannin de ano, apaato o sheaa shita n desu ne. ‘ ...three of us, uh, shared the apartment, you know.’ (I: S23)). By means of STS 2 English verbs are recategorised as nouns through the verbal noun construction in Japanese (see Tsujimura 1996: 138-41, 277-79; Azuma 1997: 5-7; Appendix 8 (2.1)).
Morphological strategies also play a significant part in the process of integration of lexical transfers. MS 1 truncates part of a lexical item to conform to the native prosody. Some Japanese wives in Sydney used the three-mora *pikku* 'to pick', that is, a clipped form of the six-mora verb phrase *pikku appu* 'to pick up' for picking up their children after school (e.g., ...sanji yonjuu gofun ni *pikku shitara,* ...‘...after picking up my children at three forty five,...’ (I: S16); ...kodomo no *pikku* ga yoji gurai nan desu kedo,... ‘...I pick up my child around four o’clock,...’ (I: S30)). The adoption of MS 1 suggests the frequent use of this lexical item among these housewives. Note that shortened items realised through MS 1 can take the original forms under the influence of the source language. For example, in the JAU/JNZ corpus the well-integrated clipped items *depaato* 'department store' and *biru* 'building' occurred in the original forms, viz., *depaatamento sutoaa* (I: S5), (I: S41); and *birudingu* (I: S29), (I: S30), (I: S44) respectively.

MS 3 promotes the use of compounding strategy. One notable example of a compound is the Japanese-coined word *shea-meito* (share + mate) ‘someone who shares a flat/house’ which is in common use in both JAU and JNZ. Other examples include hybrid compounds (or compromise forms) such as *raito mono* (light + thing) ‘low-fat products’ (D: S15), *jii-pii seido* ‘GP system’ (I: S24), *Rasseru doori* ‘Russell Street’ (I: S24), *Haguree kooen* ‘Hagley Park’ (I: S52).

MS 5 (i.e., affixation) also plays a part in integrating transfers. The following are examples of hybrid affixation: *materiaru-shugi* (material + -ism) ‘materialism’ (I: S37); *Oojii-san* (Aussie + honorific suffix) ‘Mr/Ms Aussie’ (I: S2); *Oojii-ka* (Aussie + -fy) ‘to make or become Australian in outlook, attitudes, etc.’, (e.g.,...karada made *Oojii-ka* shichau. ‘...you will become an Aussie even physically.’ (I: S68)).
6.2.4. Semantic Integration

Not all lexical transfers assume the meanings used in the source language. As discussed in 3.4.1.1.1 and Appendix 8 (3), lexical items from L2 may take on meanings different from the original ones, owing to the semantic strategies for integration operating in lexical transference. Note, however, that some of the semantic strategies employed in Japan undergo changes as a result of prolonged language contact in the Australian/New Zealand environment.

For instance, due to SS 2 (i.e., specialise or restrict the original meaning) birudingu ‘building’ usually represents a Western high-rise in Japan. However, this lexical transfer is used in its original meaning, i.e., ‘something built with a roof and walls’ in JAU/JNZ (I: S29), (I: S30), (I: S72). By the same token, booifurendo assumes the original meaning, i.e., ‘favoured male companion of a girl or young woman’ in JAU/JNZ (I: S23) rather than the extended meaning, i.e., ‘a male friend’ adopted through SS 3 in Japan. The use of the lexical transfer doraibu (suru) ‘to drive’ in Japan is usually specialised to mean ‘to go for a drive’, but in JAU/JNZ the item also takes on the meaning of ‘to drive a car’ (I: S36), (I: S40), (I: S74), (I: S85) (e.g., I: ...kochira no omise made itsumo... S: Hai, doraibu desu ne. ‘I: ...to this restaurant do you always... S: Yes, I come here by car.’ (I: S36)).

A semantic shift which occurs by means of SS 4 (i.e., change the original meaning) is corrected toward the original meaning in JAU/JNZ as in doraibuwei ‘driveway’ (e.g., Anoo doraibuwei no sooji ga taihen da toka, soo iu men wa
aru n desu kedo. ‘Uhm, there are some things which require hard work such as cleaning the driveway.’ (I: S14)); and rookaru ‘local’ (I: S2), (I: S37), (I: S85), (D: NS2). In Japan doraibweyi means ‘highway’, while rookaru has the sense of ‘rural’. It is noteworthy that due to SS 4 the lexical transfer Nyuujii takes on the meaning of ‘New Zealander’ among some Japanese speakers in Sydney (e.g., I: Kanojo Oojii? S: Iya, Nyuujii. ‘I: Is she an Australian? S: No, she is a New Zealander.’ (PO: S9)). It appears that this semantic shift is promoted by analogy with Oojii ‘Aussie’. In JNZ Nyuujii is used in its original meaning, that is, ‘New Zealand’ (e.g., Nyuujii ni iru to, futotchaimasu yo ne. ‘Living in New Zealand, it’s easy to gain weight, isn’t it.’ (PO: NS3)).

As noted in Chapter 3, SS 5 (i.e., assign a semantic place to a lexical transfer to avoid a conflict with its native equivalent) distinguishes between the lexical transfer raisu ‘rice’ and gohan in a Japanese context. However, this semantic distinction may be lost and these two items stand in free variation in JAU/JNZ (I: S64), (O: S30).

Although some core lexical transfers are employed through SS 6 (i.e., adopt a core lexical transfer in a compound), constituents of compounds may be used on their own in JAU/JNZ (e.g., fiudo ‘food’ (I: S30)) (cf. jankufiudo ‘junk food’ (D: S1)).

Abstract concepts are less subject to transference (see Appendix 8 (3.2)). In the predominantly Japanese setting in Japan, Sino-Japanese words are usually adopted to represent abstract notions via SS 7 (i.e., employ a Sino-Japanese word for a foreign abstract concept) and LS 2 (i.e., employ a native/Sino-Japanese word rather than a lexical transfer). However, in the JAU/JNZ setting, lexical transfers/code-switches are used to represent some abstract nouns. Examples: ajasutomento ‘adjustment’ (I: S17); akutibitii ‘activity’ (I: S1), (I: S33); deribariti ‘delivery’
SS 8 (i.e., play up the [+ prestigious] or [− direct] semantic feature of a core lexical transfer) plays a role in semantic integration of transfers in JAU/JNZ as well. Examples: *disuadobantejji* ‘disadvantage’ (cf. *furī*) (e.g., ...aa iu *autobakku* ni sunde te mo, ano *disuadobantejji* aru n da kedo mo... ‘...even if you live in the outback like that, and uh, you may have disadvantages for that,...’ (I: S37)); *kitchin hando* ‘kitchen hand’ (cf. *daidokoro no shitabataraki*) (e.g., ...*kitchin hando* mo *waakingu* no hito ga konai shi,... ‘...people on working holiday don’t come to work as kitchen hands,...’ (I: S30)). As discussed in 3.4.1.1.3, SS 8 also functions as an off-record politeness strategy, as the semantic opacity of core transfers satisfies euphemistic needs.

From what has been discussed above, it can be assumed that a partial restructuring of the lexical field has taken place because of some changes of the aforementioned semantic strategies in the Australian/New Zealand environment.

### 6.3. Transference Phenomena (Other than Lexical Transference) Identified in the Corpus

#### 6.3.1. Phonological Transference

Phonological transference to Japanese takes place by means of the following phonological strategies: PS 5 (i.e., adopt an innovative/bilingual mora to fill phonological gaps); PS 6 (i.e., pronounce an L2 morpheme based on the sound); and PS 10 (i.e., adopt the original L2 sound or a sound close to the
As noted in 3.4.1.1.1, PS 8 (i.e., adopt the pronunciation of Standard British English as a model) or PS 9 (i.e., adopt the pronunciation of Standard American English as a model) normally employed in Japan is likely to change in JAU/JNZ under the influence of the general or broad (or ethnic-broad) variety of AUE/NZE, though it should be noted that the pronunciation of the cultivated variety of AUE/NZE is practically the same as that of Standard British English (see Neustupný 1985d: 89-90, 1992).


PS 6 is employed in JAU/JNZ. Examples: [ʃeɾiːa] ‘area’ (I: S24), [meʃəɾ] ‘major’ (I: S31), [maʃiː] ‘money’ (I: S35), [nuːzʊ] ‘news’ (I: S6), [ʃuːna]/ [ʃuːna] ‘tuna’ (I: S2), (I: S26). Notice that the integrated forms of these lexical transfers normally used in Japan are [erʰia], [meʃaː], [maːniː], [nuːʃiː], and [tsuːna] respectively.
Some English phonemes and allophones are transferred to Japanese on the basis of PS 10. Through PS 4 the alveolar approximant [j] and lateral [l] in English are likely to be under-differentiated and replaced by the apico-alveolar tap [r] in Japanese. However, [l] was sometimes employed as in [leizi:] ‘lazy’ (I: S25); [losûto] ‘lost’ (I: S29); [lo:karu] ‘local’ (I: S37). The voiced labiodental fricative [v] in English was usually replaced by the voiced labial stop [b] in Japanese, but there was one exception to this conversion as in the initialisation [kû:$$\beta$$wibi:] ‘QVB, Queen Victoria Building’ (I: S20). In this example the voiced bilabial fricative [$$\beta$$] is employed instead of [b], but English [v] was not transferred. No examples of transference of the English dental fricatives [θ] and [ð] were found in the JAU/JNZ data. English [θ] is usually replaced by Japanese [s] as in [kasorîkkû] ‘Catholic’ (I: S25), (I: S37), (I: S43); and [ð] by Japanese [z] as in [buraza:inro:] ‘brother-in-law’ (I: S43).

Although the cultivated variants of AUE/NZE were normally used as a model, general/broad AUE/NZE vowel phonemes or allophones were also transferred and replaced by similar Japanese vowels as in [baistû] for [bais]/[bais] ‘base’ (I: S7); [daita] for [daita]/[daita], [da:ta] for [da:ta] ‘data’ (O: S70); [maito] for [mait]/[mait] ‘mate’ (I: S3), (I: S20), (I: S28); [pai$$\phi$$:$$\eta$$] for [pa$$\phi$$:$$\eta$$]/[pa$$\phi$$:$$\eta$$] ‘pay phone’ (I: S8). However, what is important to note here is that, as the analysis of data shows, the use of the general and broad varieties of AUE/NZE still requires metalinguistic awareness on the part of the subject. For instance, S70 felt amused when she heard one of her Australian professors pronounce “data” as [dai:ta]. When she spoke Japanese with her fellow Japanese students, S70 sometimes adopted [dai:ta] for humour. This example shows that the use of general/broad varieties of AUE can involve metalinguistic awareness. Most of the above examples were elicited when the subjects talked about AUE. In this sense, except for the commonly used maito ‘mate,’
the above examples can be considered as code-switches despite their phonologically integrated forms.

6.3.2. Prosodic Transference

Prosodic transference is attributed to PRS 1 (i.e., adopt L2 prosodic features or features close to L2 prosody for a lexical transfer). As seen above, the pitch accent of lexical transfers is usually subject to the accent assignment rule (i.e., the antepenultimate or unaccented rule) operating via PRS 2. However, the preservation of the original (primary) accent location was observed in the corpus, even though individual phonemes or allophones were replaced by the Japanese equivalents through PS4. Examples\(^2\): da[:mejji [damedd3i] (cf. dame\'eji [dame:3i]) 'damage' (I: S36); enji\'la [e\^33ipia] (cf. enji\'nia) 'engineer' (I: S42); futtoboru [\^uttoborru] (cf. futtobo\'oru) 'football' (I: S43); pa\^laan [pata:n] (cf. pata\'an/pata\'n [patan]) 'pattern' (I: S23); sa\'baabu [saba:buu] (cf. saba\'abu) 'suburb' (I: S26), (I: S44); dutandaado [si\^tanda:do] (cf. sutanda\'ado) 'standard' (I: S37); tora\'mu [toramu] (cf. to\'ramu) 'tram' (I: S24). It can be said from these examples that the long-term residents tend to adopt the original English accent location by means of PRS 1.

As Burridge and Mulder (1998: 69) indicate, “a distinctive intonation pattern that occurs in NZ and OZ English is the use of a high rising terminal (HRT) rather than a falling one at the end of a statement” (see also Allan 1984). Clyne (1991: 188) points out that the transference of HRTs to community languages in Australia has been reported by researches in language contact

\(^2\) The examples given in parentheses for comparison show the accent location most likely employed in the predominantly Japanese setting in Japan.
According to Inoue (1998a), the use of HRTs is observed in Tokyo Japanese as well and that the "quasi-questioning" intonation or "half-question" intonation pattern (i.e., "the rising intonation applied to a word in the middle of a sentence" (ibid.: 11)) is also spreading among young female speakers in Tokyo. Examples of both the HRT and the half-question intonation were found in the JAU/JNZ data. However, despite the fact that HRTs were used by some subjects (e.g., (I: S3), (I: S32), (PO: S50)) in Australia and New Zealand, it is not clear whether the examples of HRTs in the corpus are a result of prosodic transference from AUE/NZE or a reflection of recent changes of intonation occurring among Japanese speakers (especially, young females) living in Japan. Observe the examples below:

(3) Anmari kireizuki da to, annari sono jibun ga kaette kireizuki da to,

*Oojii* no hito ni wa kyuukutsu tte iu ka, ano *Oojii* no hito ga yogosenai?

(I: S3)

'If you are so neat, very, uh, meticulous, Australians will feel all the more uncomfortable, uh, they can't behave as they do.'

(4) Uun taboo minasan iu to omou n desu kedo, kurashiyasui?

(I: S32)

'Erm, perhaps everyone says this, I reckon, it's comfortable to live here.'

6.3.3. Grammatical Transference

Grammatical transference occurs via STS 1 (i.e., adopt L2 syntactic/morphosyntactic rules for a lexical transfer). Unlike typologically proximate language pairs in contact (e.g., German/Dutch in contact with English; see Clyne 1967, 1972a, 1991), an examination of the JAU/JNZ corpus shows that
as far as syntax is concerned, the Japanese spoken by the first-generation Japanese adults is rather resilient to transference from AUE/NZE. The canonical Japanese word-order (Subject-Object-Verb) is stable in the corpus.

Due to STS 1, however, some morphosyntactic rules were transferred as part of lexical transfers from AUE/NZE to JAU/JNZ. Examples: *Oojii ruuruzu* 'Oz rules' (I: S1), (I: S31) [plural morpheme]; *hasshuto poteto* 'hashed potatoes' (I: S68), *konpyuutaraizu to bokko-kiipingu* ‘computerised book-keeping’ (I: S37), *saabisuto apaatonineto* ‘serviced apartment’ (I: S69) [past participle morpheme]; *masutaazuu koosu* ‘master’s course’ (I: S15) [possessive morpheme].

As repeatedly noted, the English definite article “the” was transferred to Japanese as the emphatic affix *za* (e.g., *za-shoosha fujin* ‘the wife of a representative of a trading firm’ (I: S12)). The use of *za* is, however, not peculiar to JAU/JNZ, and it occurs in the predominantly Japanese setting in Japan as well (e.g., *Sutoppu za kootsuujiko*. ‘Stop the traffic accident.’).³

There was one example of transference of the English indefinite article “a.” Observe the following example:

(5) ...atashi wa mukashi ano sho~shoogakkoo de *a tiichingu ashisutanto* o shite ita n desu kedo,... (I: S15)

‘...I used to work as a teaching assistant in, uh, pri-primary school, and...’

This subconscious use of the determiner by the subject may be attributed to the “anticipational triggering” (Clyne 1991: 195; see also 3.2.1.3) by the subsequent trigger word, that is, the lexical transfer *tiichingu ashisutanto*.

---

³ This example is taken from a brochure issued by Aichi Prefecture, Japan (Aichi-ken Kootsuu Anzen Suishin Kyooogikai, 1999). See also Ishino (1983: 129, 159-60).
'teaching assistant'. This example may be considered to be a code-switch of the NP despite its phonological integration into Japanese.

6.3.4. Semantic Transference

The adoption of SS 1 (i.e., transfer words in meaning only) gives rise to semantic transference, leading to the use of LS 2 (i.e., employ native/Sino-Japanese words). Hence, SS 1 prevents the use of lexical transfers. As Clyne (1991: 176) states, semantic transfers are "indicative of a puristic tendency on the part of the speaker to avoid 'English forms'." Interlingual identification between two languages in contact plays a part in semantic transference. Morphemic, phonological, or semantic correspondence between items in two languages promotes this type of transference. In Australian Italian, for example, the word fattoria 'farm' has assumed the meaning of 'factory' because of the phonetic similarity between the two items (ibid.: 175; see also Bettoni 1981: 69-70). In the JAU/JNZ corpus, however, no examples of transference of this type were found except for the semantic transfer kuruma 'car/automobile' that is commonly used in the JAU/JNZ setting as well as in Japan. Other examples identified in the corpus are concerned with "loan translations" (e.g., gooshuujin 'Australians' (I: S24); chukagai 'Chinatown' (I: S15), (I: S31)) (see Appendix 8 (2.1 and 3.2)).

6.3.5. Pragmatic Transference

By means of PMS 1 (i.e., adopt L2 rules/features of interaction in an L1 context), pragmatic transference takes place. Two types of pragmatic transference were found in the corpus. The first type is the use of a first name.
In the interview situation, S67 addressed the present writer by his first name with the honorific suffix -san. Irrespective of their ages, several female subjects (e.g., S18, S40, S41, S43, S68) introduced themselves by using their first names when they met the present writer for the first time. On the other hand, male subjects normally used their family names at the time of introduction (PMS 2), although in everyday situation they also employed their first names (often shortened forms or Anglicised versions), transferring the English rule of social interaction to Japanese.

The second type is the adoption of English editing words such as “uh,” “er,” “uhm” in Japanese-based interactions. Examples:

(6) Uh oyogu no wa suki na n desu kedo, kotchi no umi tsuetasugite hairenai n desu yo. (I: S7)

‘Uh, I like swimming, but the sea here is too cold for swimming, I tell you.’

(7) Uhm maa raku desu ne, hijoo ni. (I: S31)

‘Uhm, well, it’s easy, you know, very easy.’

This second type of pragmatic transference was normally used by the subjects with a good knowledge of English.

6.4. Functions of Transference/Code-switching

In this section, the main functions of transfers/code-switches identified in the corpus are presented. As noted in Chapter 1, intra-sentential code-switches are regarded as unintegrated transfers (including compounds and phrases), and that intra-sentential code-switches and lexical transfers are therefore looked
upon as a continuum in this study. Examples of lexical transference and code-switching (both intra- and inter-sentential) in the corpus show that one of the functions of lexical transference/code-switching is to provide the context of situation in which one of the languages is used. In order to contextualise the speaker's past or present experiences, lexical transfers/code-switches play a significant part in interaction. The chief functions of transference/code-switching dealt with in this section are as follows: (i) referential; (ii) quotation; (iii) expressive; (iv) metaphorical/rhetorical; (v) metalinguistic (cf. Appel and Muysken 1987: 118-20; see also 3.2.1.3). Although this may not be an exhaustive list, the main functions identified in the present corpus are classified into these groups. The question of which contact strategies are associated with these functions will also be discussed.

(i) Referential

One of the significant functions of transference/code-switching is a referential function. As discussed in 3.2.1.3, L2 contexts promote transference of L2 lexical items; on the other hand, L1 references tend to trigger the use of L1 lexical items. Topics appertaining to Australian/New Zealand environments give rise to lexical transference/code-switching, while topics relating to Japan are likely to trigger the adoption of the native lexicon. It appears that semantic appropriateness of given concepts or objects in certain contexts plays a role in these processes. We have already seen some of the examples of the referential function in Chapter 5. The main strategies operating in these lexical transference/code-switching processes were LS 1 (LS 1.1 and LS 1.2) (i.e., adopt a lexical transfer) and LS 2 (i.e., employ a native word rather than a lexical transfer). Some more examples are shown below:
(8) Sore kara modotte, de maa, ocha shi- *afutanum tii o hosuto famiriit* to issho ni totte... (I: S55)

‘After that, I go home, and well, I drink tea- have afternoon tea with my host family and...’

(9) Ichiban sukunai *kurasu de kindii ga juukunin de, ato iyaa wan kara shikkusu wa daitai sanjuunin chikaku iru n desu.* (I: S55)

‘The smallest class is a kindy class which has 19 pupils, and each class from year one to six has about 30.’

(10) Na- nan demo kekkoo suki desu kedo, anoo *Chainiizu, Chainiizu wa yasuku- yasukute maa kuchi ni aimasu yo ne, itsumo.* (I: S13)

‘I like all- all kinds of dishes, but, erm, Chinese, Chinese food is chea-cheap and well, it’s tasty, always.’

(11) Ima ano *Eijan Sutadiizu no emu-ee no gakusei nan desu ga, kore watashi no moo sekando semesutaa ni narimasu. Faasuto semesutaa wa Pedagoji to Hisutorikaru Ringisutikku, ato Kuritikaru Seortii o totemashita.* (I: S63)

‘I am currently an MA student in Asian Studies. This is already my second semester. In the first semester I took Pedagogy, Historical Linguistics, and Critical Theory.’

(12) Uun machii zuutto *iisutan sabaabu ni sunde ru node, iisutan sabaabu wa suki desu ne. To iu no wa haabaa ga Shidonii ga a Shidonii Haabaa ga miwataseru.* (I: S34)

‘Uhm, about the city, as I’ve always lived in the eastern suburbs, I like
the eastern suburbs. Because you can see the harbour, Sydney, uh, Sydney Harbour from there.'

The above examples illustrate the referential function of transference/code-switching in L2 contexts. It can be seen from these examples that the AUE environment promotes the use of L2 items in the speech of these residents in Australia.

As already shown in Chapter 5 (example (12)), transference/code-switching also plays a part in overcoming lexical difficulties caused by memory lapse or language attrition. A resort to external language resources helps the speaker to achieve his/her communicative goal in a given situation. As Appel and Muysken (1987: 118) point out, transference/switching “often involves lack of knowledge of one language or lack of facility in that language on a certain subject.” However, note again that if the use of L2 items is negatively evaluated by the speaker or other participants in interaction, CRSs and/or TMSs are also employed. Observe the following examples taken from the long-term residents in Sydney:

(13) Sono nan te iu kana, tsumari tradesman desu yo ne, ano wa, ate ni naranai no. (I: S43)

‘Uh, uhm, that is, tradesmen, you know. Uh, you can’t count on them.’

(14) Anoo are ga nai no ne, peishensu ga. Peishensu tte iu no kana, nintairyoku ga nakute umaku ikanakattara moo dame, opporidasu. (I: S44)

‘Uhm, I don’t have that thing, you know, patience. I don’t have what might be called patience, that is, perseverance, and I will just give it up if I can’t do it well.’
(15) Koko ni nihonjin no ano sen’in kyo~ ano nihongo de nan~ mission of the seaman tte, doko no kuni ni mo kite, anoo soko ni kuru sen’in san o tasukeru kyookai ga aru n desu ne. (I: S44)
‘There is a church here for Japanese, uh, seamen- Uh, what (is it called) in Japanese- It’s called a mission of the seaman, and there is one of those churches in any country, erm, which give a helping hand to sailors who visit there.’

In (13) S43, not recalling the Japanese word, adopted the code-switch "tradesman" via LS 1.2 after the use of the hedge tsumari ‘that is to say’ (TMS 3). In (14) the core lexical transfer peishensu ‘patience’ was the initially available word for S44, but after the use of this L2 item through LS 1.2, she post-corrected it and via LS 2 (i.e., use of native/Sino-Japanese items) employed the Japanese counterpart. In (15) S44, having difficulty in recalling the native item, resorted to LS 1.2 and adopted the corresponding English phrase accompanied by the Japanese explanation/gloss (TMS 4).

(ii) Quotation

Another significant function of transference/code-switching identified in the corpus is quotation. Gumperz (1982: 75-76) states: “In many instances the code switched passages are clearly identifiable either as direct quotations or as reported speech.” Quotations are considered to be conducive to conceptualising the past or present incident the speaker was/is involved in. The following are some examples taken from the JAU data:
(16) Ma kochira ga katta toki ni, moo Oojii no kata wa saigo ni congratulation to ka tte iu n desu yo. 
‘Well, when we win the game, our Australian tennis partners say “congratulations” or something like that after the game.’

(17) Sono tooji wa yappari doo shite mo koo nihonjin tte iu to ne, koo buradii Jappu tte iwareteta kara...
‘In those days, after all, er, the Japanese were simply called, er, “bloody Japs”…’

(18) Kantoriisaido de wa yoku fair dinkum to ka kiitemashita kara.
‘When I lived in the countryside, I often heard people say “fair dinkum” or something.’

(19) Atta toki ni ne, yappari minna ga nan ka how’s it going, mate? mitai na kanji de iu hito toka iru kara.
‘As I expected, there are many Australians who greet me by saying “How’s it going, mate?” or something like that.’

(20) S: Sore de sono hito no uchi ni ano ji-anoo keisatsu ga norikondara, toohin no yama de uzumatchatte (h) Sore de jeiru ni san- sannen haitta n desu ne.
I: Ee ee ee.
S: Aimashita yo dete kita no to, doroboo ni.
I: Nan ka itemashita ka?
S: Sugoi no. Hello, Mrs --- to koo kita wa ne (h) Moo doo shiyou mo nai (h)
(I: S44)
"S: And, uh, the police investigated that man's house and found it filled with the stolen goods. So he was in jail for three- three years.

I: Yes, mm hmm.

S: I bumped into the man after he was released, that thief.

I: Did he say something to you?

S: It's awesome. He said, "Hello, Mrs ---." Well, he is hopeless.'

(21) ...uun koko o koko oopun shita toki ni, erm, could I have a tea now? tte kiita kara, oh, of course tte itte soshite irete agetara, nan no ocha ga ii desu ka, green tea ga ii desu ka, black tea de ii, jasmine tea desu ka tte kiite. Atashi ga sore ocha no koto ka to omottara, yappari tii dakara sapaa mitai na mono ga tabetakatta n (da keredo mo). Sore ga- o waratchatta koto ga arimasu yo ne. (I: S29)

'...uhm, when we opened this, this restaurant, a customer said to me, erm, "Could I have a tea now?" I said, "Oh, of course" and made tea for him, asking if he wanted green tea, black tea, or jasmine tea. I thought he just wanted to drink a cup of tea, but after all, he wanted to eat supper or something because it was tea. We laughed about the incident later.'

(iii) Expressive

"Speakers emphasize a mixed identity through the use of two languages in the same discourse" (Appel and Muysken 1987: 119). The expressive function of transference/code-switching was already illustrated in Chapter 5 (examples (15) and (16)). The adoption of an L2 gloss (TMS 4) for an L1 synonym plays a part in expressing the mixed or multiple identity of the bilingual speaker. This is
not the only case where the mixed identity of the speaker is expressed. Consider the additional examples below:

(22) S: Saisho komatta no ga desu ne, pai foon.
I: Pai foon..aa hai hai.
S: Haa? I'd like to connect to contact to Japan and nan da, sonoo but I have no small money. De komatte tashika tosho- soogoo toshokan no hoo e itta no ka naa. Soshitara soko ni pai foon ga aru kara tte iu n desu yo. Haa? Pai foon? Nan ka koo san ten ichi yon ni kankei aru, iya chigau naa, saifon no kankei kana to ka itte (h) Juppun gurai wakannakute oshimondoo shimashita (h) Hidoi su ne. (I: S8)
'S: The word which gave me a tough time first was a pay phone.
I: A pay phone. Oh, uh-hum.
S: What? I'd like to make a phone call to Japan and what, uh, but I have no change. So not knowing what to do, as I recall, I went to the libra-the main library. Then, someone told me that there was a pay phone in the library. What? A pay phone? The first thing that came into my mind was, er, the mathematical pi, that is, 3.14. Oh, no, it’s not that. Is it a siphon, then? It took me about ten minutes to understand what it was. Awful, isn’t it.'

(23) Dee genzai mo, oo asa hachiji kara yonaka made buttooshi de, ee se bun deizu a uiiku de yattemasu node... (I: S62)
‘And now, too, er, we are working without a break from seven o’clock in the morning till late at night, uh, seven days a week, so...’
(24) Eeto ne, yasumi wa ne, doyoobi ga yuugata kara, dee nichiyooobi ga all day, 
...nichiyooobi wa atashitachi Kurisuchan nan desu yo, dakara chaachi ni
ikanakya nannai no.  
‘Uhm, we are closed on Saturday evening and all day on Sunday,…on
Sundays, we are Christians, so we must go to church.’

(25) OK, wakarimashita. Reito afutamun to iu koto de.  
‘OK, I got it. I’ll see you in the late afternoon.’

(26) I: Shiminken nan ka mo [kochira no.
    S: [Ano Oosutorarian nashonaritii o motte ru n desu.
    I: Aa.
    S: De Nihon no nashonaritii wa moo haki shita n desu.  
       (I: S43)
    ‘I: Do you have citizenship [here?]’
    S: [Uh, my nationality is Australian.
    I: Oh.
    S: So, I’ve given up Japanese nationality.’

In (22) S8 code-switched to English. It is most likely that in this case
the lexical transfer pai foon ‘pay phone’ triggered code-switching (consequential
triggering). Notice that when describing his past experience, the subject used
the present tense, creating some dramatic effect in speech. It can be supposed
that through this inter-sentential code-switching, the subject’s desire to be
assimilated into the English-speaking community is also expressed. Examples
(23-26) show that a mixed identity on the part of individual subjects is
conveyed through the use of L2 items in Japanese-based discourse (LS 1.2).
(iv) Metaphorical/Rhetorical

The metaphorical or rhetorical function of transference/code-switching was often employed by the subjects to achieve a special effect in speech. Performing more than a referential function, this function highlights the meaning conveyed by way of lexical transference/code-switching in a given context. As seen in Chapter 5 (example (8)), it achieves a humorous effect as well. It is also a useful device for stylistic purposes. Euphemistic needs are satisfied through this function, too. This function is associated with LS 1.2 (i.e., adopt a core lexical transfer), SS 8 (i.e., play up the [+ prestigious]/[-- direct] semantic feature of a lexical transfer), and off-record politeness strategy (i.e., play up indirectness and euphemism in language use). Consider the following examples:

(27) ...umidemo anoo yama demo watashi wa aruku koto ga suki desu kara...
issentumemonosukinahitowauerukamu desu. (I: S41)
‘...in the seaside or, uhm, the mountains, I like walking, so...everyone interested in walking is always welcome.’

(28) ...futariga tsukiaun desu. Kodomo wa soo iu toki wa moo kodomo wa hontowa moo sooiutokishoutout.Suiminyakunomashitene,kodomo oitektiteiuitodatteikura demosimasu yo. (I: S40)
‘...parents go out alone, leaving their children at home. In such a case children are, in such a case children are actually excluded. Many couples I know give their kids sleeping pills and leave them at home, I tell you.’
...anoo sai-fai gakatta Ekkusu Fairu no yoo na, anoo iwayuru

ekusutoraoodinarii teki na mono ga suki de, ee mite masu ne. (I: S9)

‘...uhm, sci-fi types of programmes like X Files, uhm, films dealing with
extraordinary phenomena are my favourite, and, uh, I watch them.’

S: Sore kara asoko chotto kowaku arimasen?
I: Ano Shidonii desu ka?
S: Hai.
I: Uun yahari ookii machi de, anoo uun soo desu nee.
S: Gibu mii manee tte iu no kanari nankai mo. Toku ni nihonjin ni mieru
n deshoo ka, oo desu kara nee. (I: S8)

‘S: And is it a bit scary there?
I: Uh, you mean Sydney?
S: Yes.
I: Uhm, after all, it’s a big city, uh, er, maybe.
S: I’ve quite often come across people who said: “Give me money.”
Especially, maybe because I look like a Japanese, they often begged
money from me.’

In (27) and (28) the use of the core lexical transfers/code-switches uerukamu
‘wecome’ and shut out (LS 1.2) changes a tone of the discourse and produces a
more emphatic effect than that of their native equivalents. In (29) S9 achieved a
humorous and emphatic effect through the employment of the core lexical
transfer (LS 1.2) preceded by the hedge iwayuru (TMS 3) and accompanied by
laughter (TMS 1). In (30) the code-switch Gibu mii manee ‘Give me money’
serves a metaphorical function. It is reasonable to assume that S8 used this L2 quote metaphorically, highlighting his experience of encountering beggars in Sydney.

As mentioned earlier, transference/code-switching plays a part in meeting euphemistic needs through SS 8 and off-record politeness strategy. It also produces stylistic effects such as reiteration, emphasis, clarification, and avoidance of repetition. Examine the examples below:

(31) Oisha san mo furain dokutaa toka, aa iu autobakku ni sundete mo, ano disuadobanteiji aru n da kedo mo, soo iu tokoro ni chikara irete ru desho, koko no kuni no shakaihoshoo tte iu n desu ka.

‘There are also doctors like flying doctors. Even if you live in the outback like that and uh, may have disadvantages for that, the social welfare system in this country is so well-equipped as to overcome such a disadvantage, isn’t it?’

(32) Sunde ru no ga hora Koofirudo desho. Desu kara yappari (2.0) sunde ru ano Juu ga ooi desu yo ne, Yudaya no kata ga.

‘The suburb where I live now is Caulfield, you know. So, as I expected, uh, many Jews live there, Jewish people.’

(33) Meruborun no shinai desu to, soo desu nee, toku ni suki to iu ka, maa jakkan sono, keshiki ga suki da to iu, to iu bubun desu to oo anoo Shu-Shurain obu Rimenburansu? soko kara mita shitti ga suki desu ne...

‘The suburb where I live now is Caulfield, you know. So, as I expected, uh, many Jews live there, Jewish people.’
to *Sausu Banku* no toko kara dochira kara mite mo nite ru wake desu kedo ne.

(I: S22)

‘As far as the city of Melbourne is concerned, let’s see, my favourite place, well, the place of scenic beauty I like, in that respect, is, uh, the Sh- Shrine of Remembrance, and I like the view of the city from there... The view of Melbourne City along the Yara River is also beautiful, and this is another scenic spot. Well, so, these two views are similar. The views of the city from the Shri-, you know, uh, the Shrine of Remembrance and South Bank are similar.’

In (31) the lexical transfer *disuadobantejji* ‘disadvantage’ creates a softening effect which the Sino-Japanese equivalent *furi* might miss. Example (32) illustrates that after the English lexical transfer *Juu* ‘Jew’, the synonym *Yudaya*, which is a well-integrated Latin loanword in Japanese, is used for clarification (see Gumperz 1982: 78). As the follow-up interview revealed, S24 post-corrected the peripheral first item to the established loan out of consideration for the interviewer (see 8.3.4). Note again that CRSs are related to negative politeness strategy. As shown in (33), transference/code-switching is sometimes employed to avoid repetition. S22 first used the Sino-Japanese word *shinai*, meaning the ‘city’, but later adopted the lexical transfer *shitii* (LS 1.2). By the same token, the subject used the L2 item *Shurain obu Rimenburansu* ‘Shrine of Remembrance’ via LS 1.2, but afterwards employed the Sino-Japanese equivalent *sensooireihi* through LS 2. Although in this process the subject tried to adopt the L2 item first, he corrected it via CRS 2 (in-correction strategy) himself and employed the Japanese counterpart through LS 2.
The metalinguistic function of transference/code-switching is concerned with a direct or indirect comment on the languages involved (Appel and Muysken 1987: 120). As seen in Chapter 5 (example (6)), this function is associated with the use of TMS 4 (i.e., make a metalinguistic commentary on a transfer/code-switch).

As in Japan, some Japanese speakers living in an English-speaking environment employ lexical transfers/code-switches in Japanese-based conversations just to show off their knowledge of English or linguistic skills. It appears that for these Japanese speakers the use of English is associated with prestige, elitism, fashionableness, education, and so on (cf. Haarmann 1989). As repeatedly noted, in an overseas setting the speaker's desire for assimilation into mainstream society is an important motivation for the adoption of transference/code-switching in Japanese-based interactions. The use of English also reflects the social identity of the speaker. Hence the metalinguistic function may be related to the social psychological motivation. It seems that prestige motives are a promoting factor for this function. As discussed in Chapter 3, it is also connected to the puristic motivation to separate two languages in certain cases. Observe the examples below:

(34) ...esunikku ga kakkoii koto nan desu ne. Sono yoosuru ni kuuru, ankuuru de iku to, esunikku tte iu no wa kuuru nan desu yo. (I: S31)

'...eating ethnic dishes is a fashionable trend now, you know. Uh, in short, if you use the English word "cool" or "uncool," ethnic dishes are "cool" for them.'
(35) Hitobito no inshoo wa, soo desu ne, yasashii na to omoimashita.

Eigo de iu to, friendly desu. (I: S75)

‘My impression of the people here, well, I thought they were kind.
To say it in English, “friendly” is the word.’

In (34) S31 first used the Japanese word kakkoii. Then after employing the editing word sono (TMS 2) and the hedge yoosuru ni (TMS 3), he introduced the L2 equivalent kuuru ‘cool’ and substituted it for the native word, showing off his knowledge of English (LS 1.2). In (35), on the other hand, the subject’s puristic attitude is evident. S75 first adopted the native word yasashii to describe Australian people. Although its English counterpart “friendly” is a lexical transfer commonly used in Japan, after making a metalinguistic comment eigo de iu to (TMS 4) on the Japanese word, she used the English equivalent which may be more appropriate in an Australian context.

6.5. Summary

In this chapter we have described and analysed the types of integration and transference phenomena (other than lexical transference) identified in the corpus. We have also identified and analysed the types of contact strategies underlying these integration and transference phenomena.

First, the integration phenomena were examined in terms of phonological, prosodic, grammatical, and semantic aspects. The hypothesized processing strategies for integration were all identified. The analysis of data shows that some strategies used in Japan for integrating certain lexical transfers changed as a result of prolonged language contact in the AUE/NZE environment.
Second, the transference phenomena were analysed in terms of phonological, prosodic, grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic aspects. All the hypothesized processing strategies for transference were identified in the corpus. Grammatical transference (STS 1) was found to be rare. The structure of the Japanese language spoken by the first-generation Japanese adults appears to be resilient to the dominant English norm.

Finally, the five main functions of transference/code-switching identified in the corpus (i.e., referential, quotation, expressive, metaphorical/rhetorical, and metalinguistic) were presented. It was also demonstrated how these functions were realised through the employment of contact strategies.
In the present chapter the relationship between the frequency of lexical transference and the subjects' backgrounds is examined through the analysis of 44 interviews conducted in Australia. The following 10 variables are dealt with here: sex, age, occupation, education, hometown, length of stay, type of stay, nationality of spouse, competence in English, and relationship with the interviewer. It is investigated which variables affect lexical transference and what other factors are involved in transference in an interview situation. It is, however, of little use to pinpoint only one factor for promoting or inhibiting transference, as it appears that a variety of factors play a part in triggering or restraining lexical transference to a greater or lesser extent. Bettoni (1981) reports that in the case of Italian-English bilinguals in North Queensland, Australia, transference patterns depend on socio-cultural factors, degree of dominance, and attitudes toward language rather than individual backgrounds and the relative use of the two languages. Thus, taking account of socio-cultural/socio-psychological factors, we shall investigate how individual backgrounds contribute to the incidence of lexical transference in the case of JAU.
7.2. Lexical Transference and the Subjects' Backgrounds

Tables 7.1-7.9 below show the distribution of the 44 Japanese subjects cross-classified by sex and each of the other variables mentioned above.

Table 7.1.--44 subjects cross-classified by sex and age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Row total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger (20-39)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older (40-64)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2.--44 subjects cross-classified by sex and occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Row total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/Office worker</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed/Service worker</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary participant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3.--44 subjects cross-classified by sex and education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Row total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Junior college</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/Graduate school</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.4. 44 subjects cross-classified by sex and hometown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hometown</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Row total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kanto</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansai</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.5. 44 subjects cross-classified by sex and length of stay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of stay (years)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Row total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.6. 44 subjects cross-classified by sex and type of stay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of stay</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Row total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.7. 44 subjects cross-classified by sex and nationality of spouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality of spouse</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Row total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.8.—44 subjects cross-classified by sex and competence in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence in English</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Row total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.9.—44 subjects cross-classified by sex and relationship with interviewer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-group belonging score</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Row total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.10 below shows the total number of words, the frequency and the relative frequency of lexical transfers used by the 44 subjects in Australia. The mean relative frequency of lexical transference in the present corpus was 4.04% (range: 2.36-6.54%). For criteria for word count and inclusion of lexical transfers, see Appendix 5.
Table 7.10.--Frequency table of lexical transference in samples of 44 subjects in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Code</th>
<th>Total number of words</th>
<th>Frequency of lexical transference (tokens)</th>
<th>Relative frequency of lexical transference (%)</th>
<th>W-score (^1) for relative frequency of lexical transference (radian)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>2244</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.1726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>1393</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>.2489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>2871</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.1709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>.2445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>.2268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>3210</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>.2343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.2083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.1793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>3732</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.2105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>2888</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.2220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>2277</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.1668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>.2480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>.2321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>.2427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>.2587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>2172</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.2073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>2495</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.1544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.2032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td>2964</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.2093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S26</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.2094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S27</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S28</td>
<td>5749</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S29</td>
<td>2072</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.2123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S30</td>
<td>4736</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>.2318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S31</td>
<td>5258</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S32</td>
<td>1387</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S33</td>
<td>2615</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.1918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 The percentage (X) of lexical transference was transformed to the score (W) through the arcsine transformation, employing the formula \( W = \arcsin \sqrt{X/100} \) (Woods et al. 1986: 220). The W-score was used for statistically testing the relationship between the relative frequency of lexical transference and the variables.
Based on the above data, statistical tests were first conducted to investigate the relationship between the aforementioned 10 variables and the relative frequency of lexical transference. The t-test (for two groups), the analysis of variance (for more than two groups), the Pearson product-moment correlation (with respect to length of stay) and the Spearman rank order correlation (with respect to relationship with the interviewer) were employed. The statistical program used for analysis is SPSS.

As can be seen from the above tables, the problem is that the number of the subjects in some groups within those variables is small (e.g., competence in English). It was therefore expected that the analysis of mean differences between the groups which are unequal in size might lead to statistically insignificant results. The results of the tests revealed that most of the variables were not significant statistically, but two variables did turn out to be significant. These variables are length of stay and type of stay. Although focus falls on these variables, the rest of the variables are also discussed briefly below in order to supplement the test results.
7.2.1. Sex

It was initially assumed that, as women are regarded as more inclined to use standard forms than men (see Holmes 1992, Wardhaugh 1992), sex differences might affect the subjects’ use of lexical transference in a formal interview situation, but there was not much difference in the mean value of lexical transference between male and female groups in our corpus (i.e., males: 4.11%; females: 3.96%). As illustrated in Figure 7.1 below, however, there is greater in-group variation within the female group than within the male group. The sex variable is further examined below with each of the remaining variables mentioned above.

7.2.2. Length of Stay

As shown in Figure 7.1 below, approximately up to 50 months the frequency of lexical transference was relatively high, but after that it gradually decreased and around 250 months the frequency rate returned to almost the same rate which the newcomers exhibited. The result of the Pearson product-moment correlation indicates that there is a low negative correlation between relative frequency of lexical transference and length of stay \((r = -.368, p = .014, r\text{-square} = .14)\). Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level. Notice that for the first few years of residence there was substantial variation in the frequency of lexical transference, but the variation was reduced as the length of stay increased. It appears that during the period of 50-250 months (approximately 4-20 years) the identity as Japanese immigrants is gradually established, and that, as Japanese residents become aware of their identity as
migrants, their metalinguistic awareness becomes stronger (see Masumi-So 1983) and accordingly they are likely to separate the two language systems. It therefore appears that the long-term residents employed different contact strategies from those of the short-term visitors when they spoke to the present writer in the interviews. Notice that for the first few years of stay the females exhibited greater in-group variation in lexical transference than the males.

![Figure 7.1. Correlation between length of stay and relative frequency of lexical transference in samples of 44 subjects](image)

7.2.3. Type of Stay

With regard to the type of stay variable, it was assumed that the two groups of residents holding different types of residence status (i.e., permanent vs. temporary) might adopt different contact strategies, reflecting the varying degrees of lexical transference. As long-term residents normally have permanent residence visas,
this variable is related to the length of stay variable. The mean relative frequencies of lexical transference for the temporary and permanent groups were 4.37% (standard deviation: 1.19%) and 3.68% (standard deviation: 0.73%) respectively. The following figure shows that the temporary group exhibited a higher mean relative frequency of lexical transference than the permanent group. This difference was statistically significant at the 0.05 level ($t = 2.207, p = .033, df = 42$).

![Figure 7.2. Mean relative frequencies of lexical transference in samples of 44 subjects, by type of stay and sex](image)

As illustrated in the above bar chart, the females (4.43%) in the temporary group exhibited slightly higher mean relative frequency of lexical transference than the males in the same group (4.29%), whereas the reverse is the case with the permanent group (females: 3.40%; males: 3.93%). It appears that some of the short-term female subjects were anxious to learn and use English while the long-term female subjects were inclined to avoid the use of lexical transfers in the interviews with the present writer.
7.2.4. Relationship with the Interviewer

In order to examine the "relationship with the interviewer" variable, all the interviews were conducted by the present writer. On the basis of the assumption that the subjects' perception of identity characteristics of the interviewer plays a part in lexical transference (cf. Gibbons 1987: 128), a five-point "in-group belonging score" was formulated in order to investigate the relationship of each subject to the present writer (see 4.2.2.3). However, the result of the Spearman rank order correlation shows that there is no significant correlation between these two variables (rho = .103, p = .504). The following graphs illustrate the relationship between mean relative frequencies of lexical transference and in-group belonging scores.

Figure 7.3. Relationship between mean relative frequency of lexical transference and in-group belonging score in samples of 44 subjects
As shown in Figures 7.3 and 7.4, eight subjects achieved the highest in-group belonging score, namely four. These subjects share four common features with the interviewer in terms of in-group belonging (i.e., (i) acquaintance/friend, (ii) common acquaintance/friendship network, (iii) same type of stay, and (iv) same occupation). They were sojourners studying at university and friends or acquaintances of the present writer. These subjects exhibited the highest mean relative frequency of lexical transference (4.64%). As argued in Chapter 3, the use of lexical transfers plays a significant part in in-group boosting.

On the other hand, it appears that the reason why the subjects with two points reflected the lowest mean proportion of lexical transference (3.82%) is that many long-term/permanent residents were included in this group. As noted above, the long-term subjects tended to suppress the use of lexical transfers in the interviews with the investigator who was an out-group member for them.
Seven subjects scored one point. Unlike the prediction, this group exhibited higher mean value (4.07%) than groups two (3.82%) and three (4.02%). All the subjects in the one-point-group were permanent residents, but their length of residence in Australia was less than 15 years. As permanent residents some of them - especially the male subjects (S25, S30) - had a strong desire to adjust themselves to mainstream society and were inclined to use lexical transfers readily. These factors appear to be conducive to their relatively high mean proportion of lexical transference despite the lowest in-group belonging score. Note that this group contained the female subject (S23) who reflected the lowest relative frequency of lexical transference (2.36%) of all the subjects. As illustrated in Figure 7.4, this fact contributed to the much lower mean proportion of lexical transference of the female group (3.48%), compared with that of the male group (4.51%).

Finally, the high mean relative frequency of the female three-point-group (4.85%) can be attributed to the fact that the short-term female subjects (S5, S18) who were eager to learn and use English belonged to this group. Notice that up to point three, the frequency of lexical transference in the female group increased while that in the male group decreased. This may suggest that the degree of in-group belongingness plays a more important part in lexical transference in the female group.

7.2.5. Occupation

As argued in Chapter 5, it was assumed that occupation was one of the important factors for lexical transference. Occupation-related words were
considered as subject to lexical transference despite the existence of their native counterparts. Notice that this feature was included as one of the four features constituting the in-group belonging score. Although the result of analysis of variance shows that the group difference was not significant at the 0.05 level ($F = 2.526, p = .071, df = 3$), this result can be considered to be indicative of some influence of occupation upon the frequency of lexical transference.

![Figure 7.5. Mean relative frequencies of lexical transference in samples of 44 subjects, by occupation and sex](image)

The tertiary group exhibited the highest mean relative frequency of lexical transference (4.63%). This group of subjects shared the common occupation with the interviewer, and therefore showed a tendency to adopt those words associated with university life in Australia without resorting to pre-correction strategy (CRS 1). Another reason why the tertiary group used lexical transfers more frequently than any other group is that these subjects were temporary residents who were eager to master English. It can be said that the motivation to learn English promoted the frequent use of lexical transfers by some of the subjects. As examined in 7.2.3,
the temporary group exhibited a higher proportion of lexical transference than the permanent group. The group of office workers showed the second highest mean relative frequency of lexical transference (4.29%). As shown in Figure 7.5, this group contained a female subject (S21) who exhibited the highest relative frequency rate (6.54%) of all the subjects. Like the tertiary group, the office group also had an English-speaking work network that provided English input with the subjects in everyday life. The use of English at work seems to be a promoting factor for lexical transference in the interview context.

On the other hand, the remaining two groups, that is, the service and “other” groups reflected a lower proportion of lexical transference (i.e., service: 3.73%; other: 3.57%) than the above-mentioned two groups. This may be because the group of service workers contained long-term residents and because the “other” group had some housewives without any English-speaking work network.

7.2.6. Age

The amount of exposure to the source language may be a promoting factor for lexical transference, but as discussed above, the relationship with the interviewer and other socio-psychological factors involved at the time of the interview are assumed to play a significant role in determining what strategies were to be employed. For instance, it appears that the age variable had some effect on lexical transference in the interview situation. It is possible that businessmen who were senior to the present writer did not pay particular attention to suppressing the use of lexical transfers because of the seniority factor.
The younger group exhibited a higher mean proportion of lexical transference (4.18%) than the older group (3.83%). Figure 7.6 shows that the older males exhibited a higher relative frequency of lexical transference than the females in the same category. This may be partly because compared with the older female group without any temporary resident, the older male group contained four temporary residents who were all businessmen.

![Figure 7.6. Mean relative frequencies of lexical transference in samples of 44 subjects, by age category and sex](image)

7.2.7. Hometown

The hometown variable was included so as to investigate the dialect influence on lexical transference. The initial assumption was that dialect speakers resort to lexical transference more readily than non-dialect speakers, as they attempt to avoid the use of their dialects in an interview situation. First, let us observe the bar chart below.
The Kansai group (4.26%) achieved a slightly higher mean proportion of lexical transference than the other two groups (Kanto: 4.08%; other: 3.78%). At the time of the follow-up interview, one of the Kansai subjects (S24) pointed out that when he tried to speak standard Japanese, he was inclined to adopt more words from English to avoid dialect usage. In the interview session another Kansai subject (S37) post-corrected the English lexical item *chikin* ‘chicken’ and used the equivalent Japanese word *kashiwa*, but she thought that the latter might be a Kansai dialect word and switched back to *chikin*. From these examples, it was inferred that the subjects in the Kansai or the other regional group might use more lexical transfers than those in the Kanto group who spoke the Tokyo dialect close to standard Japanese. As shown in Figure 7.7, the Kansai group achieved the highest mean relative frequency of these three groups, but the Kanto group surpassed the “other” group. This result suggests that factors other than the hometown variable also played a part in the process of lexical transference.
Notice that there is a rather great difference in the mean proportion of lexical transference between the male and female subjects of the Kanto group (males: 4.30%; females: 3.76%). This may be because the female group contained some permanent residents who suppressed lexical transference (e.g., S23, S44), while the male group contained some temporary and permanent residents who were motivated to learn English so as to adjust themselves into mainstream society (e.g., S8, S19, S30).

7.2.8. Education

As far as the education level is concerned, initially the university group was assumed to achieve the highest mean proportion of lexical transference, as they normally had a better knowledge of English than the other groups. However, study of the relevant data showed that the college group (4.21%) surpassed the other two groups (i.e., university: 4.15%; high school 3.61%) in the mean relative frequency of lexical transference.
As illustrated in Figure 7.8, the females in the college group (4.76%) achieved a much higher mean relative frequency of lexical transfers than the males in the same group (3.30%). This may be explained by the fact that three females in this group (S3, S18, S21) were temporary residents who had a strong desire to learn English and that, as noted earlier, S21 exhibited higher relative frequency of lexical transference than any other subject. On the other hand, the relatively low proportion of lexical transference in the speech of the females in the high school group (3.20%) may be ascribed to the fact that S23, who reflected the lowest proportion of lexical transference, and some of those long-term female residents, who were inclined to avoid lexical transference, belonged to this group.
7.2.9. Competence in English

It was initially assumed that the subjects with high competence in English were likely to use lexical transference more frequently than the other subjects in the remaining two groups. As shown in Figure 7.9, however, the moderate group (4.22%) achieved a slightly higher mean proportion of lexical transfers than the other groups (i.e., low: 3.94%; high: 3.93%). It appears that the subjects, especially the males, with moderate competence in English who were therefore in the process of learning English were inclined to use lexical transfers more readily in an interview situation. In her research on Italian in North Queensland, Bettoni (1981: 95) observes that “moderate knowledge of English would appear to favour lexical transference. Yet when the knowledge is either very poor or very good, it would seem to hinder it.” Our results are almost parallel to Bettoni’s findings.

![Figure 7.9. Mean relative frequencies of lexical transference in samples of 44 subjects, by competence in English and sex](image-url)
Finally, it is appropriate to refer to nationality of the spouse. Observe the bar chart below.

Due to the existence of an English-speaking home network, the Australian group was provisionally assumed to exhibit the highest mean relative frequency of lexical transference. The result was, however, that the Japanese group (4.19%) reflected a higher mean proportion of lexical transfers than the other two groups (i.e., Australian: 3.65%; none/single: 4.04%). The reason for this may be that the Australian group contained the long-term permanent female residents who tended to avoid the usage of English words in the interviews with the present writer, while the Japanese group and the single group contained the subjects who were eager to learn English and to show their English knowledge to the interviewer. The use of English at home seems to have little bearing on lexical transference in the interview situation.
7.3. Summary

In this chapter we have investigated the relationship between the 10 variables and the incidence of lexical transference. Although each of these variables may have contributed to the use of lexical transfers in the interview situation to a greater or lesser degree, length of stay and type of stay were taken as the statistically significant variables.

Different contact strategies were employed by the subjects according to their backgrounds when talking to the present writer in the interviews. The sojourners or temporary residents showed a tendency to adopt lexical transfers more frequently than the long-term permanent residents, who were inclined to suppress the use of lexical transfers. It appears that occupation was also a significant variable for lexical transference. A work-related English-speaking network was considered to be a promoting factor for the use of L2 items. Socio-psychological factors working at the time of the interview were assumed to be involved in transference processes. It was observed that the relationship with the interviewer played a part in lexical transference. The subjects' motivation to learn English and/or their desire to be assimilated into mainstream society/culture were regarded as responsible for more frequent use of lexical transfers. It seems that linguistic acculturation has the effect of reducing social/psychological distance between some subjects and the dominant society/culture.
CHAPTER 8
LEXICAL TRANSFERENCE AND CONTACT STRATEGIES

8.1. Introduction

The present chapter attempts to explore the relationship between lexical transference and contact strategies employed in an interview situation by 44 Japanese subjects living in Australia. As the occurrence of lexical transference is affected by the use of monitoring strategies, focus falls not only on LSs but also on CRSs and TMSs. As argued in Chapter 3, the cultural-core dichotomy plays a significant part in the analysis of contact strategies. In Chapter 5 we briefly discussed how the use of LS 1.1 (i.e., adopt a cultural lexical transfer) and LS 1.2 (i.e., adopt a core lexical transfer) is associated with the use of CRSs and TMSs. In this chapter these strategies (i.e., LSs, CRSs, and TMSs) are examined in more detail, taking into account the subjects' backgrounds.

First, we shall categorise lexical transfers identified in the corpus according to parts of speech, then discuss the relationship between the subjects’ strategies and maxims, and finally investigate lexical and monitoring strategies used by the subjects in the interviews.
8.2. Lexical Transference and Parts of Speech

"Some kinds of linguistic items are more likely to be borrowed than others" (Haugen 1969: 405). Like many other language contact studies (e.g., ibid.: 406-7; Bettoni 1981: 92-93; Masumi-So 1983: 57; Tamis 1988: 85; Clyne 1991: 165; Xu 1993: 46), the present study shows that nouns are most susceptible to transference and that most lexical transfers are classified into noun, verb, and adjective categories (see 5.3).

Criteria for word count employed in this section are different from those used in Chapter 7 (see Appendix 5). For the purpose of classifying lexical transfers by lexical categories or parts of speech, a more analytical method is adopted here. That is, nominal compounds and phrases are segmented into their constituent elements which can stand alone as free morphemes. These elements are all categorised according to parts of speech. Lexical transfers/code-switches classified as formulae/quotes are not included. The rest of the criteria are basically the same as those in Appendix 5. All the lexical transfers including well-integrated transfers in common use in Japan were counted by tokens; however, proper nouns were normally excluded except for some proper nouns peculiar to the Australian environment and adjectival forms of nationality. Notice that although the majority of lexical items were transferred from English, type-wise 41 items were well-integrated loans from other languages (see Appendix 6). The following table shows the frequencies and relative frequencies of lexical transfers by parts of speech in the present corpus.

---

1 The term “formula” refers to “a segment of language made up of several morphemes or words which are learned together and used as if they were a single item” (Richards et al. 1985: 247) (e.g., How are you?, Thank you).
Table 8.1.—Frequency table of lexical transference by parts of speech in samples of 44 Japanese subjects in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parts of speech</th>
<th>Frequency (tokens)</th>
<th>Relative frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>4033</td>
<td>85.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>10.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiners</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4707</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to the proportions of lexical transfers by parts of speech, it is worthwhile to make a cross-linguistic comparison with data taken from other studies. The following data were calculated token-wise as in this study:

(i) Norwegian in America (Haugen 1969: 406-7): nouns (75.5%), verbs (18.4%), adjectives (3.4%), adverbs and prepositions (1.2%), and interjections (1.4%);

(ii) Japanese in Melbourne (Masumi-So 1983: 57): nouns (81.6%), verbs (5.9%), adjectives (12.1%), and prepositions (0.4%);

(iii) Cantonese in New Plymouth and Wellington, New Zealand (Xu 1993: 46): nouns (76.0%, 74.2%), verbs (14.2%, 10.5%), adjectives (6.5%, 8.0%), adverbs (0.0%, 0.8%), and others (3.3%, 6.5%).

As shown above, in (i) and (iii) the incidence of verbal transfers is more frequent than that of adjectival transfers, whereas in (ii) and the present corpus verbal transference occurs less frequently than adjectival transference. Notice that (ii) and the present data show higher relative frequencies of nominal transference.
than in (i) and (iii). According to Bettoni (1981: 93) [Italian in Australia] and Tamis (1988: 85) [Greek in Australia], token-wise the relative frequencies of nominal transference are 70% and 75% respectively, exhibiting percentages similar to those of (i) and (iii).

From these data it appears that nominal transference is more prominent in the case of Japanese (spoken by first-generation Japanese adults) in Australia than that in other ethnic languages. Haugen (1969: 406) makes the point that “the relative ease with which the various parts of speech can be imported must also be seen in the light of the structural organization of the language.” As discussed in 5.4 and Appendix 8 (2.1), English nouns can quite easily be transferred to Japanese without any morphological readjustment such as occurs in Western languages. It should be noted that English nominal transfers may be used as Japanese verbal nouns followed by the verb suru ‘do’ (e.g., bukkingu suru (booking + do) ‘to book’). The low frequency of verbal transfers in Japanese may partly be ascribed to this strategy.

8.3. Lexical and Monitoring Strategies

In this section, focusing on lexical and monitoring strategies, we shall examine how these contact strategies were employed by the subjects in the interviews. The relationship between these strategies and the subjects’ backgrounds is also investigated in comparison with the results of the findings in Chapter 7.

As examined in Chapter 7, the subjects’ contact strategies differed with variables such as length of stay, type of stay, and other factors prevailing in the interview situation. In our contact strategy hypothesis it can be assumed that
their strategies varied as the maxims affecting strategies changed with these variables. Thus, taking account of these factors, we shall first examine the relationship between the subjects' strategies and maxims immediately below.

8.3.1. Strategies and Maxims

As illustrated in Figure 8.1 below, six subjects who achieved high relative frequencies of lexical transference and another six subjects who reflected low proportions of lexical transference are marked by in-group belonging scores. As these scores indicate, the relationship with the interviewer affected the subjects' strategies to a greater or lesser extent. That is, the subjects in the high frequency group exhibited relatively high scores while those in the low frequency group reflected relatively low scores. Notice, however, that S21 in the high frequency group exhibited the highest relative frequency of lexical transference (6.54%) despite her low in-group belonging score, reflecting her strong desire to adjust herself to the new environment. S19 in the same group also reflected a fairly high proportion of lexical transference (5.78%) in spite of his low score. The reason may be that as a banker he was exposed to English at work and that he subconsciously wanted to show his English knowledge as a marker of linguistic acculturation or sophistication, and that his social status and seniority acted as promoting factors for lexical transference. On the other hand, S6 in the low frequency group exhibited a rather low proportion of lexical transference (2.89%) despite his high score. This may be because as a researcher in the field of performing arts and literature and also as a translator, S6 had a fairly strong metalinguistic awareness that led to the avoidance of mixing the two languages.
It appears that metalinguistic awareness may play a role in separating the two language systems and suppressing the use of lexical transfers.

It can be said that the subjects in the above two groups employed two different lexical strategies in the interviews with the present writer. That is to say, the high frequency group used LS 1 (i.e., adopt a lexical transfer) more frequently than the low frequency group who were inclined to use LS 2 (i.e., employ a native equivalent rather than a lexical transfer). The prominent underlying maxims for these lexical strategies are assumed to be "acculturation" in the case of the high frequency group and "language loyalty" and/or "identity as a Japanese/Japanese migrant" in the case of the low frequency group. These maxims are concurrently at work behind the lexical strategies adopted by these two groups.

It can be assumed that as the length of stay increases, the maxims of language loyalty and identity as a Japanese migrant gradually come to take precedence.
over the acculturation maxim which is initially strong when facing a new cultural environment. As discussed in 7.2.2, after about four or five years of residence, the frequency of lexical transference by Japanese residents tends to decrease. This reduction process coincides with the process of the development of identity as Japanese migrants.

As seen in the above chart, the temporary group is more associated with the acculturation maxim, whereas the permanent group is more related to the language loyalty and/or the identity maxim. As the language loyalty maxim becomes stronger, the separation of the two languages is more likely to occur, thus leading to the more frequent use of LS 2. Likewise, as the identity maxim becomes stronger, LS 2 is more likely to be employed by the permanent residents for non-local members. These two maxims contribute to language maintenance. Note that the use of LS 2 is associated with pre-correction strategy (CRS 1) (see 8.3.4).

Depending on whether the speaker shares the same communicative norm with the interlocutor, the speaker changes his/her contact strategies. Although the use of lexical transfers may be considered as an identity/solidarity marker for Japanese migrants, they are more likely to avoid lexical transference in interacting with newcomers from Japan. The identity maxim is assumed to generate a convergent strategy linguistically and a divergent strategy psychologically on the part of migrants when speaking to out-group members. Hence the avoidance of LS 1 by the long-term residents for newcomers occurs with CRSs for intelligibility of lexical transfers (see 8.3.4). As discussed in Chapter 3, this is also regarded as a negative politeness strategy.

We have demonstrated above that different maxims give rise to the adoption of different strategies. It can therefore be assumed that when maxims change, all
the strategies (i.e., processing, monitoring, and social strategies) may go through changes to a greater or lesser degree.

8.3.2. Cultural and Core Lexical Strategies

In Chapter 3 it was assumed that LS 1.1 (i.e., adopt a cultural lexical transfer) and LS 1.2 (i.e., adopt a core lexical transfer) are responsible for cultural and core lexical transference respectively. Cultural lexical transfers are items that are new to the culture of the recipient language and transferred from the source language due to the lack of their native, Sino-Japanese or well-integrated Western loan equivalents. On the other hand, core lexical transfers are items transferred from the source language despite the existence of their native, Sino-Japanese or well-integrated L2 counterparts. LS 1.1 is normally employed to fill lexical gaps between the source and recipient languages while LS 1.2 is frequently used for metaphorical/rhetorical functions or due to lexical difficulties or short memory lapses.

It should be noted that L2 core items transferred via LS 1.2 can become “cultural” items if they gain general currency across the speech community and replace the equivalent L1 items (e.g., fuan ‘fan’ vs. aikoosha/shijisha). On the other hand, L2 cultural items transferred by means of LS 1.1 may be treated as core items if their (Sino-)Japanese equivalents are invented and used along with the L2 items (e.g., depaato ‘department store’ vs. hyakkaten). In this sense, the distinction between core and cultural lexical transference should be regarded as a continuum rather than a dichotomy.
All the data used for analysis are presented in Appendix 6. Note that it is not always an easy task to distinguish between cultural and core lexical transfers. There is a so-called grey area where it is difficult to make such distinctions. Hence, the above distinction between core and cultural items is to be treated as a provisional one. The following tables and figures show the proportions of cultural and core lexical transfers employed by 44 subjects in an interview situation.

Table 8.2.– Frequency table of cultural and core lexical transference in samples of 44 subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject code</th>
<th>Proportion of cultural lexical transference (I) (%)</th>
<th>Proportion of core lexical transference (II) (%)</th>
<th>Proportion of cultural lexical transference (I) (%)</th>
<th>Proportion of core lexical transference (II) (%)</th>
<th>W-score for proportion of core lexical transference (II) (radian)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>36.76</td>
<td>63.24</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.1389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>21.57</td>
<td>78.43</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.1526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>28.33</td>
<td>71.67</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.1505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.1473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>43.37</td>
<td>56.63</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.1283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>54.05</td>
<td>45.95</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.1648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>27.18</td>
<td>72.82</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>31.21</td>
<td>68.79</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>51.56</td>
<td>48.44</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.1444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>52.50</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.1296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>32.52</td>
<td>67.48</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.1725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>74.29</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.1715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>36.14</td>
<td>63.86</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.1532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.1289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 The second and third columns show the relative frequencies of cultural and core lexical transfers in relation to the total number of lexical transfers in each interview respectively; the fourth and fifth columns denote the relative frequencies of cultural and core lexical transfers in relation to the total number of words in each interview respectively. The sixth column shows the W-scores for the relative frequencies (i.e., proportions) of core lexical transference (II). These scores were used for the statistical test in section 8.3.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Cultural Transference (%)</th>
<th>Core Transference (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>24.39</td>
<td>75.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>73.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>47.95</td>
<td>52.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>54.10</td>
<td>45.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>28.17</td>
<td>71.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>32.61</td>
<td>67.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>45.76</td>
<td>54.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td>40.85</td>
<td>59.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td>28.13</td>
<td>71.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S26</td>
<td>21.92</td>
<td>78.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S27</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S28</td>
<td>42.41</td>
<td>57.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S29</td>
<td>14.13</td>
<td>85.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S30</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>78.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S31</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>65.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S32</td>
<td>37.25</td>
<td>62.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S33</td>
<td>44.21</td>
<td>55.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S34</td>
<td>35.45</td>
<td>64.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S35</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>65.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S36</td>
<td>34.44</td>
<td>65.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S37</td>
<td>36.28</td>
<td>63.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S38</td>
<td>37.29</td>
<td>62.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S39</td>
<td>37.78</td>
<td>62.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S40</td>
<td>45.98</td>
<td>54.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S41</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>71.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S42</td>
<td>21.93</td>
<td>78.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S43</td>
<td>45.98</td>
<td>54.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S44</td>
<td>41.53</td>
<td>58.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8.2. Proportions of cultural and core lexical transference (1) in samples of 44 subjects.
Figure 8.3. Proportions of cultural and core lexical transference (II) in samples of 44 subjects

As shown in the above table and figures, except for three temporary residents (S7, S10, S20) who adopted more cultural transfers than core items, the rest of the subjects employed LS 1.2 more frequently than LS 1.1. Token-wise the total frequencies of cultural and core lexical transference are 1439 and 2799 respectively. The mean relative frequencies of cultural and core lexical transference (I) are 34.92% (cultural) and 65.08% (core); those of cultural and core lexical transference (II) are 1.39% (cultural) and 2.65% (core). These data show that LS 1.2 was used about twice as frequently as LS 1.1 in the present corpus (see Appendix 6).

8.3.3. Core Lexical Transference and the Subjects’ Backgrounds

Cultural lexical transference occurs from necessity, whereas core lexical transference can take place as a result of speakers making a choice out of lexical items from different languages. The marked or unmarked choice primarily depends upon whether the speaker and the interlocutor share the same communicative norm
or not. In this section, we shall briefly examine the relationship between the frequency of core lexical transference (II) and the 10 variables dealt with in Chapter 7. The role played by LS 1.2 in lexical transference is also discussed briefly. First, let us observe the following scattergram:

![Figure 8.4. Correlation between length of stay and relative frequency of core lexical transference (II) in samples of 44 subjects](image)

Figure 8.4 above is similar to Figure 7.1 (see 7.2.2). That is, the frequency of core lexical transference is high for the first few years of residence, but it gradually decreases as the length of stay increases. The result of the Pearson product-moment correlation shows that there is a low negative correlation between length of stay and relative frequency of core lexical transference (see Table 8.2) \((r = -.298, p = .050, r\text{-square} = .09)\). Notice that there is significant variation in the frequency of core lexical transfers used by the subjects for the first few years of stay, but after that the variation is reduced as the subjects are assimilated into
the new environment. It appears that LS 1.2, which is more frequent than LS 1.1, contributes a great deal to determining the tendency in lexical transference at large. The following figure shows the relative frequencies of lexical transference (both cultural and core) and core lexical transference in the corpus.

![Figure 8.5. Relative frequencies of lexical transference and core lexical transference (II) in samples of 44 subjects](image)

As illustrated in Figure 8.5, the relative frequency of core lexical transference is almost parallel to that of lexical transference at large. The result of the Pearson product-moment correlation shows that there is a high correlation between the relative frequencies of lexical transference (see Table 7.10) and core lexical transference (see Table 8.2) \((r = .886, p = .000, r\text{-square} = .79)\). This result indicates that core lexical strategy plays an important part in determining a tendency in lexical transference.
Notice that the subjects (e.g., S 5, S17, S21) who achieved high frequencies of lexical transference also exhibited high frequencies of core lexical transference. These subjects were all temporary residents in Australia who were eager to learn English and to assimilate themselves into Australian society/culture. In the present corpus the mean relative frequencies of core lexical transference of the temporary and the permanent groups are 2.81% and 2.49% respectively; that is, the temporary group employed LS 1.2 slightly more frequently, though this is not a significant group difference.

Of the three subjects mentioned above, two were from the Kansai area. In Chapter 5 we discussed Scotton and Okeju's research (1973: 883) on Aseto where non-standard speakers show a tendency toward greater use of core lexical transfers. In the present corpus the Kansai group exhibited the highest mean relative frequency of core lexical transference (2.75%), followed by the Kanto group (2.70%) and the “other” group (2.52%). These data show that there is not much regional group difference in core lexical transference. It cannot therefore be concluded from our corpus that non-standard speakers tend to use more core items. It seems that in the case of JAU, dialectal differences do not play a significant role in core lexical transference or lexical transference at large. As noted in Chapter 1, owing to the compulsory education system in Japan and the Japanese media, Japanese residents in Australia normally have a good command of standard Japanese, irrespective of their hometown.

The other variables examined in Chapter 7 were also tested with respect to the relative frequency of core lexical transference, but the results were not statistically significant.
8.3.4. Core Lexical Transference and Correcting Strategies (CRSs)

In this section we shall first present some examples of CRSs identified in the present corpus and then investigate the incidence of post-correction strategy (CRS 3) employed by the subjects. The types of post-corrected core items are also examined briefly.

As argued in Chapters 3 and 5, in our contact strategy theory core lexical items transferred to Japanese can be corrected to their native, Sino-Japanese or well-integrated Western loan equivalents, while cultural lexical transfers can not, due to the lack of the corresponding lexical items in Japanese. Basically, CRSs can be applied to core items, but not to cultural items. In the present study the concept of correction is limited to the L2 to L1 correction and the L2 to L2 correction. It is, however, possible that in an overseas setting an L1 item, if its inadequacy is noted, may be given a negative evaluation and replaced by a more appropriate L2 item in common use across the community. Such a case is subsumed under TMS 4 (i.e., use of glosses) in this thesis (see 8.3.5).

Core lexical transfers may be pre-corrected, in-corrected or post-corrected via CRSs. As discussed in Chapter 3, pre-articulatory repairs are carried out by means of pre-correction strategy (CRS 1); post-articulatory repairs are conducted through in-correction strategy (CRS 2) (for partially verbalised core items) or CRS 3 (for fully verbalised core items). CRS 1 triggers LS 2 with or without any TMS (e.g., use of editing words (TMS 2)); CRS 2 occurs in the middle of the use of LS 1.2; CRS 3 gives rise to LS 2 after the use of LS 1.2. CRSs 2 and 3 are often accompanied by TMSs.

The problem with CRS 1 is that as this strategy operates in inner speech or before a speech event, it is difficult to identify its occurrence, unless it occurs with
TMSs which suggest pre-correcting the core item in question (see Levelt 1983: 55).

On the other hand, the adoption of CRS 2 or 3 is obvious, since a core item is partially or fully verbalised in overt speech. CRSs may be employed out of consideration for the interlocutor as a negative politeness strategy. The following are some examples of CRSs identified in the present corpus:

Pre-correction strategy (CRS 1):

(1) Hito mo sukunakatta shi, mada anoo shiden ga hashitteta.  
   (I: S44)  
   'The population was smaller than it is now, and we still had, uhm, trams here.'

(2) ...Opera-za no Kaijin toka, ee Yonjuu ni Sutoriito toka, ato ongakkai wa  
    ma konsaato hooru...  
    (I: S19)  
    '...Phantom of the Opera, uh, the 42nd Street, and as for concerts, well,  
    the concert hall...'

(3) Yasaitame toka, ato sakana to chippusu toka, kantan na ryoori desu kedo ne.  
    (I: S21)  
    '(He prepares) simple dishes like vegetable sauté and fish and chips, you know.'

As noted above, without the follow-up interview it would be difficult to identify example (1) as a result of pre-correction, although the use of the editing word anoo ‘uhm’ (TMS 2) suggests the subject’s monitoring behaviour in her inner speech (see Masumi-So 1983: 114). In this case, S44 pre-corrected the use of
toramu 'tram' and employed the Sino-Japanese equivalent shiden. In example (2) S19 is mentioning the names of the musicals he and his family saw and the places they went to in their spare time. As the follow-up interview revealed, he was so tense at the time of the interview that he never noticed uttering Yonjuu ni instead of the Fortii sekando 'forty second' he usually says. It can be said, therefore, that S19 subconsciously employed CRS 1 for the L2 item. Likewise, in example (3) S21 subconsciously pre-corrected the first two elements of the NP fisshu ando chippusu, employing the corresponding native items sakana to. Note that chippusu 'chips' is a cultural item to which CRSs cannot be applied. The last two examples show that hypercorrections can occur as a result of the subconscious employment of CRS 1 and LS 2 (i.e., use a native/Sino-Japanese word rather than a lexical transfer).

In-correction strategy (CRS 2):

(4) Ato torai shitemitai no ga Tai Tai ryoori, sore karaa ee (2.0) ee Guri- Girisha ryoori.

   'And what I want to try is Thai, Thai food and, uh, uh, Gre- Greek cuisine.'

(5) Shujin ga anoo Mareeshia kara kita Chaimii- chuugokujin nan desu ne.

   'My husband is, uhm, a Chine- Chinese person from Malaysia.'

Example (4) shows that in the middle of verbalising the transfer Guriiku 'Greek (cuisine)', S26 corrected it by employing its equivalent compound, namely
the well-integrated L2 loan *Girisha* ‘Greece’ and the Sino-Japanese word *ryoori* ‘cuisine’. In example (5) before completing the lexical item *Chainizuu* ‘Chinese (person)’, S33 noticed its inadequacy and corrected it by employing its Sino-Japanese counterpart *chuugokujin*.

Post-correction strategy (CRS 3):

(6) Anoo (2.0) *makkararu* to iu ka, ano *saba* desu ka ne...

‘Uhm, it is what might be called mackerel, uh, mackerel, you know.’

(7) Dakara ima wa *gan* ne, *pisutoru?..gan* no are iwaretemasu desho, ima koko demo.

‘So now they are debating on the gun issue, you know. Pistols? The question of right or wrong for holding guns is a current moot issue even here, isn’t it.’

It is noteworthy that, as illustrated in example (6), a lexical transfer is often accompanied by the phrase *to iu* ‘what is called’ or *to iu ka* ‘what might be called’ or their variations such as *tte iu* and *tte iu ka* (see Masumi-So 1983: 128). In this example after the use of TMS 2s (i.e., use of the editing word *anoo* ‘uhm’ and a two-second pause) S2 employed *makkararu* ‘mackerel’, but replaced the item with the Japanese equivalent *saba* after employing another editing word *ano* ‘uh’ (TMS 2). Example (7) shows that the well-assimilated Dutch loan *pisutoru* ‘pistol’ was adopted with TMS 1 (i.e., rising intonation) out of consideration for the interviewer after the more peripheral L2 item *gan* ‘gun’ was used with the direct hedge *ne* ‘you know’ (TMS 3).
As pointed out above, CRS 1 is difficult to identify. Incomplete lexical transfers where CRS 2 can apply are not counted as words, and therefore are not included in the main corpus (see Appendix 5). Hence, we shall focus on CRS 3 and examine the relationship between this correcting strategy and the subjects' backgrounds.

What should be noted here is that a newly transferred core item is normally corrected at its first introduction in discourse if it is noted and negatively evaluated as a less socially integrated item by the speaker, and therefore the first occurrence of each lexical transference is of utmost importance. Actually, all the examples of post-correction occurred at the first introduction of the items in discourse in the present corpus. Once the transferred item is established as one of the common transfers for both the speaker and the interlocutor, there is no need to resort to the use of CRSs and/or TMSs at its subsequent occurrences. As an unmarked choice, a mutually intelligible and acceptable item does not require any correction, clarification or explanation. It is therefore vital that transfer types (i.e., the number of different lexical transfers) should be used for analysing the incidence of CRS 3 and/or TMSs in order to avoid some misleading results. For this reason, only the first occurrence of CRS 3 was counted here (see Kinder 1987: 135-37). The following tables show relevant data for the examination of CRS 3 employed by the subjects in the interviews.
Table 8.3.—Frequency table of core lexical transfer types and lexical transfer types in samples of 44 subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject code</th>
<th>Frequency of core lexical transfer types</th>
<th>Frequency of lexical transfer types</th>
<th>Relative frequency of core lexical transfer types (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>81.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>73.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>67.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>72.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>71.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>78.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>64.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>72.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>61.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>75.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>61.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>77.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>77.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S28</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>69.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S29</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>85.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S31</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>64.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>73.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S34</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject code</td>
<td>Frequency of CRS 3</td>
<td>Relative frequency of CRS 3 (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>1 [1]</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>3 [1]</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>1 [1]</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>1 [1]</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td>1 [1]</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 The numeral in square parentheses denotes the frequency of the L2 to L2 correction that is included in the frequency of CRS 3. The numeral in round parentheses indicates the frequency of CRS 2, but this is shown only for reference. All the examples of CRSs 2 and 3 identified in the corpus are listed in Appendix 7.

4 The relative frequency of CRS 3 was calculated by dividing the frequency of this correcting strategy by the number of core lexical transfer types employed by each subject.
As shown in Tables 8.3 and 8.4, the total number of core lexical transfer types in the corpus is 1913 (see Appendix 6); in total 33 post-corrections occurred at the first occurrence of the core items (see Appendix 7). The mean proportion of core lexical transfer types in relation to the number of lexical transfer types is 68.11%. The mean relative frequency of CRS 3 identified in the corpus is 1.88%. This means that in our corpus approximately one post-correction occurred in every 53 types of core lexical transfers employed by the subjects.
Table 8.4 and Figure 8.6 show that four subjects (S2, S8, S40, S44) exhibited more than five percent use of CRS 3. S2 and S8 were temporary residents while S40 and S44 were permanent residents. With their competence in English being low or moderate, S2 and S8 had a strong desire to learn English. S2 (sushi chef) post-corrected three core transfers (names of fish), partly for clarification or confirmation and partly being not quite confident in the use of lexical transference (example (6)). S8 (researcher) used terms like posutta sesshon ‘poster session’ peculiar to his profession and post-corrected these items for making them intelligible to the interviewer. As already seen in 5.2.2 (example (7)), in the case of S40 (restaurant owner), whose competence in English was high, she post-corrected a common loan in JAU such as gamuturii ‘gumtree’ out of consideration for the present writer who was a newcomer from Japan. Note that S40 even post-corrected oo-kee ‘OK’, an item which is in common use in Japan. S44 (shopkeeper), who also had a good command of English, employed CRS 3 for the three core items peishensu ‘patience’, keateikaa ‘caretaker’, and booi ‘boy’ for the intelligibility of these transfers for the interviewer. It appears that with regard to
the first item *peishensu*, S44 used this core transfer as she could not recall its Sino-Japanese equivalent *nintairyoku* due to a short memory lapse, but soon after uttering the word, she recalled the L1 item and post-corrected the L2 transfer as if to save herself from embarrassment (see 6.4 example (14))

From these examples, it seems that the speaker's awareness of the degree of social integration of lexical items and also of the identity of the interlocutor plays a part in CRS 3. Marked items, if so evaluated by the speaker, are likely to be post-corrected in the process of establishing a shared communicative norm with respect to lexical transference.

Ten subjects (43.48%) in the temporary group and eleven subjects (52.38%) in the permanent group did not employ CRS 3. Notice, however, that among these subjects, two permanent subjects (S26, S43) used CRS 2 instead. Hence ten temporary (43.48%) and nine permanent residents (42.86%) did not adopt CRS 2 or 3. As will be discussed in 8.3.5, however, even those subjects who did not use any CRS 2 or 3 employed another monitoring strategy, namely TMSs for signalling the tentative use of L2 items.

The mean relative frequency of CRS 3 for the temporary group was 2.19% while for the permanent group it was 1.54%. It appears that the short-term residents corrected core lexical transfers slightly more frequently than the permanent residents, though the group difference is not significant statistically. Since the temporary group exhibited a higher frequency of lexical transference than the permanent group, it was initially assumed that the former group would exhibit a higher frequency of CRS 3 as well. However, the result of the Pearson product-moment correlation shows that there is no correlation between the frequencies of lexical transference and CRS 3. The above-mentioned tendency for the temporary group to show a
higher frequency of CRS 3 may therefore be associated with the insecure use of core lexical transfers by the sojourners who were going through acculturation processes. As the follow-up interviews revealed, some temporary residents were aware of a sudden increase in the amount of lexical transference in their Japanese speech and attempted to take a preventive measure against the influx of lexical transfers, while others were indifferent to such a puristic attitude towards transference. As discussed earlier, CRS 3 is often used for confirmation, clarification or out of consideration for the interlocutor. It may be that not knowing the communicative norm in the speech community, the temporary residents, who are in the process of acculturation, tend to adopt CRS 3.

The relationship between competence in English (see 7.2.9) and frequency of CRS 3 was also tested, but there was no significant relationship between these two variables. All the other variables examined in Chapter 7 were tested as well in connection with the frequency of CRS 3, but no statistically significant results were obtained.

Finally, the kinds of post-corrected core items are briefly examined here.

In the present corpus the following core lexical transfers were post-corrected to the corresponding L1 or more appropriate, well-integrated L2 items (see Appendix 7). As shown below, the kinds of corrected core items slightly differ with type of stay.

Temporary residents:

*chuna berii* ‘(lit.) tuna belly’, *ii ru* ‘eel’, *makkararu* ‘mackerel’ (S2);
*iizii-gooingu* ‘easy-going’ (S3); *hoomuwaaku* ‘homework’, *Chainiizu* ‘Chinese (cuisine)’ (S5); *manson* ‘mansion’ (S7, S20); *furatto* ‘flat’, *posutta sesshon* ‘(lit.) poster session’, *repooto taikai* ‘(lit.) report conference’ (S8); *pedagogii* ‘pedagogy’
Permanent residents:

*bodii rangeeji* ‘body language’ (S31); *myuujikku* ‘music’ (S33); *Ingurisshu* ‘English English’ (S34); *manii* ‘money’, *Yuubooto* ‘U-boat’ (S35); *jeaa* ‘fair’ (S36); *chikin* ‘chicken’ (S37); *gan* ‘gun’ (S37, S38); *oo-kee* ‘OK’, *gamuturii* ‘gumtree’ (S40); *Chainiizu* ‘Chinese (person)’ (S42); *peishensu* ‘patience’, *keateikaa* ‘caretaker’, *booi* ‘boy’ (S44)

With regard to the temporary group, the well-established Japanese loan *manshon* ‘mansion’ (S7, S20) is still used in the overseas setting, but may be post-corrected to *apaato* ‘apartment’. The lexical transfer *furatto* ‘flat’ (S8) in common use in JAU may also be post-corrected to *apaato* among sojourners.

As far as the permanent group is concerned, common items in JAU such as *gamuturii* ‘gumtree’ (S40) and *gan* ‘gun’ (S37, S38) were post-corrected for intelligibility of the items. It is interesting that S37 even attempted to post-correct the well-integrated loan *chikin* ‘chicken’, not knowing that it is widely used in Japan.
8.3.5. Lexical Transference and Transference-Marking Strategies (TMSs)

In the preceding section core lexical transference has mainly been discussed in relation to CRSs. In this section, however, lexical transference at large (i.e., both cultural and core lexical transference) is dealt with, as TMSs are involved in the use of both core and cultural items. We have already seen some examples of TMSs in Chapters 3 and 5. Here, we shall first examine some more examples of TMSs identified in the corpus and then investigate the incidence of these monitoring strategies adopted by the subjects in the interview situation.

As discussed in 3.4.1.1.2, TMSs 1-4 are employed so as to signal the speaker's awareness of the degree of social integration of lexical transfers used in a speech community and to attempt to establish a shared norm with co-participant(s) in interaction. The use of TMSs 1-4 suggests to a greater or lesser degree the peripheral nature and/or the tentative use of a given item accompanied by them. TMS 1 deals with a change in tone of voice and an accompaniment of laughter. TMS 2 is concerned with hesitation phenomena (i.e., a pause, an editing word, a repeat, and a false start). TMS 3 is associated with the use of a hedge (e.g., iwayuru 'what you call, what is called'; iwaba 'so to speak, as it were'; ma(a) 'well'; ne 'isn't it?'). TMS 4 provides a gloss for a cultural lexical transfer and also for a core lexical transfer, especially when its corresponding L1 or well-integrated L2 item is unavailable for some reason. This last strategy includes the use of a metalinguistic commentary on the lexical transfer adopted. Note that more than one TMS can be simultaneously employed to signal the use of a lexical transfer. The following are some of the examples of TMSs 1-4 identified in the corpus:
TMS 1:

(8) Konaida wa eiga ni ikimashita shi, ikanai toki wa ookina shoppu? chikaku no, isshukan bun no kaimono shite toka... (I: S21)

‘The other day we went to a movie. When we don’t go, we buy things for the week at a big shop, a nearby shop and...’

(9) Sono hi no sukejuuru ni awasete moo takushii doraibaa de (h) sore- ano okurimukae o shimasu. (I: S10)

‘Following the daily schedule, I just act as a taxi driver and, uh, take the children to school and pick them up after school.’

Example (8) shows that via TMS 1, a rising intonation pattern was employed in articulating the lexical transfer shoppu ‘shop’ to attract the interviewer’s attention. As in (9), a lexical transfer is sometimes accompanied by laughter through TMS 1. The accompaniment of laughter suggests that S10 consciously adopted the lexical transfer.

TMS 2:

(10) Kanari nan ka Nihon yori mo ano subete no fun’iki ga kajuaru tte iu ka, uun (1.0) rirakkusu shita kanji de, rafi na kanji deshita ne. (I: S33)

‘Compared with Japan, I found that, uh, the overall atmosphere was what might be called casual, uhm, relaxed, and rough, you know.’
(11) Iyaa machinami wa ne, *ano sitii wa ookii birudingu* takusan dekimashita kedo ne, *sabaabu* ni ittara, sonna ni kawaranai.

‘Ah, as far as the streets and the houses are concerned, uh, in the city lots of tall buildings have been built, but in the suburbs they have not changed so much.’

(12) Kojin teki ni ichiban suki na no wa daigaku no asoko no chuutei arimasu yo ne, koo *mein- mein hooru* no *mein- mein- mein birudingu* no naka no koo juuji ni natte ru...

‘My favourite place is that courtyard at University, you know, er, that courtyard [with a pavement] designed like a cross, surrounded by the main-main hall, main- main- main building...’

(13) Toku ni ano (1.0) iroiro (0.5) moyooshi *i- i- ano ikusukaajon* (0.5) toka (0.5) attari...

‘Particularly, uh, there are various events such as e- e- uh, excursion, and so on...’

As shown in example (10), due to TMS 2 a silent pause can occur before lexical transference. It appears that in this example S33 first attempted to post-correct the preceding lexical transfer *kajuaru* ‘casual’. After the use of the filled pause *unm* ‘uhm’ and a one-second silent pause, however, she failed to adopt its native equivalent and employed two L2 synonymous glosses *rirakkusu* ‘relax’ and *rafu* ‘rough’ through TMS 4. Example (11) shows the use of the common filler/editing
word *ano* ‘uh’ before the transfer *siti* ‘city’. Note that this filler and its variations such as *anoo, kono, sono, koo* often occur before lexical transfers. As illustrated in example (12), TMS 2 can give rise to the repeat of a transferred item. In this case S1 wanted to say “Main Quadrangle,” but somehow he could not recall the term “Quadrangle” at that time. The subject therefore used the word *hooru* ‘hall’ instead, and then replaced it with the superordinate word *birudingu* ‘building’, which he evaluated as more appropriate, after repeating *mein* ‘main’ twice.

It can be said that the search for the right word triggered TMS 2, resulting in the repetition of the same word *mein* ‘main’ a few times before producing the appropriate item. As in example (13), a false start, which occurs via TMS 2, suggests the tentative use of an item by the speaker. After the false start and the use of the editing word *ano* ‘uh’, S5 employed the lexical transfer *ikusukaajon* ‘excursion’ rather than its L1 counterpart *ensoku*.

TMS 3:

(14) Aa shujin nan kaa ni kiku to, *Shidonii* daigaku demo hadashi de aruite ru (h) josei takusan iru yo to itte orimashita node. Uun ma soo iu sono iwayuru furawaa piipuru to iu, anoo tashika Betonamu sensoo no koro datta to omou n desu ga, sono koro ni soo iu no hayatta n ja nai ka to omou n desu keredomo.

(I: S43)

‘Uh, according to my husband, even at Sydney University there are many female students walking with bare feet. Uhm, well, such, uh, what is called flower people, uhm, I think it was during the period of Vietnam War that such people appeared and walking barefoot became fashionable.’
(15) ...soo iu ii men dake ja nakute, yappari un ano nan te iu ka, maa negatibu tte iu ka, soo iu men mo dandan miete kuru yoo ni narimashita. (I: S17)

'...not only such a good aspect but also after all, yeah, uh, erm, well, what might be called negative, such an aspect also has gradually become visible to me.'

(16) De ato wa chikin ne, (1.0) kashiwa, (0.5) kashiwa tte shi-kansaiben desu ka? (I: S37)

'And also we eat chicken, you know, kashiwa, do you know kashiwa- is that a Kansai dialect word?'

A notion of “caution, modesty or non-committal attitude” (Clyne 1991: 166) can be expressed by the use of hedges through TMS 3. Example (14) illustrates the use of iwayuru ‘what is called’ which suggests that the following item has general currency across the speech community, and/or that even if the interlocutor does not know the word, the speaker can avoid a kind of face-threatening act such as explaining the item to the interlocutor through TMS 4 (see Masumi-So 1983: 191). As in example (15), maa/ma ‘well’ can express the speaker’s modest judgement (Morita 1984: 278-81) about the meaning of a lexical transfer. Notice that before maa, the editing word ano ‘uh’ and the multi-word filler nan te iu ka ‘erm, (lit.) what shall I say?’ (TMS 2) (Backhouse 1993: 180) are also employed here. Example (16) shows that the Japanese sentence-final particle ne ‘isn’t it?, you know’ may be used as a direct hedge which appeals directly to the interlocutor.
TMS 4:

(17) Anoo ma- magu- maguppii [sic] desu ka, ano shiro to kuro no koo iu tori ga...

(I: S1)

‘Uhm, is it called a m- mag- magpie? Uh, a bird with black and white
patterns like this...’

(18) Yappari kan- anoo kanturii ga suki de, rookaru na kaiwai ga suki na node.

(I: S14)

‘After all, because I like the coun- uh, country, I like the local area.’

(19) De ee san jikan no aida maa kihonteki ni (2.5) eigo de iu anoo sutajio
direkushon tsumari sono tokei o nirami- nirami nagara, nama hoosoo no
yoosuru ni jikanwari no kontorooru to sorekara nakami no kontorooru o
dooji ni yaru wake desu ne.

(I: S31)

‘And uh, for three hours, well, basically, my work is, as is called in
English, uh, studio direction; that is, er, watching- watching the clock,
in short, I control both a timetable and contents of the live talk show
at the same time, you know.’

(20) Meruboruun tte iu no wa sugoku shittori shita kanji deshoo. Arne ga ookute,
ano toden ga toden toden tte iwanai n da (h) Toramu ii desu yo ne.

(I: S6)

‘Melbourne is a city with fairly wet weather. It rains a lot and, er, streetcars,
streetcars, we don’t call them streetcars. Trams are charming, aren’t they.’
As shown in example (17), TMS 4 may be employed when the speaker is not confident in the use of a lexical transfer. In this example S1 did not know the item exactly, and so after the false start, he used a wrong form for *magupai* ‘magpie’, employing a gloss in Japanese. Example (18) also illustrates the use of a gloss. S14 first employed the lexical transfer *kanturii* ‘country’ after the false start and use of the filler *anoo* ‘uhrn’ (TMS 2), but she glossed it by what she judged as more appropriate, that is, the NP *rookaru na kaiwai* ‘local area’. In (19) S31 made a metalinguistic commentary (i.e., *eigo de iu* ‘as is said in English’) on the lexical transfer *sutajio direkushon* ‘studio direction’ via TMS 4. Notice that a description of his work following this transfer is also made through TMS 4. Finally, example (20) shows that an L1 item, if it is noted as inadequate and negatively evaluated by the speaker, may be replaced by a more appropriate L2 item. This type of L1 to L2 “correction” is treated as a monitoring strategy (TMS 4) in the present study.

The above examples illustrate that the subjects used TMSs for signalling their awareness of the degree of social integration of transferred items. As Kinder (1987: 141) points out, compared with TMSs 1 and 2 (i.e., vocal and hesitation phenomena), TMSs 3 and 4 (i.e., use of hedges and glosses) are assumed to signal the tentative use of transfers in a more explicit way. As these two strategies are involved in use of certain words, phrases or clauses (e.g., *iwaba* ‘as it were’, *eigo de iu to* ‘to say it in English’, etc.), they indicate that lexical transfers employed are “marked” to a greater or lesser extent. Thus, focusing on TMSs 3 and 4, we shall examine the frequency of these two types of TMSs identified in the corpus. First, let us observe the data shown in the two tables below.
Table 8.5.--Frequency table of transference-marking strategies (TMSs) in samples of 44 subjects (I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject code</th>
<th>Frequencies of TMSs 3 and 4</th>
<th>Number of lexical transfer types accompanied by TMSs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TMS 3</td>
<td>TMS 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.6.--Frequency table of transference-marking strategies (TMSs) in samples of 44 subjects (II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject code</th>
<th>Relative frequency of TMSs 3 and 4 (%)^3</th>
<th>Relative frequency of lexical transfer types accompanied by TMSs (%)^6</th>
<th>W-score for relative frequency of TMSs 3 and 4 (radian)</th>
<th>W-score for relative frequency of lexical transfer types accompanied by TMSs (radian)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>52.63</td>
<td>.4436</td>
<td>.8117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>.2315</td>
<td>.5387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>39.02</td>
<td>.3177</td>
<td>.6747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>25.58</td>
<td>.2673</td>
<td>.5303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>.1135</td>
<td>.6155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>.1884</td>
<td>.5387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td>.1317</td>
<td>.5136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>22.97</td>
<td>.2027</td>
<td>.4999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>33.88</td>
<td>.3471</td>
<td>.6213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>.2148</td>
<td>.5495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>26.47</td>
<td>.2450</td>
<td>.5404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>18.52</td>
<td>.2756</td>
<td>.4449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>35.14</td>
<td>.2887</td>
<td>.6345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>.2681</td>
<td>.5967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>20.34</td>
<td>.2634</td>
<td>.4679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>38.24</td>
<td>.1724</td>
<td>.6666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>34.57</td>
<td>.3398</td>
<td>.6285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>24.32</td>
<td>.2630</td>
<td>.5158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>52.78</td>
<td>.3819</td>
<td>.8132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>.3063</td>
<td>.5495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^3 This value was calculated by dividing the frequency of TMSs 3 and 4 by the number of lexical transfer types employed by each subject (see Tables 8.3 and 8.5).

^6 This value was calculated by dividing the number of lexical transfer types accompanied by all types of TMSs by the number of lexical transfer types employed by each subject (see Tables 8.3 and 8.5).
As shown in Table 8.5 above, in total 256 TMSs 3 and 4 occurred in the corpus. As discussed in 8.3.4, TMSs 3 and 4 marking a lexical transfer at its first occurrence only were counted. The number of lexical transfer types accompanied by TMSs 1-4 is 857.

It was assumed that the number of lexical transfer types (see Table 8.3) positively correlates with the number of lexical transfers accompanied by TMSs. In fact, the Pearson product-moment correlation shows that there is a high positive correlation between these two variables ($r = .805$, $p = .000$, $r$-square = .17).

It can therefore be supposed that the higher the number of lexical transfer types the speaker employs, the more frequently he/she tends to signal his/her awareness.
of transferred words with TMSs. Note that the number of lexical transfer types
also positively correlates with the frequency of lexical transference \(r = .374, \ p = .012, \text{ r-square} = .14\).\(^7\) This means that speakers who show a high frequency
of lexical transference tend to adopt more transfer types as well.

The correlation of the frequency of TMSs 3 and 4 in relation to the number of
lexical transfer types accompanied by TMSs was also tested. A moderate positive
correlation was found between these two variables \(r = .413, \ p = .005, \text{ r-square} = .17\).\(^8\) This result indicates that, as the number of lexical transfer types
accompanied by TMSs increases, TMSs 3 and 4 are more likely to occur.

As illustrated in Figure 8.7 below, all the subjects employed TMS 3 or 4 or
both of them to a greater or lesser degree. As mentioned in section 8.3.4, even those
subjects who did not use any CRS 3 resorted to TMS 3 and/or TMS 4. The mean
relative frequency of TMSs 3 and 4 was 8.99%. 19 subjects exhibited higher relative
frequencies of TMSs 3 and 4 than the average. Notice that 12 of them (63.16%)
were permanent residents.

---

\(^7\) The W-scores for the relative frequencies of lexical transference (see Table 7.10) were
used for the test.

\(^8\) The W-scores (see Table 8.6) were used for the test.
The mean relative frequencies of TMSs 3 and 4 for the permanent and temporary groups were 10.10% and 7.97% respectively. It appears that the permanent group used TMSs 3 and 4 more frequently than the temporary group, though the group difference is not statistically significant. This tendency may be attributable to metalinguistic awareness, which can be fostered by the language loyalty and identity maxims that are predominant in the permanent group.

The relationship between competence in English and the frequency of TMSs 3 and 4 was tested as well. The result of analysis of variance revealed that there was no statistically significant group difference. However, it appears that TMSs 3 and 4 were employed by the high competence group more frequently (cf. Kinder 1987: 148). As shown in Figure 8.7, of those six subjects who exhibited more than 15%, five belonged to the high competence group. The mean relative frequencies of the high, moderate, and low groups were 9.40%, 8.82%, and 6.41% respectively.

The other variables dealt with in Chapter 7 were also tested with respect to the use of TMSs 3 and 4, but none of them was found to be significant statistically.
The only one variable that was close to the minimum 5% significance level was length of stay ($r = .275, p = .071$). There may be a tendency that as the length of stay increases, TMSs 3 and 4 are likely to be used more frequently. It appears that this result is parallel to the slightly higher percentage of use of TMSs 3 and 4 by the permanent group.

8.4. Summary

In this chapter we have examined the subjects' use of lexical and monitoring strategies in the interview situation.

First, it was shown that nouns were the most frequently transferred items among parts of speech. It was then discussed that lexical strategies, which are responsible for lexical transference, were influenced by maxims such as acculturation, language loyalty, and identity as Japanese migrants. The temporary group was likely to be affected by the acculturation maxim, and therefore to resort to LS 1, which promotes lexical transference. On the other hand, the permanent group was inclined to avoid lexical transference under the influence of the language loyalty and identity maxims.

Our subjects employed LS 1.2 (i.e., core lexical strategy) almost twice as frequently as LS 1.1 (i.e., cultural lexical strategy) in the interview situation. It was also found that frequency of core lexical transference negatively correlates with length of stay.

Individual backgrounds seem to have little bearing on the use of CRS 3. However, the temporary group used this correcting strategy slightly more

---

9 The $W$-scores (see Table 8.6) were used for the test.
frequently than the permanent group. This tendency appears to be associated with the insecure use of core lexical transfers by the short-time residents who were going through acculturation processes. It was also demonstrated that the kinds of corrected core items slightly differ according to type of stay.

More importantly, it was shown that the use of TMSs positively correlates with the number of lexical transfer types, and that, as the number of lexical transfer types accompanied by TMSs increases, TMSs 3 and 4 (i.e., use of hedges and glosses) tend to occur more frequently. The permanent group employed these monitoring strategies more frequently than the temporary group. This tendency was ascribed to the metalinguistic awareness that could be fostered by the language loyalty and identity maxims predominant in the permanent group.

The types of CRSs and TMSs discussed in this thesis were identified in the present corpus. From the analysis of data, it seems that the speaker’s perception of the degree of social integration of transferred items and of the identity of the interlocutor plays a significant part in these two types of monitoring strategies which are employed in the process of exploring an ad hoc communicative norm with regard to the use of lexical transfers.
CHAPTER 9
CONCLUSION

This thesis has examined language contact phenomena in the speech of first-generation Japanese residents in Australia and New Zealand through the analysis of interview and other spoken data. It has proposed a contact strategy hypothesis in order to explain Japanese-AUE/NZE contact phenomena in a systematic way. Based on this hypothesis, this study attempted to identify and analyse the three types of contact strategies (i.e., processing, monitoring and social) at work in contact processes such as transference and integration.

Like any other overseas variety of Japanese, JAU and JNZ are characterised by the use of lexical transfers. The following types of transference phenomena and the corresponding processing strategies were identified in the JAU/JNZ corpus: lexical, phonological, prosodic, grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic. Furthermore, the integration phenomena and the processing strategies underlying them were also identified in terms of phonological, prosodic, grammatical, and semantic aspects. Some lexical transfers peculiar to JAU and JNZ were identified. Some of the semantic shifts that occurred in Japan were corrected toward the English norm in JAU/JNZ. In this thesis, evidence is presented to demonstrate that transference patterns deviating from standard Japanese norms are attributable to changes in strategies under the influence of maxims and determinants prevailing in the AUE/NZE-speaking environment.
The bilingual situation of the investigated Japanese communities in Australia/New Zealand was dynamic bilingualism without diglossia. In such communities, communicative norms were found to be flexible and in a state of constant development. It was found that the types of lexical transfers used in these communities differ from those adopted in a static bilingual situation such as that of the Japanese community in Hawaii. Core lexical transfers used in Hawaiian Japanese such as address terms were not adopted in JAU/JNZ. Time and quantity expressions were employed in JAU/JNZ as well, but normally in compounds or noun phrases. In this study, evidence is presented to show that these interdialectal differences can be ascribed to differences in determinants, maxims, strategies, and rules operating in these different bilingual communities.

It appears that a variety of factors were involved in transference processes to a greater or lesser degree. A significant negative correlation was found between length of stay and lexical transference in the interview situation. Although for the first few years of residence there was substantial variation in the frequency of lexical transference among the subjects, this variation was reduced and the frequency of transference decreased as the length of stay increased. It was also demonstrated that the subjects showed a tendency to employ different lexical strategies in the interviews, depending on type of stay. It seems that due to the acculturation maxim, the temporary residents were liable to adopt lexical transference more readily than the permanent residents, and also that owing to the language loyalty and identity maxims, the long-term residents were inclined to suppress lexical transference. It appears that occupation played a part in lexical transference. The existence of an English-speaking work network seemed to be a promoting factor for lexical transference, but sex, age, education, nationality of spouse, language at home, and hometown/dialect had little bearing on lexical transference in the present corpus. A moderate knowledge of English
seemed to favour lexical transference, while high or low competence in English seemed to slightly suppress lexical transference. It appeared that a good command of English favoured phonological and prosodic transference while a poor knowledge of English favoured phonological and prosodic integration. However, attitude towards transference was also important.

Socio-psychological factors also affected transference. A strong motivation to learn English and a desire to be assimilated into mainstream society were conducive to lexical transference. To show off degrees of linguistic acculturation, some subjects, normally with a poor or moderate knowledge of English, frequently adopted LS 1. However, a metalinguistic awareness, which might be fostered as the length of stay increased, appeared to be an impeding factor for lexical transference, leading to the separation of the two languages. Core lexical strategy (LS 1.2) also served as a communication strategy for overcoming lexical difficulties, achieving a communicative goal, avoiding embarrassment, and so on. It appeared that the interlocutor variable (i.e., the speaker’s relationship with the interlocutor, his/her perception of the identity of the interlocutor, etc.) and the speaker’s communicative goal also play an important role in the choice of lexical and other strategies.

LS 1.2 was adopted about twice as frequently as LS 1.1 (i.e., cultural lexical strategy). It was also found that the frequency of LS 1.2 negatively correlated with length of stay. LS 1.2 also played a significant part in performing the five functions of transference/code-switching identified in the corpus.

The choice of LS 1 immediately activates other processing strategies, monitoring, and social strategies under the influence of particular maxims and determinants prevalent in an interactive situation concerned. As noted above, various factors affect the choice of lexical strategies. A marked or an unmarked choice primarily depends on whether or not the speaker and the interlocutor share
the same communicative norm. If the item is noted as inadequate and negatively evaluated by the speaker, or if the interlocutor requests clarification because of a comprehension problem, post-correction strategy (CRS 3) is employed by the speaker for the marked core item. Otherwise, to signal the foreign status of the transferred item to the interlocutor, the speaker adopts TMSs.

About half the subjects used CRS 3. The types of corrected core items differed slightly according to type of stay. With regard to TMSs, all the subjects employed them in the interview situation. The frequency of TMSs positively correlated with the number of lexical transfer types. The temporary residents used CRS 3 slightly more frequently than the permanent residents, perhaps because of the insecure use of core lexical items, not knowing the communicative norm in the community. On the other hand, the permanent residents employed TMSs 3 and 4 (i.e., use of hedges and glosses) more frequently. Metalinguistic awareness seemed to play a part in promoting the use of TMSs 3 and 4 among the permanent residents. These monitoring strategies operating in correction or integration processes were regarded as a negative politeness strategy. The subjects' employment of these strategies appears to have been based mainly on their awareness of the degree of social integration of lexical transfers and also of the identity of the interviewer. All the monitoring and social strategies were identified in the corpus.

No distinct varieties such as might be called “Australian/New Zealand Japanese” have been developed, though some lexical transfers peculiar to JAU/JNZ were identified. In the dynamic bilingual situation of the Japanese communities in Australia/New Zealand, the communicative norm is constantly developing. Japanese expatriates in these communities seek to establish an ad hoc norm for communication. The fact that the permanent residents consciously or subconsciously attempted to suppress the use of lexical transfers in the
interviews with the present writer suggests that they clearly envisaged themselves as Japanese migrants in Australia/New Zealand.

Although the long-term residents were apt to avoid lexical transference in the interviews, they used lexical transference/code-switching more frequently in their in-group communication, as the present writer observed. The use of lexical transfers/code-switches was a communicative norm for Japanese migrants in Australia/New Zealand and also an identity/solidarity marker for them. However, in the interviews with a newcomer like the present writer, these Japanese expatriates changed lexical strategies under the influence of the identity maxim that was more predominant than other maxims. It appears that the identity maxim generated a convergent strategy linguistically and a divergent strategy psychologically on the part of these migrants when speaking to the interviewer.

As this study shows, syntactic transference is rare among first-generation Japanese-English adult bilinguals in Australia/New Zealand, though some deviations from standard norms were observed. This indicates that the structure of Japanese is fairly resilient to the dominant external linguistic norm. Provided Japanese residents in these two countries maintain their identity as Japanese persons and also make efforts to maintain their language and cultural heritage, it is unlikely that Japanese language use among Japanese migrants to Australia/New Zealand will deviate substantially from standard Japanese norms, despite the constant influence of AUE and NZE.
APPENDIX 1: Interview Questions
(English Translation)

City and People
--- When did you come to Australia/New Zealand?
--- Could you tell me about your first impressions of the city and its people?
--- Have your first impressions changed now?
--- Could you tell me your favourite place(s) in the city?

Work
--- What is your current occupation?
--- Could you tell me about your work/studies?

Life in Australia/New Zealand
--- Where do you live now?
--- How do you commute from your house to your office/university?
--- Could you describe your typical daily life in Australia/New Zealand?
--- Compared with your life in Japan, what do you think about Australian/
    New Zealand life in terms of housing, commodity price, climate, and so on?
--- Have you found something interesting about Australian/New Zealand life?
--- Have you ever encountered trouble such as illness, burglary, misunderstandings
    induced by linguistic and cultural differences?
Eating Habits

--- Have your eating habits changed since you came to Australia/New Zealand?
--- Do you eat out sometimes?
--- If so, what kind of food do you eat?

Weekends and Holidays

--- How do you spend your weekends and holidays?
--- Do you like going to movies and theatres?
--- Do you go back to Japan for a vacation?

Sports

--- Do you like Australian/New Zealand sports?
--- Do you do any sports yourself?

Reading, Journalism, and Mass Media

--- Have you read any interesting book recently?
--- Do you read Australian/New Zealand newspapers and magazines?
--- Do you read Japanese newspapers and magazines as well?
--- Do you watch TV and listen to the radio?
--- What types of TV or radio programmes do you like?
--- Have you found any differences between Japanese and Australian/New Zealand media in terms of the treatment of news?
Friendship Network
--- Do you have Australian/Kiwi friends?
--- How often do you see your friends?
--- Do you invite them to your house?
--- Do you associate with your neighbours?

Education for Children
--- Do you have any children?
--- If so, where do they go to school?
--- What do you think about the educational system in Australia/New Zealand?
--- Do you make any efforts to help your children maintain their Japanese language?

English Learning
--- How did you learn English?
--- Did you go to English language school in Australia/New Zealand?
--- How did you find Australian/New Zealand English?

View of Life
--- Do you think that your view of life has changed through your experiences in Australia/New Zealand?
Interview Questionnaire

(English Translation)

1. Sex
2. Age
3. Occupation
4. Place of Birth (City)
5. Region of Residence in Japan
   Length of Residence _______ years
6. Education
7. Formal Study of English _______ years
8. Experience of Studying Other Languages _______ years
9. Previous Experience of Living Overseas (yes/no)
   Country and Length of Stay _______ _______ years
10. Length of Residence in Australia _______ _______ months
11. Marital Status _______ Nationality of Spouse _______
12. Language in Use at Home/Work _______ / _______
APPENDIX 2:
Sample Interviews

S8 (while talking about his first impressions of Melbourne)

S: To ichiban saisho tte iu no [wa, tashika ano, kuukoo kara paatto=
I: [ee
S: =tootta dake na n desu yo.

*Monasshu* chokkoo shi- te kita n de.
I: hai
S: De, aa nan ka koo, ikamettsui *Igirisu* teki na machi da naa,
I: uun
S: [nante iu.. no o kanjimashita.
I: [hai

Aa, naruhodo nee.

*Sore ga maa daiichi inshoo datta [wake desu ne.
S: [Daiichi inshoo desu.
I: De, genzai de wa sono inshoo wa kawarimashita ka?
S: Anoo igai to kindaiteki- ja nai desu ka to iu.
I: ee uun
S: Toku ni *paburikku toransupooto* ga angai, [maa *reito de, panku-
I: [ee un fun
S: *anpunkuchmaru* da to iu hanashi wa kikimasu kedo.
I: hai hai
S: Iya maa, sore sae gaman dekireba igai to, doko ni de mo.
I: un un

(acc)

S: Ima made kuruma nakatta n desu yo.
I: Aa soo desu ka.

(dec) (acc)

S: De nan do mo paburikku toransupooto dake de idoo [shiteta n= I: [aaaaaa

S: =desu kedo, angai.
I: naruhodo ne.

S12 (while talking about Japanese society in Melbourne)

S: Soo su to (1.0) yoo wa ne, nihonjin shakai no naka wa
toku ni jo[sei no sekai ga desu ne, hijoo ni (1.0) iya na n desu yo.
I: [un
(h)

S: Sore de anmari detenai n desu.
I: Aa soo [desu ka.
S: [ee
I: Do- doo iu ten..de, sono, iya to ossharu n deshoo ka.

[Sore wa taihen kyoomibukai n desu ga.

S: [Anooooo kojinmei wa mochiron nan
to mo [iemasen kedo mo, tatoeba, oote shoosha no kata de.
I: [hai hai hai
S: [nikai me sankai me no..kata de, ee shikamo ue ni naru to=]
I: [hai hai
(dec)
S: =desu ne, anoo watashi wa za-shoosha fujin yo to iu.=
I: hai un aa
S: =De ( ) soo iu jooryuu kaikyuu no yoo ni [sakkaku o sarete=
I: [a aa aa aa
S: =ru n desu ne.
(acc)
Wareware to shite wa, anta mo sarariiman no okusan desho to,
futsuu [wa to.
I: [un fun=
S: [Tokoro ga soo iu keiken o shite kuru to desu ne, kakuchi kakuchii=
I: =[fun
S: =de iwayuru, sono repurizentatibu aruiwa sinia to iu- shite
atsukawarete kite imasu n de, soo iu fuu na jibun ga, suteetasu=
I: hai un fun
S: =ga takai to omotchau n desu ne.

S14 (while talking about her volunteer work in Sydney)

(dec)
S: ...de koodineetaa ga Korian no kata [na n desu yo.
I: [aa soo nan desu [ka.
S: [Un,
soko ni anoo, iroiro to yoo wa, [non"maiguranto no [eigo=
I: hee [un fun [hai
S: =no dekinai kata toka, nani ka kikita koto [toka=
I: un fun fun [un fun
S: =attara, soko ni..doo shitara ii [no tte denwa kakete kite, soi de=
I: [uun naruhodo ne.
S: =[denwa uketsuke? mitai na "kanji desu ↑|ne°
I: [uun un fun fun [hee
(dec) < (dec)
S: To ato, [iron na marutikaruchurararu] na ibento ga [areba,
I: [Sore wa subarashii desu ne. ] ee ee [naruhodo ne
S: Japanizu [to shite soto e dasu "wake desu ne."°
I: [un fun naruhodo ne.

S28 (while talking about his work in Sydney)

S: Ano, shigoto to shite wa (1.0) ee ka- kaisha to shite no shigoto wa,
I: hai
<
S: ano kuruuju gaisha, Shidonii no wan nai ii de, ano=
I: hai hai
S: = kankoosen koo ano hashirashitemashite,
I: hai ee sugoi desu ne.
S: ee fune to shi- fune no kazu wa, ima yonseki aru n desu [ga, ichioo=
I: [heee
S: =sono uun funagaisha no maneijingu dairekutaa [to iu no ] ga=
I: [ee ee ee]
S: =watashi no pojishon (nan desu), [ee.
I: [uun (acc)
S: Fudan wa [anmari an (1.0) tokubetsu ni nan to iu n desu=
I: [Sugoi desu ne, ee.
<
S: =ka ne, sono iwayuru ruuchin waaku ga nai wake desu.
I: un

S30 (while talking about his restaurant business in Sydney)

S: ...ja ranchi mo oopun sezaru °o enai.°
Sore de sebun dee oopun °ni naru to. °
↑ Ne, ichinichi yasumi ga, [futsuka yasumi ga ichinichi yasumi ni=
I: [un fun
S: =shite, kondo wa..yasumi nashi.
[Son de ranchi mo oopun se yo.
I: [un fun
S: Kekkyoku rento ga appu ni natta eikyoo de.
. De, uchi dake ja nakute, daitai zenbu soo desu yo.
I: Aa soo desu [ka.
S: [Minna rento appu de, zenbu sebun dee oopun
[ni naritsutsu aru.
I: [un
S: Un, sore dake maa [ne, rento ga ne, [kitsui wake yo ne.

I: [un un fun

Konoo, chika ga..koo agatte kita no wa, daitai dore gurai..mae kara [koo

S: [Un yori mo hore, moo keiyaku no toki ni, shii-pii-ai de ten

paaento [toka, aa iu keiyaku sarechau desho.

I: [aa fun fun aa naruho, hai.

S43 (while talking about her life in Australia)

S: ..ee shichiji gojuppun goro ni uchi o demashite, basu gaa=

I: hai

S: =hachiji ii sanpun ni, anoo jibun no..itsumo tsukatte ru basu tei

ni haitte kuru n desu ga, sore ni nokkatte, "Shidoni" ee shitii ni,

shitii to yutte mo Uinyaado ni hairu n [desu ga.

I: [hai

S: Dee soko karaa a aruku nari basu ni noru nari shite, eetoo (1.0)

(dec)

Middle City Centre to yuu (h) tokoro [ni, yasui kooii to koo=

I: [hai

S: =toosuto o oo saabisu shite kureru tokoro ga ari, soko de=

I: ee ee

(dec)

S: =burekkufasuto o totte, ee sore kara ofi- eeto otsutome ni i=

I: hai
S: =Rokkusu made ikimashite, n de, ee soko de motte, ee (0.5)

I: hai

S: ichinichi ga hajimarui wake desu.
APPENDIX 3:
Questionnaire Survey

以下の日本語の文(1〜110)はオーストラリア、ニュージーランド在住の日本人が話す日本語から取られたものです。各文には外来語（カタカナ字で表記）が含まれています。これらの外来語について、次のA、Bの各項目の中から適当なものを選び、その番号をカッコのなかに記入してください。

A
1 知らない。
2 知っているが、自分では使わない。
3 ときどき使う。
4 よく使う。
5 変だと思う。

B
1 日本では使われていないと思う。
2 日本でも使われていると思う。

例
コーヒーを飲みながら話しました。 A (4); B (2)

1 シティーに行こうって言ったら、そしたら、何を着ようかしらってことを言うんですよ。 A ( ); B ( )

2 雨も、まあ、最近ちょっと長雨が降りますけども、もともとは、その、シャワーだよ。 A ( ); B ( )

3 現地校行っても、ちっちゃい時から行かしていればですね、まあ、ネイティブに近いような格好で、できるでしょうけども。 A ( ); B ( )

4 ティーパーティーといいますかね、そういうのに呼ばれたりですね。 A ( ); B ( )
5 日本から... アテンドをしろという指示がきて、そういうふうにしますと...。

6 これはお互いに、まあ、アクセススティブな問題だということだと思うんですね。

7 これは契約の社会ですから、リツウェンで出したものについては、それを訂正するということになれば、裁判だとか弁護士だとか、そういう手段を使わないとできないことで...。

8 具体的に言うとですね、例えば、女房がスクールバスを待ってるときに水をかけられたとかですね。

9 こちらのキーワイのかたは、いい人もいればね、もう外人慣れしちゃって、すごく冷たい人から、もういろいろですね。

10 例えば、大手商社の方で、2回目、3回目の方で、しかも上になるとですね、あの、私は大手商社夫人よと言う。

11 普段はあまり、あの、特別に、なんと言うんですかね、その、いわゆるルーチンワークがないわけです。

12 のんびりとですね、まわりの景色を見ながら、まあ、あの、めしでも食べようかっていう、そういうクラーズは、もうシドニーしかできないですね。

13 まあ、そうですね、比較的見るとつのは、クリケットを、あの、見たりしますけどね。

14 ここは道が広いという点ではドライブしやすいですね。

15 だから私のほうもね、そういう面でね、レントをね、2軒、3軒のうち2軒下げてもよかった、ええ。

16 ホテルと兼用になってるからね、あたしのフラットは。

17 どうしても日本人のお客さんぽっきりなんですから、ね、オージーの日本語できないの方が勤めても役に立たないし。
18 それで、結局、請求してお金取ったために、あとで、結局、あのう、飲み物
だけでフードを出さなかったと、これ違反だと、ね。
A( ); B( )

19 今のね、地下のね、フードコートが全部なくなっちゃうらしい。
A( ); B( )

20 改築の時にね、ティカウェイの店出したいなと思って。
A( ); B( )

21 まあ、家賃は高いて言うけれども、この私にしてみたらリーズナブルかな
とも思います。
A( ); B( )

22 チュートリアルとか、人数の少ないこういう授業だと、やっぱり、ま、英語
とかの方でいろいろ苦労してるんですけれど。
A( ); B( )

23 あの、会計学のレクチャーだと、もうそうですね、1クラス、そうですね。
200人もいないですかね。
A( ); B( )

24 メルボルンにちょっと旅行行ったぐらいで、ラウンドもお金があればと
考えてるんですけども。
A( ); B( )

25 まあ、僕はシェアーだから、4人でひとつの家に住んでますけどね。
A( ); B( )

26 白人の普通のオフィスワーカーみたいな人で、めしを食いに来る人がいっぱ
いいずわけですよ。
A( ); B( )

27 チャイニーズは安く、安くて、まあ、口に合いますよね、いつも。
A( ); B( )

28 オーストラリア人向けの、ええ、ええ、時事報道番組の、ええ、生番組の
トークショーの制作担当ですか。
A( ); B( )

29 夏はたいていビーチでごろごろしてますね。
A( ); B( )

30 アベレージでいくと、月に2回ぐらい行きますよね。
A( ); B( )

31 美術館関係はひと月に1回ぐらいはなにかメイジャーなものがあるから
行きたいなど、そういう感じですね。
A( ); B( )
32 土曜日の夜か、ウィークデイの夜ですけども。
A ( ) ; B ( )

33 フラットメイトにどっか連れてってもらって...。
A ( ) ; B ( )

34 野菜炒めとか、あと、魚とチップスとか...
A ( ) ; B ( )

35 もしそういうペーパーワークがないときは、あの、たいがい飲みに行きますね。
A ( ) ; B ( )

36 気さくでほんとにイージーゴーイングっていうか...
A ( ) ; B ( )

37 まあ、あとはいろんなムービーですね。そういうのを見せますね、はい。
A ( ) ; B ( )

38 いわゆる日本の、そ、まあ、カルチャーかもしれないですね。
A ( ) ; B ( )

39 トランも、もう１台あるんですね、古い型のが。
A ( ) ; B ( )

40 一流のスーパーバイヤーなんですが、これはもう、この人は世界的に、もう有名な人なんで。
A ( ) ; B ( )

41 アボリジニーの人たちの立場を考えるんだったら、それはおかしいって、勧告してるでしょう。
A ( ) ; B ( )

42 今で言うバックパッカーみたいな感じで、ずっと放浪とか、旅をしてたので...
A ( ) ; B ( )

43 「彼女、オージー？」「いや、ニュージー。」
A ( ) ; B ( )

44 大きい家にしても破られても、まあ、勿論、残ってる家も随分ありますけども、あのう、ユニットがね、あの、たくさん建って...
A ( ) ; B ( )

45 挿挿程度の付き合いから、まあ、たまにはよねで、家によんでアフタヌーンティーっていう付き合いまで何人かいますけど。
A ( ) ; B ( )

46 日本人って、あのう、自分たちがすごくウエスタマイズされてるっていう意識が結構あると思います。
A ( ) ; B ( )
47 多分、あのう、なにかホリデーのときだと思いますけども。 A ( ) ; B ( )

48 今学期やっているのは、インドネシア語と、ええ、リサーチペーパーだけです。 A ( ) ; B ( )

49 オージールール、あれは１度も見に行ったことないけれども、まあ、せっかくメルボルンに来てるから、帰るまでに１度は見に行きたいなって思いますね。 A ( ) ; B ( )

50 汚いなぁ、シドニーのエアポートはと思ったんですけど。 A ( ) ; B ( )

51 もう高校の、あのう、シニアになってくると、時間がないんですよね。 A ( ) ; B ( )

52 食料品を買いたかったんだけど、1時でクローズなんですね。 A ( ) ; B ( )

53 ガバーメント関係ですね、でも働いたことあります。 A ( ) ; B ( )

54 あのう、ショップアシスタントという形で雇われてまして、あの、お店自体はオパール販売店ですね。 A ( ) ; B ( )

55 あの、ウィークエンドは家庭の仕事しなくちゃいけないでしょ。 A ( ) ; B ( )

56 くたびれたら、あのう、やっぱし、あの、ヘビーな物読まないよね、きっと。 A ( ) ; B ( )

57 最初に来たのがですね、あの、ワーキングホリデーで、あの、来たんですけれども。 A ( ) ; B ( )

58 すごく道がワイドなんですね。 A ( ) ; B ( )

59 それで、シェフは、あの、フランス人だったの。 A ( ) ; B ( )

60 すること決まってるの。30分以内でクックできるものだけ。 A ( ) ; B ( )
61 町並みはね。...サバープに行ったら、そんな変わらない。 A（）；B（）

62 あの、ライセンス取る時もそれの試験が厳しいわけ。 A（）；B（）

63 学校に行って、ま、授業を受けたり、ティーチングをしたりして。...。 A（）；B（）

64 イースターにカードを送り合ったりするぐらいですね。 A（）；B（）

65 自然の中に行きたいと思ったら、すぐ行えますよね。アクセスがある。 A（）；B（）

66 たいていマスターの学生ですから、そうすると日本語かなりできるわけです よね、オーストラリア人。 A（）；B（）

67 あのう、ドライプウェイの掃除が大変だとか、そういった面はあるんです けど。 A（）；B（）

68 プッシュウォーキングに行かないかと誘われて。...。 A（）；B（）

69 あの、ハイスクールあたりの子たちが、こう、かたまってたりとかで、 ちょっと、あの、感じが違いますね。 A（）；B（）

70 あのう、ローカルの人ってそんなに、あの、付き合わないですね。 A（）；B（）

71 日本料理が多いかなと思うんでしょうねけれど、あとは、まあ、エスニックですね。 A（）；B（）

72 いっそ行くなら、スカラーシップでも取ったらどうですかっていう話が あって。...。 A（）；B（）

73 「大学の近くに住んでいらっしゃるですか。」「はい、フランティング です。」 A（）；B（）

74 その時にこっちで、そのう、ええ、ヘルプしましょうっていうのが。... ありますって。 A（）；B（）

75 日本ですよ、キャッシュを渡したりしますけど、そういうのをしていいのか どうか。...。 A（）；B（）
76 服装は、うーん、そうですね、カジュアルだと思いませんね。 A ( ) ; B ( )

77 おにぎり持ってどっか公園行って、でー、ゆっくりして、で、それからショッピング行って。。。 A ( ) ; B ( )

78 それから、まあ、こっちでエム・ピー・エーやりましたでょ。 A ( ) ; B ( )

79 テニス、ずっとソーシャルでやってますからね。 A ( ) ; B ( )

80 クライアントとしては、あのう、弁護士事務所とか会計事務所、まあ、そういったところで翻訳、ともに通訳ね、裁判所の通訳、そういった方たちを派遣している。 A ( ) ; B ( )

81 僕と、その、ピー・エイチ・ディーの生徒ふたりだけですね。 A ( ) ; B ( )

82 午後はまた、あのう、子供たち結婚、あの、お稽古事があるものですから。。。3時5分にピックしたら、その後はそういうところに行きますので。 A ( ) ; B ( )

83 あとは、よく友達に誘われてバーに行ったりとか。。。 A ( ) ; B ( )

84 あのう、いわゆるダムトゥリー、ユウカリの木すごく多いんですってね、この国。 A ( ) ; B ( )

85 そのう、フリーマーケットとか、やってるのが面白くて。 A ( ) ; B ( )

86 2月からワーキングホリデーも今ストップになっています。。。。だから、キッチンハンドもワーキングの人が来ないし。。。 A ( ) ; B ( )

87 最初はすごくコンフリクトがあったんですけど、今はそんなことないんじゃない、もう。日本のやり方がいいと思えば日本のやり方でやるし。。。 A ( ) ; B ( )

88 冬の間はサッカーとか、子供がやってたので、ほとんど毎日なんか、あの、あるんですね、アクティビティーが。 A ( ) ; B ( )

89 彼ら自身も、うーん、彼らのソサイアティを守るほうだから。。。
90 ブライトンはね、ま、エリアとしては、まあ、高級住宅地であっていいんですしょうけど、。
A ( ) ; B ( )

91 昼までごろごろ寝て、でー、ああ、近くのカフェでブランチを食べて、。
A ( ) ; B ( )

92 あの、名所旧跡というよりも、僕は、あの、芸術面ですかね。たとえば、ミュージアムとか。
A ( ) ; B ( )

93 ま、フレンチとかになってくると、あんまり行かないですけどね。
A ( ) ; B ( )

94 わたし、このタームで3ターム目になるんですけれども。
A ( ) ; B ( )

95 大人がはぐっていうよりも、子供っていうか、ディーンエイジャーの人たちがはくものだったんです。
A ( ) ; B ( )

96 あのう、一番不便を感じたのは、トランスポートですね。
A ( ) ; B ( )

97 今はもうそれこそコリアンになってきたでしょう。コリアン街になってきて
A ( ) ; B ( )

98 アル中とかドラッグの人たちとか、ああいう人たちは普通に話してると普通
A ( ) ; B ( )

99 ちっちゃなキンドイぐらいの子どもがいて。
A ( ) ; B ( )

100 「風邪ですか。」「いえ、ヘイフィーバーなんですよ。」
A ( ) ; B ( )

101 そういう観光地っていうのも、郊外なんかワインのワイナリーがあったり。
A ( ) ; B ( )

102 「これはモール、モールですよね。」「よく買い物に行かれますか、
そのあたり。」
A ( ) ; B ( )
103 ここでブレックファストをとって。……おええ、1日が始まるわけですね。
A（）;B（）

104 「切符はどこで手に入れられるんですか。」「やっぱり、オペラハウスで買う
ことが多いです、直接行って。……他、どこで買うとブッキングフィー
取られちゃうんで。」
A（）;B（）

105 あの子はパケハとマオリの間の子です。
A（）;B（）

106 あの辺りはなんとか古風なレストランというか。……ミルクバーかレストランか
なんかあったと思うんですけど。
A（）;B（）

107 例えば、ラグビーの試合をやるときに。……ハカリっていって、その、
マオリの戦闘の祈りを、あの、踊りをするんですね。
A（）;B（）

108 男性店員は。……あの、ディスカウントはしてくれますね。
A（）;B（）

109 僕は、その、将来オールブラックになるたいなぁとか。……そういう
ような夢を持ってね、ラグビーって続けられるじゃないですか。
A（）;B（）

110 「あれは食べます？その、ベジマイト。」「ああ、食べろって言われれば
なんとか食べれるけど。」
A（）;B（）
Table A.1.—Lexical transfers intelligible to more than 50% of informants resident in Japan (Question B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Not used</th>
<th>Used (%)</th>
<th>Not used</th>
<th>Used (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>neitibu</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>tii paatii</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>sukuuru basu</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>kuruuzu</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>kuriketto</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>doraibu</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>rizunaburu</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Chainizu</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>too ku shoo</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>biichi</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>abereeji</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>meijaa</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>uiiku dei</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>chippusu</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>miu bii</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>karuchaa</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>suupaabaiaza</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Aborijini</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>yunitto</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>afutaman tii</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>horidee</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>eapooto</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>shina</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>kuroozu</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>uiikuendo</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>hebi</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>waakingu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>horidee</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>waido</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>shefu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>raisensu</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>lisutaat</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>akusesu</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>masutaa</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>doraibuswei</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>hai sukuuru</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A.2.—Lexical transfers intelligible to less than 50% of informants resident in Japan (Question B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not used</th>
<th>Used (%)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Not used</th>
<th>Used (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>shitii</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>furatingu</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>shawaa</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>emu-bii-ee</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>atendo</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>soosharu</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>akuseputaburu</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>piii-eichi-dii</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ritum</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>pikklu</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kiwi</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>gamuturii</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>za</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>kitchin hando</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ruuchin waaku</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>konfurikuto</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>rento</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>akutibitii</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>furatto</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>sosaiattii</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ooji</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>earia</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>faudo</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>taamu</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>faudo kooto</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>toransupooto</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>teikuawei</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>kindii</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>chuutoriaru</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>hei fiiba</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>raundo</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>mooru</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>sheaa</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>bukkingufi</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ofisu waaka</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>pakeha</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>furattomeito</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>mirukuba</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>peepawaaku</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>haka</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>iiiji-googuingu</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>Oori Burakkusu</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>toramu</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Bejimaito</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>bakkupakkaa</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Nyunii</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>yunitto</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>uesutanaizu</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>risaachi peepaa</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Ooji ruuru</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>gabaamento</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>shoppu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ashisutanto</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>kukku</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>sabaabu</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>tichingu</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>busshwokingu</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>sukaraashhippu</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4:
Subject Information (S55-S87)

Subject Background: Australia (I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject code</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Hometown</th>
<th>Length of stay (y.m)¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S55</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>volunteer teacher</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Ehime</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S56</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>graduate student</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Yamaguchi</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S57</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>working holiday</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Fukui</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S58</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>ELS student</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Fukushima</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S59</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>graduate student</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Kanagawa</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S60</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>working holiday</td>
<td>technical college</td>
<td>Nagasaki</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S61</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>travel college student</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S62</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>restaurant manager</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S63</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>graduate student</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Mie</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S64</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>graduate student</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Aichi</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S65</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>graduate student</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S66</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>graduate student</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Nara</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S67</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>graduate student</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Shizuoka</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S68</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>travel college student</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Hyogo</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ y = year; m = month
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Highest Education</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S69</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>graduate student</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Hiroshima</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S70</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>graduate student</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S71</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>graduate student</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Ehime</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S72</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>tour guide</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Nagoya</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S73</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>shop assistant</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Fukushima</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S74</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>office worker</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Hyogo</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S75</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>graduate student</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Chiba</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S76</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60?</td>
<td>managing director</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S77</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>chef</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Tochigi</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S78</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>graduate student</td>
<td>graduate school</td>
<td>Chiba</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S79</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>unemployed (retired)</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Nagoya</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>chef</td>
<td>middle school</td>
<td>Niigata</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S81</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>restaurant owner</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Kanagawa</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S82</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>restaurant owner</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Kagoshima</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S83</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>restaurant manageress</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>Hiroshima</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S84</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>restaurant manageress</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>Gunma</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S85</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>unemployed (retired)</td>
<td>girls’ high school</td>
<td>Miyagi</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S86</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>nurse</td>
<td>technical college</td>
<td>Shizuoka</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S87</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50?</td>
<td>restaurant owner</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Ehime</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject Background: Australia (II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject code</th>
<th>Type of Stay</th>
<th>Spouse</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>In-group belonging score</th>
<th>Language at home/work</th>
<th>Previous overseas experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S55</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S56</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E/E</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S57</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E, J/E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S58</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E/E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S59</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S60</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S61</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E/E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S62</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>J/E, J</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S63</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E/E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S64</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>J/E, J</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S65</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E/E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S66</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>J/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S67</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E, J/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S68</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E, J/E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S69</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E, J/E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S70</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S71</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E/E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S72</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S73</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>E/E, J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S74</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>J/E</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S75</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E, J/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S76</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>J/J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S77</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>J/E, J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S78</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E/E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S79</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>J/J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S81</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Moderate 2</td>
<td>J/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S82</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Moderate 1</td>
<td>J/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S83</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>High 1</td>
<td>E/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S84</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>High 1</td>
<td>J/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S85</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>High 2</td>
<td>J/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S86</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>High 2</td>
<td>E/E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S87</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Moderate 1</td>
<td>J/E, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5:
Criteria for Word Count in This Study

1. Lexemes (i.e., dictionary words) realised as word-forms (Bauer 1992: 256) are counted as single units (e.g., *iki-mashi-ta* [go-auxiliary (polite)-past]).

2. Bound morphemes such as particles and affixes are not counted (e.g., *Yooroppa-jin* ‘Europeans’, *yoochi-en* ‘kindergarten’, *choomajime* ‘extremely serious’). Copulas, auxiliary verbals, and inflectional morphemes are excluded from counting, since they are bound morphemes (e.g., *iki-mashi-ta* [go-auxiliary (polite)-past]).

3. Two-character morphemes are counted as single units (e.g., *bunka* ‘culture’, *kaisha* ‘company’, *shizen* ‘nature’) (cf. Ishii 1989: 171).

4. Two-character morphemes which cannot stand alone are regarded as equivalent to affixes (e.g., *kokusai-shakai* ‘international society’, *taikyu-reesu* ‘perseverance race’, *jibun-igai* ‘other than oneself’, *tenki-shidai* ‘depending on the weather’) (Miyaji 1988: 51).

5. Compounds (including hybrid compounds) are each treated as single units (e.g., *kankyoo osen* ‘environmental pollution’, *hotto doggu* ‘hot dog’, *aisu kuriimu* ‘ice cream’, *kankoo basu* ‘sightseeing bus’).

6. Clipping compounds are regarded as single units (e.g., *gen-patsu* ‘nuclear power plant’, *paso-kon* ‘personal computer’, *waa-puro* ‘word processor’, *deji-kame* ‘digital camera’).
7. Acronyms and initialisations are also counted as single units (e.g., AIDS, MBA, PTA).

8. Blends are counted as single units (e.g., obatarian (obasan + battalion), sumoggu ‘smog’ (smoke + fog)).

9. Reduplicated words are counted as single units (e.g., wareware ‘we’, hitobito ‘people’, kirakira ‘twinkling’).

10. Idiomatic or set expressions, formulae, and phrases are treated as single units (e.g., ki ni iru ‘to like’, aa iu ‘that sort’, koo shita ‘this sort’, sono ue ‘in addition, moreover’, nan te iu ka ‘erm, (lit.) what shall I say?’, Sankyou ‘Thank you’).

11. Nominalisers such as koto and no are counted as single units.

12. Lexical transfers/code-switches are treated as single units, irrespective of their length (i.e., words, phrases, or clauses, or – rarely – complete sentences). For example, furatto ‘flat’, nashonaru paaku ‘national park’, wan sukuuru iyaa ‘one school year’, and the quote “Discount, please” are all counted as one unit. Verbal noun constructions (e.g., arenji suru ‘to arrange’, enjoi suru ‘to enjoy’) are counted as single units. Those items metalinguistically used by the subjects (i.e., when talking about Australian English) are not included.

13. Foreign place names and other proper nouns are normally not counted as lexical transfers, though they are included in the total number of words. However, frequently used proper nouns and significant items peculiar to the Australian environment are included (e.g., Noosu ‘North Sydney’, Kin-kuro ‘Kings Cross’).

14. Laughter is regarded as a single unit.

15. Incomplete words are not counted.
APPENDIX 6:
Lexical Transfers Used by 44 Subjects in Australia

This appendix presents all the lexical transfers that occurred in the main corpus for the present study. The following points should be noted:

1. A lexical transfer/code-switched item is italicised and its original form or meaning is presented next to the item.
2. A number in parentheses indicates tokens of an item occurring in the interview.
3. Proper nouns in parentheses are excluded from counting.
4. If a lexical transfer is a shortened form, its original form is given in parentheses next to the item (e.g., **reji (register) ‘cash register, checkout, cashier’) (see 12 for **).
5. Clipping hybrid compounds are shown as follows: e.g., **aru-chuu (arukooru ‘alcoholic’ + chuedoku ‘addiction’) ‘alcoholic’.
6. In the case of Japanese English, a Japanese-coined word is presented as follows: e.g., **shea-meito (JE. share-mate) ‘flatmate’.
7. If the source language is other than English, the etymology is shown in parentheses (e.g., **biiru (Dt. bier) ‘beer’, **kapuchiino (It. cappuccino) ‘cappuccino’).
8. The classification of lexical categories or parts of speech is based on that of the source language irrespective of the grammatical function of
a lexical transfer in the recipient language.

9. If phrases in the noun category contain free morphemes belonging to other parts of speech such as adjectives, prepositions, determiners, these items are placed in parentheses.

10. In the adjective category, particles attached to the preceding adjectival transfers are shown in parentheses.

11. A single asterisk indicates that an item is an incorrect form; its correct form is shown in parentheses next to the item (e.g., *maguppii [magupai] ‘magpie’).

12. A double asterisk indicates that an item is a cultural lexical transfer which has no native, Sino-Japanese, or well-integrated Western loanword equivalent (e.g., **hotto doggu ‘hot dog’).

13. A transferred item is classified as a transfer of cultural type, if its native, Sino-Japanese, or well-assimilated Western loan counterpart exists but is not widely used across the speech community (e.g., **oobaa ‘overcoat’ vs. gaitoo).

14. If a nominal compound or noun phrase contains a cultural item as one of the constituent elements, it is regarded as a cultural transfer as a whole (e.g., **pengin pareedo ‘penguin parade’, **(puraibeeto) hoteru ‘(private) hotel’).

15. F stands for formula; QT for quote.
S1

Nouns:

Adjectives:
- Angurikan: 'Anglican', mein: 'main' (5), Oosutorarian: 'Australian'

Hybrids:
- imeeji-teki: 'in terms of image' (ni), **kokusai: nyuusu: 'international news'

S2

Nouns:

Adjectives:
- mein: 'main' (no), paburikku: 'public', rafu: 'rough', rookaru: 'local' (no) (2)
Hybrids:
**garasu-bari ‘glass (Dt. glas)-surfaced’ (no), kosuto-teki ‘in terms of cost’ (ni),
nihon resutoran ‘Japanese restaurant’, Oojii-san ‘Mr/Ms. Aussie’

S3
Nouns:
**basu ‘bus’ (4), (botanikaru) gaaden ‘(botanical) garden’, chansu ‘chance’,
diskaunto ‘discount’, dorama ‘drama’, fasshon ‘fashion’, **kapuchiino
(It. cappuccino) ‘cappuccino’, koodimeeto ‘coordinate’, **kooto ‘coat’ (2),
(nashonaru) paaku ‘(national) park’ (2), **meron ‘melon’, neitibu ‘native’,
**nyusu ‘news’, Oojii ‘Aussie’ (7), peesu ‘pace’, **rizumu ‘rhythm’, toramu
‘tram’ (2), **seetaa ‘sweater’ (2), **sheaa ‘share’, shitii ‘city’, shoppingu
‘shopping’ (2), suubenia shoppu ‘souvenir shop’, teikuawei ‘takeaway’,
**terebi ‘television’, woshingu mashin ‘washing machine’, wain ‘wine’,
**wainarii ‘winery’

Verbs:
rifuresshu ‘to refresh’, seebu ‘to save’, **sheaa ‘to share’

Adjectives:
Aborijinaru ‘Aboriginal’ (no) (2), botanikaru ‘botanical’, burui ‘blue’ (ni),
iiziigooingu ‘easy-going’, nashonaru ‘national’ (2), rafu ‘rough’, shibia ‘severe’,
shimpuru ‘simple’ (na)

Prepositions:
raundo ‘round’ (4)

Hybrids:
tootaru-teki (ni) ‘in total’, **gomu zoori ‘rubber (Dt. gom) sandals’, eikaiwa
sukuru ‘English conversation school’

Formulae/Quotes:
Discount, please (QT)
Haroo ‘hello’ (F)
S4

Nouns:


Adjectives:


Prepositions:

- raundo ‘round’

Hybrids:

- *manyuaru misshon-sha ‘manual transmission car’

Formulae/Quotes:

- sankyuu ‘thank you’ (F)

S5

Nouns:


Verbs:

Amerikanaizu ‘to Americanise’, rirakkusu ‘to relax’, torai ‘to try’

Adjectives:


Hybrids:

uikurii zasshi ‘weekly magazine’

S6

Nouns:


Verbs:

kabaa ‘to cover’, sabusukuribu ‘to subscribe’

Adjectives:

haado ‘hard’, rongu ‘long’, waido ‘wide’ (2)

Hybrids:

daigaku reberu ‘university level’, **nyusu bangumi ‘news programme’, meka-zuki ‘someone who is keen on machinery and equipment’, **pai kawa ‘piecrust’, **pai kiji ‘piecrust’ (2), **paso-kon tsuushin (paasonaru konpyuutaa ‘personal computer’ + tsuushin ‘communication’) ‘electronic communication’, **Tefuron kakoo ‘Teflon-coated’, **yakyuu chiimu ‘baseball team’ (2)

Nouns:

suupaamaaketto ‘supermarket’, **tenisu ‘tennis’, (tenporarii) rejidento ‘(temporary) resident’, **terebi ‘television’ (5), toppu ‘top’, (tsui)-bettorummu ‘(two) bedroom’ (2), tiineijaa ‘teenager’

Adjectives:

*fasuto* ‘fast’, *Japaniizu* ‘Japanese’, *tenporarii* ‘temporary’

Determiners:

*tsuu* ‘two’ (2)

Hybrids:


S8

Nouns:

Verbs:

enjoi ‘to enjoy’, **sheaa ‘to share’

Adjectives:


Hybrids:


Formulae/Quotes:

Gibu mit manee ‘Give me money’ (2) (QT)
OK, OK (QT)
OK (3) (QT)

S9

Nouns:

**kaado** ‘card’, **kaaringu** ‘curling’, **kategorii** ‘category’, **keesu** ‘case’ (3),
**komyunikeeshon** ‘communication’ (2), **koohii** (Dt. koff’ie) ‘coffee’, **koosu** ‘course’ (5),
**korekushon** ‘collection’, **Kuinzu Ingurisshu** ‘Queen’s English’, **kurasu** ‘class’,
**kurasumeeto** ‘classmate’, **kuriketto** ‘cricket’ (5), **kuruuzingu** ‘cruising’ (2),
**kyarakutaa** ‘character’, **meekaa** ‘maker’, **miruku** ‘milk’, **myuujiamu** ‘museum’ (2),

Verbs:
* rejisutoreeto [rejisutaa] ‘to register’ (2), sapooto ‘to support’

Adjectives:

**Chainizuu** ‘Chinese (cuisine)’, dorai ‘dry’, furanku ‘frank’, insutanto ‘instant’,

Determiners:

**ten** ‘ten’

Hybrids:

ekusutoraoodinarii-teki ‘extraordinary type of’ (na), komedii shibai ‘comedy theatre’, sai-fai-gakatta ‘sci-fi type of’, **tanjoo paatii** ‘birthday party’
Nouns:

- arukooru ‘alcohol’, **baree ‘ballet’, **basu ‘bus’ (5), burijji ‘bridge’,
- walking’, **yoga (Skr. yoga) ‘yoga’

Verbs:

- imeeji ‘to image’

Adjectives:

- Chainiizu ‘Chinese (cuisine)’, kurashikku (classic) ‘classical (music)’,
- orijinaru ‘original’, sentoraru ‘central’

Hybrids:

- autodoa shikoo ‘outdoor-orientated’, **basu-tei ‘bus stop’ (3), **terebi ran
- ‘TV programme guide’

Nouns:

- (botanikaru) gaaden ‘(botanical) garden’, **channeru ‘channel’, doraibingu
- ressun ‘driving lesson’ (2), doraibu ‘drive’, furasutoreeshon ‘frustration’,
- gaarufruendo ‘girlfriend’, **hoomusutei ‘homestay’, **konbini ‘convenience store’,
- **koohii (Dt. koffie) ‘coffee’, kuuraa (cooler) ‘room cooler, air-conditioner’ (3),
- **Medikea ‘Medicare’, **nyuusu ‘news’, **paattii ‘party’, **raijo ‘radio’ (2),
- sabukaruchaa ‘subculture’, Satadee sukuuru ‘Saturday school’, Sebun ‘(Channel)
Seven’, **sheaa ‘share’, **tenisu ‘tennis’, **terebi ‘television’ (2), tiichingu ‘teaching’

Verbs:
  kabaa ‘to cover’, **sheaa ‘to share’

Adjectives:
  botanikaru ‘botanical’, kosunoporitan ‘cosmopolitan’ (na), oopun ‘open’ (na), Oosutorarian ‘Australian’

Hybrids:
  **eijuuken biza ‘permanent residence visa’, **haiki gasu (exhaust gas) ‘exhaust fumes’, **terebi bangumi ‘TV programme’ (2)

Nouns:

Verbs:
apuriishieito ‘to appreciate’, atendo ‘to attend’, inpuruubu ‘to improve’, masutaa ‘to master’, mikkusu ‘to mix’

Adjectives:

Determiners:
za ‘the’

Hybrids:

Formulae/Quotes:
Hi (QT)
Excuse me (QT)
How are you? (QT)
Thank you (QT)

S13
Nouns:
aagyumento ‘argument’ (2), andaa (under) ‘undergraduate’ (2), **basu ‘bus’ (3), **basu sutoppu ‘bus stop’ (2), biichi ‘beach’ (2), bijinesu suutsu ‘business suit’, biru ‘building’ (5), **butikku (Fr. boutique) ‘boutique’, **channeru ‘channel’, **Channeru Sebun ‘Channel Seven’ (2), **Channeru Ten ‘Channel Ten’ (2), daibingu ‘diving’ (2), depaatoo ‘department store’ (2), dipaatomento ‘department’,
**erebeetaa ‘elevator’ (3), essei ‘essay’ (8), fasshon ‘fashion’, **futobooru
‘football’ (2), goshippu ‘gossip’, hiaringu ‘hearing’, iguzamu ‘examination’,
imeeji ‘image’, intabyuu ‘interview’, **jaaji ‘jersey’, **jogingu ‘jogging’,
**jogingu shuuzu ‘jogging shoes’, koosu ‘course’ (6), koosawaaku ‘coursework’
(2), kurasu ‘class’ (2), **kuriketto ‘cricket’, maaketto ‘market’, (mainaa) shiishisu
‘(minor) thesis’, **nyusu ‘news’, oo-kee ‘OK’, (Oosutorarian) sutadiizu
‘(Australian) studies’, paaramento ‘parliament’ (2), **paatii ‘party’ (4), punto
‘point’, posutogurajueeto ‘postgraduate’, rain ‘line’, **rajio ‘radio’, ranngu
sabujekuto ‘subject’ (2), **shea-meito (JE. share-mate) ‘flatmate’, shiishisu ‘thesis’,
shisutemu ‘system’, shitii ‘city’ (13), shoppingu ‘shopping’, suunikaa ‘sneakers’,
supeesu ‘space’, superu (spell) ‘spelling’, suueeto raiburarii ‘state library’ (2),
**takushi ‘taxi’, **tenisu ‘tennis’ (2), **terebi ‘television’ (3), testsu ‘test’,
toramu ‘tram’ (9), tore-pan (traning pants) ‘sweat pants’ (2), tsuurizumu ‘tourism’,
**uindoo-shoppingu ‘window-shopping’

Verbs:

**sheaa ‘to share’

Adjectives:

Betonamiizu ‘Vietnamese (cuisine)’, Chainiizu ‘Chinese (cuisine)’ (2),
esunikku ‘ethnic’ (no), intaadisipurinarli ‘interdisciplinary’ (no), mainaa ‘minor’,
Oosutorarian ‘Australian’, rafu ‘rough’ (2), sumuuzu ‘smooth’ (ni)

Hybrids:

Chainiizu-gai (Chinese town) ‘Chinatown’, soshioroji kankei ‘related to
sociology’, tan-pan ‘short pants’

Nouns:

**bideo ‘video’ (3), biichi ‘beach’, borantia ‘volunteer’ (3), **busshuwooku
‘bushwalk’, **busshuwookingu ‘bushwalking’, dii-kee ‘dining kitchen’,
doraibuwei ‘driveway’, eejento ‘agent’, (furu) neemu ‘(full) name’, **gorfu
‘golf’, **gorfu wido ‘golf widow’, Guriiku ‘Greek’, (hai) sukuuru ‘(high)
‘Japanese’ (2), kanturii ‘country’, **karuchaa shokku ‘culture shock’ (2), kaunseru

275

Adjectives:

Chainizu ‘Chinese (cuisine)’ (2), furii ‘free’ (ni), furu ‘full’, hai ‘high’, Itarian ‘Italian (cuisine)’, marutikaruchuraru ‘multicultural’ (na), oopun ‘open’, rookaru ‘local’ (na)

Hybrids:

soogoo meekaa ‘manufacturer of general goods’

Formulae/Quotes:

Fuck you (QT)
Japanese go home (QT)
Asian go home (QT)

Nouns:

Verbs:
arenji ‘to arrange’, seebu ‘to save’

Adjectives:

Determiners:
a ‘a’, sekando ‘second’, tsuu ‘two’, wan ‘one’

Hybrids:
**danberu undoo ‘dumbbell exercise’, shoppingu-gai ‘shopping town’

S16
Nouns:
**aisu kuriimu ‘ice cream’, **auto ‘out’, **baabekyuu ‘barbecue’,
**miito pat ‘meat pie’, **nyuusu ‘news’ (2), Oojii ‘Aussie’ (2), **piano ‘piano’,

Verbs:
pikku (pick) ‘to pick up’

Adjectives:
Chainizu ‘Chinese (cuisine)’ (2), foomaru ‘formal’, hai ‘high’, kajuaru ‘casual’, rongu ‘long (skirt)’, rongu ‘long’ (na), supootii ‘sporty’ (na)

Hybrids:
fashhon zasshi ‘fashion magazine’, Itarian-kei ‘Italian’, **omoshiro bideo
‘funny video’
Formulae/Quotes:

*Good shot (QT)*

*Congratulation (QT)*

wan-tuu-surii ‘one-two-three’ (QT)

S17

Nouns:


Verbs:

*enjoi ‘to enjoy’, ikooru ‘to equal’, toransufaa ‘to transfer’, uesutanaizu ‘to westernise’
Adjectives:

Hybrids:
- shitii.yuki ‘city-bound’, soogoo depaato ‘general department store’

S18
Nouns:

Verbs:
- ekusasaizu ‘to exercise’

Adjectives:
- Chainiizu ‘Chinese (cuisine/restaurant)’ (2), duuutii-furii ‘duty-free’,

Hybrids:

horidee kibun ‘holiday mood’

Formulas/Quotes:

listen (QT)
me, me, me (QT)
serufisshu ‘selfish’ (QT)

S19

Nouns:

**anaunsaa ‘announcer’, Chainataun ‘Chinatown’, depaato ‘department store’,
**gorufu ‘golf’ (3), intoneeshon ‘intonation’, **jogingu ‘jogging’, keesu ‘case’ (8),
komento ‘comment’, konsaatoo hooru ‘concert hall’, kyasutaa ‘caster’, **marason
rannaa ‘marathon runner’ (2), mooru ‘mall’ (2), nekku (neck) ‘bottleneck’,
**nyuusu ‘news’ (10), **(Oozii) futtobooru ‘(Aussie) football’, **rajio ‘radio’ (2),
**rasshu ‘rush hour’, roodo shoo ‘road show’, shittii ‘city’, shoppingu sentaa
‘shopping centre’ (2), sittii ‘city’ (5), **supootsu ‘sports’ (3), **tenisu ‘tennis’ (3),
**terebi ‘television’ (4), toramu ‘tram’ (2)

Adjectives:

furanku ‘frank’ (na), kajuara ‘casual’ (2), kurashikku (classic) ‘classical
(music)’ (no), mairudo ‘mild’, Oozii ‘Aussie’, rafu ‘rough’ (na), yuniiku
‘unique’ (na)

Hybrids:

**efu-emu hoosoo ‘FM broadcasting’ (2), kin’yuu saabisu ‘financial service’,
komento bangumi ‘comment programme, commentary’, shoppingu-sentaa-nai
‘inside the shopping centre’, **supootsu kankei ‘related to sports’, **yagai supootsu
‘outdoor sports’
Nouns:


Adjectives:

Amerikan ‘American’, esunikku ‘ethnic (food)’, kajuaru ‘casual’ (na), mejaa ‘major’ (na), paburikku ‘public’ (no), rokkuappu ‘lockup’, sukyuuba ‘scuba’ (3), Tai ‘Thai (cuisine)’

Determiners:

wan ‘one’ (2)

Hybrids:

- fasshon zasshi ‘fashion magazine’ (2)

Nouns:


Verbs:

rinobeeto ‘to renovate’, sutei ‘to stay’

Adjectives:


Determiners:

wan ‘one’, tsuu ‘two’

Hybrids:

basu mawari ‘around the bath’, burando mono ‘brand goods’, **hoomusutei-dai ‘homestay charges’, Indian ryoori ‘Indian cuisine’, supai mono ‘spy story’ (2)

Formulae/Quotes:

Hello, how are you? (QT)

S22

Nouns:

'movie', **nyuansu (Fr. nuance) 'nuance' (3), **nyuasu 'news' (2), resutoran
'restaurant' (2), ruuru 'rule' (3), shawaa 'shower' (2), shawaa (oa) tuu 'shower
(or) two', shitti 'city' (5), supan 'span', sutansu 'stance', sukuuru horidee 'school
holiday', **supootsu 'sports' (2), sutaffu 'staff', **terebi 'television' (2), toraburu
'trouble', toramu 'tram' (2)

Verbs:

doraibu 'to drive', imeeji 'to image', raito (appu) 'to light (up)'

Adjectives:
esunikku 'ethnic', furendorii 'friendly' (2), ikusaitingu 'exciting', kajuaru
'casual' (2), Oojii 'Aussie', rafu 'rough', sofuto 'soft'

Adverbs:
appu 'up'

Prepositions:
atto 'at'

Conjunctions:
oa 'or' (2)

Hybrids:
**anaunsaa-dooshi 'among announcers', esunikku ryouor 'ethnic dishes',
ginkoo-man 'banker', **gorufu-joo 'golflinks' (5), hashiru resuringu 'wrestling
on the run' (2), **kuizu bangumi 'quiz show', nihon resutoran 'Japanese
restaurant', **sofutooroo taikai 'softball contest'

S23
Nouns:
aidea 'idea', **apaato 'apartment' (5), **baito (G. Arbeit) 'part-time job',
**bideo 'video', **biza 'visa', boofurendo 'boyfriend' (3), boonasu 'bonus', bosu
'boss' (2), buumu 'boom', Chinku 'Chink' (2), dokyumentarii 'documentary' (2),
**fami-kon (JE. family computer) 'computer for TV games', geemu 'game',
jaketto 'jacket', **opaaru 'opale', opera 'opera', **paatii 'party', pataan 'pattern',
**rajiro 'radio', reberu 'level', rejaa 'leisure', **Rentogen (G. Röntgen) 'roentgen',
resutoran ‘restaurant’, seerusu ‘sales’, **shea-meito (JE. share-mate) ‘flatmate’ (3),
shitii ‘city’ (2), shoppu ashisutanto ‘shop assistant’, **supootsu ‘sports’, sutaaffu
‘staff’, taagetto ‘target’, taitoru ‘title’, **terebi ‘television’ (2), **waakingu horidee
‘working holiday’ (3)

Verbs:
**sheaa ‘to share’ (2)

Adjectives:
furendorii ‘friendly’, oorumaitii ‘almighty’ (ni), rakkii ‘lucky’ (2)

Prepositions:
purasu ‘plus’

Conjunctions:
purasu ‘plus’

Hybrids:
**kankoo biza ‘tourist visa’, **opaaru-ten ‘opal shop’, **opaaru hanbaiten
‘opal shop’

Nouns:
akusento ‘accent’, **Channeru Nain ‘Channel Nine’, **Channeru Sebun
‘Channel Seven’, earia ‘area’ (3), furasutoreeshon ‘frustration’, **gorufu ‘golf’
(8), gureito ‘the great’, Isutaa horidee ‘Easter holiday’, **jii-pan (JE. jeans pants)
year’ (3), **karuchaa shokku ‘culture shock’, mein ‘main’ (3), (Meruborun) Sittii
‘(Melbourne) City’, paaku ‘park’, **pasuta (I’t. pastasciutta) ‘pasta’ (2),
**poriesuteru ‘polyester’, **ragubii ‘rugby’ (2), shitii ‘city’ (2), shitii mooru
‘city mall’, **sosutobooru ‘softball’ (2), sosaiatii ‘society’ (2), **supootsu ‘sports’,
**tenisu ‘tennis’ (2), **terebi ‘television’, **tiishatsu ‘T-shirt’, toramu ‘tram’,
tootaru ‘total’ (2), turamu ‘tram’, uaru ‘wool’ (2), **yunion ‘(rugby) union’

Adjectives:
dorai ‘dry’, komon ‘common’ (de), mein ‘main’ (ni), Oojii ‘Aussie’ (2),
Oosutorarian ‘Australian’, rafu ‘rough’, rafu ‘rough’ (na), supootii ‘sporty’ (na)
Hybrids:

burando shoohin ‘brand goods’, jii-pii seido ‘GP system’, shitii-nai ‘inside the city’, **sukii-joo ‘ski ground’, **supootsu bangumi ‘sports programme’ (2), **supootsu ran ‘sports column’

S25

Nouns:


Verbs:

anoi ‘to annoy’ (4), rirakkusu ‘to relax’, soosharaizu ‘to socialise’ (2)

Adjectives:

kanfotaburu ‘comfortable’, Kasorikku ‘Catholic’ (no) (2), puraibeeto ‘private’ (na), regyuraa ‘regular’ (no), reizii ‘lazy’

Hybrids:

nihon resutoran ‘Japanese restaurant’ (2), nihonjin resutoran ‘Japanese restaurant’, **nyusu bangumi ‘news programme’, **supootsu bangumi ‘sports programme’

S26

Nouns:


Verbs:

enjoi ‘to enjoy’, herupu ‘to help’ (2), kipu ‘to keep’, tootaru ‘to total’, torai ‘to try’

Adjectives:


Hybrids:

Chainizu ryoori ‘Chinese dishes’, katei saabisu ‘staying home for the family’
Nouns:


Verbs:

rirakkusu ‘to relax’

Adjectives:

Betonamizu ‘Vietnamese (cuisine)’, furendorii ‘friendly’ (2), iiji-gooingu ‘easy-going’, Itarian ‘Italian (cuisine)’, Kanbodian ‘Cambodian (cuisine)’, *rizzunaburu ‘reasonable’ (2), Supanisshu ‘Spanish (cuisine)’, suroo ‘slow’, Tai ‘Thai (cuisine)’

Hybrids:

Ajian ryoori ‘Asian dishes’, repooto mono ‘documentaries’

Nouns:


Verbs:

* konpurein ‘to complain’, purotekuto ‘to protect’, riido ‘to lead’, setto (bakku) ‘to set (back)’, suingu ‘to swing’, sutoppu ‘to stop’

Adjectives:


Adverbs:

* bakku ‘back’, iesu ‘yes’, noo ‘no’

Prepositions:

* obu ‘of’
Determiners:
wan 'one'

Hybrids:
*Aborijinii shusshin ‘Aborigine by birth’, baiorensu eiga ‘violence movie’,
borantia katsudo ‘volunteer activities’ (5), **haiki gasu (exhaust gas) ‘exhaust fumes’,

S29

Nouns:

Verbs:
ikooru ‘to equal’, kuroozu ‘to close’, oopun ‘to open’ (2)
Adjectives:

Amerikan ‘American’, bairingaru ‘bilingual’ (no), furatto ‘flat’ (na), rongu ‘long’, rosuto ‘lost’ (2), uiiku ‘weak’

Adverbs:

onrii ‘only’

Determiners:

sebun ‘seven’, ten (paasento) ‘ten (percent)’

Hybrids:


Formulae/Quotes:

tea, tea, tea (QT)
Could I have a tea now? (QT)
Oh, of course (QT)
green tea (QT)
black tea (QT)
jasmine tea (QT)

S30

Nouns:


Verbs:  
  *kuroozu ‘to close’, *kyatchi ‘to catch’ (2), *oopun ‘to open’ (7), *pei ‘to pay’ (2)

Adjectives:  

Adverbs:  
  *appu ‘up’ (ni) (2)

Determiners:  
  *sebun ‘seven’ (3), *ten (paasento) ‘ten (percent)’

Hybrids:  
Nouns:

Verbs:

bureeku ‘to break’, sutokku ‘to stock’, **suitehi (ofu) ‘to switch (off)’

Adjectives:


Adverbs:

ofu ‘off’

Prepositions:

obu ‘of’

Determiners:

faasuto ‘first’

Hybrids:

**fashon-herusu (JE. fashion-health) yoohin ‘items for sexual massage’, gyagu manga ‘gag comics’, **haado-boirudo-ppoi ‘hard-boiled type of’, **kon’yakusha biza ‘fiancé visa’, kuchi-komi (kuchi ‘mouth’ + komunikeeshon ‘communication’) ‘from mouth to mouth’ (de), memo-choo ‘memo pad’, **Nihon Shirizu ‘the Japan Series (baseball)’, **rekoodo-ya ‘record shop’

Nouns:


Adjectives:
Chainizu ‘Chinese (cuisine)’, esunikku ‘ethnic (dishes)’, mainasu ‘minus’ (no), nyuutoraru ‘neutral’ (na), purasu ‘plus’ (no)

Prepositions:
tuu ‘to’

Hybrids:
esunikku ryoori ‘ethnic dishes’, nihongo ashisutanto kyooshi ‘Japanese assistant teacher’, ashisutanto kyooshi ‘assistant teacher’

S33
Nouns:
(Chainizu) resutoran ‘(Chinese) restaurant’, depaato ‘department store’,
*suwearingu waado (swearing word) ‘swearword’, teema (G. Thema) ‘theme’,
**tenisu ‘tennis’ (5), **tenisu kooto ‘tennis court’, **tento ‘tent’, **terebi ‘television’ (3), tii taoru ‘tea towel’, (uesutan) sabaabu ‘(western) suburb’

Verbs:
nachuraraizu ‘to naturalize’, pikku (pick) ‘to pick up’, rirakkusu ‘to relax’ (2)
Adjectives:


Hybrids:
**basu-tei ‘bus stop’, supootsu kankei ‘related to sports’

S34

Nouns:

Verbs:
  doraibu ‘to drive’, hitto ‘to hit’, intabyuu ‘to interview’ (2), **kyanpu ‘to camp’

Adjectives:

Hybrids:
  Anguro bunka ‘Anglo culture’, konpyuutaa kankei ‘related to computers’ (no), kookuu chiketto ‘airline ticket’, **nyuusu gawa ‘newscaster side’, **waakingu-horidee seido ‘working-holiday system’

S35

Nouns:

Verbs:
  appudeeto ‘to update’, katto ‘to cut’ (2), ritaiya(a) ‘to retire’

Adjectives:
Adverbs:

noo 'no'

Hybrids:

*feaa seishin* ‘fair mind’ (4), **tennen gasu** ‘natural gas’, **gasu more** ‘gas leak’ (2), *maiguranto-yoo* ‘for migrants’, *supiido ihan* ‘speeding’ (2)

Formulae/Quotes:

*iesu* ‘yes’ (QT)

S36

Nouns:


Verbs:

doraiibu ‘to drive’, *enjoi* ‘to enjoy’, *misuandaasutando* ‘to misunderstand’, *setto* ‘to set’

Adjectives:

*Amerikan* ‘American’, *botanikku* ‘botanic’, *ekisaitingu* ‘exciting’, *feaa* ‘fair’,
furu-taimu ‘full-time’ (no), pureen ‘plain’ (de), rakkii ‘lucky’, rakkii ‘lucky’ (na), rookaru ‘local’ (no)

Hybrids:

* Chanizu-kei ‘of Chinese descent’ (no), intaanashonaru-ka ‘to internationalise’, seikatsu sukeeru ‘life scale’, seikatsu supeesu ‘life space’,
shutchoo beesu ‘on the basis of business trips’ (de), **han-zubon (han ‘half’ + zubon (Fr. jupon) ‘trousers, pants’) ‘short pants’, ueitaa-san ‘waiter’, ueitoresu-san ‘waitress’ (2)

Formulae/Quotes

buradii Japanizu ‘bloody Japanese’ (QT)

S37

Nouns:

**Intaanetto ‘Internet’, kappuru ‘couple’, konfurikuto ‘conflict’, konpyuuta ‘computer’ (2), (konpyuutaraijudo) bukkukiipingu ‘(computerised) bookkeeping’,
**kurabu ‘club’, kurasu ‘class’, **(kuootaa) eekaa ‘(quarter) acre’, maiguranto ‘migrant’, **manneri ‘mannerism’, miruku ‘milk’ (2), **Noosu ‘North (Sydney)’,
**nyuusu ‘news’ (4), ofisu ‘office’, **paatii ‘party’ (3), pantomaimu ‘pantomime’,
pataan ‘pattern’ (2), peesu ‘pace’ (2), pen fuendo ‘pen friend’ (2), pikunikku ‘picnic’ (2), pisutoru (Dt. pistool) ‘pistol’, purasu ‘plus’, **puuru ‘(swimming) pool’,
**raamen (C. lao mián) ‘noodles’, ramu ‘lamb’, **rasshu ‘rush’ (2),
suteeki ‘steak’, **tenisu ‘tennis’ (3), **terebi ‘television’ (2), toraburu ‘trouble’,
tuurizumu ‘tourism’, (uiikurii) magazin ‘(weekly) magazine’, waaku ikusupiriensu ‘work experience’
Verbs:
arenji ‘to arrange’, enjoi ‘to enjoy’ (3), kontorooru ‘to control’

Adjectives:

Adverbs:
iesu ‘yes’

Determiners:
kuootaa ‘quarter’

Hybrids:
gabaamento kankei ‘related to government’, Kasorikku-kei ‘Catholic’

Formulae/Quotes:
hai ‘hi’ (QT)
iesu ‘yes’ (QT)

Nouns:
**kuriketto ‘cricket’, kurisutaru ‘crystal’ (3), kyasshaa ‘cashier’, naifu ‘knife’,
basu ‘school bus’, **supootsu ‘sports’, surangu ‘slang’ (5), **takushii ‘taxi’ (2),
**tenisu ‘tennis’, **terebi ‘television’ (5), **tonneru ‘tunnel’ (2), tsuurisuto
‘tourist’ (2), (uiikurii) magazin ‘(weekly) magazine’, waifu ‘wife’ (2), **yoga
(Skr. yoga) ‘yoga’ (9), **zubon (Fr. jupon) ‘trousers, pants’

Verbs:
  kabaa ‘to cover’, rirakkusu ‘to relax’

Adjectives:
  bakku ‘back’, Chainizu ‘Chinese (cuisine)’ (2), Furenchi ‘French (cuisine)’,
popyuraa ‘popular’ (na), uiikurii ‘weekly’

Prepositions:
  abekku (Fr. avec) ‘with’

Hybrids:
  kankoku resutoran ‘Korean restaurant’, nihon resutoran ‘Japanese restaurant’
(2), seikatsu pataan ‘lifestyle’, **terebi-kko ‘a child who watches a lot of TV’

S39
Nouns:
  biru ‘building’ (2), (burookun) Ingurisshu ‘(broken) English’, (Chainizu)
resutoran ‘(Chinese) restaurant’, (Doitsu (G. Deutsch)) resutoran ‘(German)
restaurant’, fiiringu ‘feeling’, (Furenchi) resutoran ‘(French) restaurant’ (2),
**gorufu ‘golf’, **hoteru ‘hotel’ (3), **nyusu ‘news’ (2), paaramento hausu
‘parliament house’, paatonaa ‘partner’, **rajio ‘radio’ (2), resutoran ‘restaurant’
(2), **sakkaa ‘soccer’, shitii ‘city’ (2), shoppingu sentaa ‘shopping centre’,
**tenisu ‘tennis’ (3), **terebi ‘television’ (4), toraburu ‘trouble’ (3), toramu
‘tram’, torein ‘train’

Verbs:
  kontakuto ‘to contact’, oopun ‘to open’

Adjectives:
  burookun ‘broken’, Chainizu ‘Chinese’, Furenchi ‘French’ (2), kompakuto
‘compact’ (ni)
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Hybrids:


Formulae/Quotes:

buradii Jappu ‘bloody Jap’ (2) (QT)

S40
Nouns:


Verbs:

doraibu ‘to drive’ (2), pusshu ‘to push’, shatto (auto) ‘to shut (out)’

Adjectives:

buruu ‘blue’, Furenchi ‘French (cuisine)’, Itarian ‘Italian (cuisine)’, oo-kee ‘OK’

Adverbs:

auto ‘out’

Hybrids:

chhuugoku resutoran ‘Chinese restaurant’ (2), **happi zubon (happi + zubon (Fr. jupon) ‘trousers, pants’) ‘happi pants’ (2), nihon resutoran ‘Japanese restaurant’
Nouns:

- arubaito (G. Arbeit) ‘part-time job’
- baabekyuu ‘barbecue’
- baree ‘ballet’
- basu ‘bus’
- beddo ‘bed’
- biru ‘building’
- (botanikaru) gaaden ‘(botanical) garden’
- busshu ‘bush’
- chansu ‘chance’
- (dipaatomento) sutoa ‘department store’
- doraggu ‘drug’
- doresu ‘dress’
- eapooto ‘airport’
- faiyaa ban ‘fire ban’
- fankushon ‘function’
- gyanburu ‘gamble’
- hooruseeru ‘wholesale’
- jankushon ‘function’
- janku shoppu ‘junk shop’
- karuchaa ‘culture’
- (nashonaru) paaku ‘(national) park’
- Noosu ‘North (Sydney)’
- news’, opera ‘opera’
- paatii ‘party’
- pataan ‘pattern’
- pikunikku ‘picnic’
- pikunikku ranchi ‘picnic lunch’
- resutoran ‘restaurant’
- riteiru ‘retail’
- ruuru ‘rule’
- sausu ‘south’
- shiizun chiketto ‘season ticket’
- shoppingu ‘shopping’
- shoppingu sentaa ‘shopping centre’
- tatsuu ‘tattoo’
- teiraa ‘tailor’
- tii-shatsu ‘T-shirt’
- toransupooto ‘transport’
- yotto reesu ‘yacht race’

Verbs:

- sutoppu ‘to stop’

Adjectives:

- botanikaru ‘botanical’
- nashonaru ‘national’
- purein ‘plain’
- uerukamu ‘welcome’
- waido ‘wide’

Adverbs:

- iesu ‘yes’
- noo ‘no’

Hybrids:

- (aru-chuu (arukooru ‘alcoholic’ + chuudoku ‘addiction’) ‘alcoholic’
- fasshon kankei ‘related to fashion’
- gyanburu-teki ‘related to gambling’
- Korian-gai ‘Korean town’
Ten ‘Channel Ten’, chikin ‘chicken’, (daburu) digurii ‘(double) degree’ (3),
(daburu) inkamu (noo) kiddo ‘(double) income (no) kids’, depaato ‘department
store’ (7), **dinkusu ‘DINKS, double income no kids’, dokutaa ‘doctor’,
dokumentarii ‘documentary’ (6), eichi-esu-shii ‘HSC, high school certificate’ (2),
ekusibishhon ‘exhibition’, enjinia ‘engineer’ (2), enjiniaringu ‘engineering’ (5),
essei ‘essay’ (3), (furuiiddo) mekanikkusu ‘(fluid) mechanics’, *haazerunatto
[heezerunatto] ‘hazelnut’, (herusii) fuudo ‘(healthy) food’, horidee ‘holiday’ (3),
**karuchaa shokku ‘culture shock’, konsaato ‘concert’ (2), kontoroorii ‘control’,
**koohii (Dt. koffie) ‘coffee’, **kooto ‘coat’, kyarotto ‘carrot’, masematikkusu
‘mathematics’, **medaru ‘medal’, (noo) choisu ‘(no) choice’, (noo) tatchi (JE. (no)
touch) ‘nothing to do with’, **nyuasu ‘news’, **omuretsu (Fr. omelette) ‘omelette’,
**paatii ‘party’, pasupooto ‘passport’ (2), **(puaraibetto) hoteru ‘(private) hotel’,
**(masshu) poteto ‘(mashed) potatoes’, **(puraibeeto) hoteru ‘(private) hotel’,
**puramaa ‘plumber’ (2), purofessaa ‘professor’ (2), puroguramu ‘program’ (2),
purojekuto maneejaa ‘project manager’, **raijio ‘radio’ (4), (roosuto) biifu ‘(roast)
beef’, (roosuto) chikin ‘(roast) chicken’, (roosuto) dinaa ‘(roast) dinner’, (roosuto)
pooku ‘(roast) pork’, shitii ‘city’, sinia ‘senior’, **supootsu ‘sports’, suteeki
sukaraashippu ‘scholarship’ (3), (tekunikaru) kareiji ‘(technical) college’,
**terebi ‘television’ (2), toreizuman ‘tradesman’, uiikuendo ‘weekend’,
**waakingu horidee ‘working holiday’ (2), yunitto ‘(home) unit’

Verbs:
apurai ‘to apply’, kontoroorii ‘to control’ (2), kukku ‘to cook’, rirakkusu
‘to relax’

Adjectives:
daburu ‘double’ (4), furendorii ‘friendly’, furuuento ‘fluent’, furuuiiddo
‘fluid’, herusii ‘healthy’, intenshibu ‘intensive’ (de), masshu ‘mash(ed)’,
puaraibetto ‘private’, roosuto ‘roast’ (4), roosuto ‘roast’ (no), tekunikaru
‘technical’

Prepositions:
obu ‘of’

Determiners:
noo ‘no’ (3)
Nouns:


Verbs:

- **ekisaito** ‘to excite’, **sutaato** ‘to start’

Adjectives:

- **botanikaru** ‘botanical’ (2), **kajuaru** ‘casual’ (na), **karashikku** (classic)
  ‘claasical (music)’, **nyuu** ‘new’, **Oosutorarian** ‘Australian’, **suroo** ‘slow’ (ni), **romantikku** ‘romantic’, **rookaru** ‘local’

Hybrids:

- **basu-tei** ‘bus stop’ (3), **chooo (neku)taa** ‘bow tie’, **dezain mono** ‘designer items’ (2), **fashhon kankaku** ‘fashion sense’, **gurin iro** ‘green colour’, **kyuu bureeki** ‘slamming on the brakes’, **nichiyoo raiburarii** ‘Sunday library’ (2), **ooshan gawa** ‘ocean side’, **rookaru shinbun** ‘local newspaper’, **shiriizu mono** ‘series’ (2)

S44

Nouns:

- **aato gyararii** ‘art gallery’, **akusesarrii** ‘accessory’, **anaunssa** ‘announcer’ (2), **bakku** ‘back’ (2), **baree** ‘ballet’, **basu** ‘bus’ (2), **birudingu** ‘building’ (2), **biza** ‘visa’ (2), **borantia** ‘volunteer’, **butiiku** (Fr. boutique) ‘boutique’, **Chainitsu** ‘Chinese’, **chanmeru** ‘channel’, **chansu** ‘chance’, **chippu** ‘tip’ (3), **chuna booto** ‘tuna boat’, **dekopaaju** (Fr. découpage) ‘decoupage’ (2), **depeato**...
Verbs:

kukku 'to cook', oopun 'to open', rejisutaa 'to register'

Adjectives:

Chainizu 'Chinese' (no), fiuendorii 'friendly', hebii 'heavy' (na), iisutan 'eastern' (2), intaanashonaru 'international', Juuisshu 'Jewish' (no), Korian 'Korean' (no), kosumoporitan 'cosmopolitan', kurasshikku (classic) 'classical (music)', ootomatikku 'automatic', ootomatikku 'automatic' (no)

Prepositions:

obu 'of'

Determiners:

za 'the'

Hybrids:

booi-san 'waiter'

Formuae/Quotes:

Hello, Mrs --- (QT)

Sorry (F)
APPENDIX 7:

In-Correction and Post-Correction Strategies Used by 44 Subjects in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject code</th>
<th>L2 items corrected via in-correction strategy</th>
<th>Corrected Items (in-correction)</th>
<th>L2 items corrected via post-correction strategy</th>
<th>Corrected items (post-correction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>reishi- (reishizumu)</td>
<td>jinshu sabetsu</td>
<td>Chainizu hoomuwaaku</td>
<td>chuuka ryoori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td></td>
<td>manshon</td>
<td>apaato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td></td>
<td>furatto posuttaa sesshon repooto taikai</td>
<td>apaato happyoo hookoku kai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td></td>
<td>pedagojii</td>
<td>kyoouhoo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td></td>
<td>feito</td>
<td>bunkasai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td></td>
<td>tesuto</td>
<td>shiken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td></td>
<td>suetto</td>
<td>toreenaa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td></td>
<td>kaatun</td>
<td>manga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td></td>
<td>kajuaru</td>
<td>kikazatte inai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td></td>
<td>manshon</td>
<td>apaato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Juu</td>
<td>Yudaya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S26</td>
<td>Guri- (Guriiku)</td>
<td>Girisha ryoori</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S28</th>
<th>S29</th>
<th>S30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S31</td>
<td>kii chen- (kii chenji)</td>
<td>kii no henka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S32</td>
<td>Chaini- (Chainizu)</td>
<td>chuugokujin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S33</td>
<td>Inguissju</td>
<td>Inguissju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S34</td>
<td>manii</td>
<td>Yuu-boostu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S36</td>
<td>feaa</td>
<td>koohei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S37</td>
<td>chikin</td>
<td>kashiwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S38</td>
<td>gan</td>
<td>pisutoru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S40</td>
<td>oo-kee</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S42</td>
<td>Chainizu (no)</td>
<td>Chuugoku (no)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S43</td>
<td>ofi- (ofisu)</td>
<td>otsutome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S44</td>
<td>booi keateikaa</td>
<td>sewagakari kanrinin nintairyoku</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This appendix provides a comprehensive description of the kinds of
strategies and rules employed by Japanese speakers when English lexical items
are transferred into Japanese. It discusses these strategies and rules in terms of
phonological, morphological, and semantic aspects.

1. Phonological Aspect

English lexical items transferred to Japanese normally go through
phonological changes according to the syllable structure of Japanese. In order to
examine phonological strategies (PSs) and rules, therefore, it will be necessary to
grasp the main differences between English and Japanese phonology. It is supposed
that these strategies determine phonological rules that operate in the process of
integration of English lexical items.

1.1. Mora vs. Syllable

PS 1. Employ the mora as a unit of timing.

One of the most striking phonological differences between Japanese and
English is that except for the “mora nasal” \( /N/ \) and the “mora obstruent” \( /Q/ \)
(Vance 1987: 36, 40), Japanese syllables (open syllables) normally end in vowels and consonant clusters do not usually occur, while English syllables (closed syllables) often end in consonants and consonant clusters frequently occur (Kubozono 1995: 22).


When an English word is transferred to Japanese, an epenthetic vowel is inserted between consonants and after a word-final consonant. Consonant clusters and final consonants of an English item are altered into sequences of a consonant and a vowel according to the syllable structure of Japanese. For example, once assimilated into Japanese, the one-syllable English word “strike” [st'raik] becomes the five-mora-word /su.to.ra.i.kи/ ‘work stoppage’ or /su.to.ra.i.kу/ ‘baseball term’ in Japanese1 (Yazaki 1964: 174). The epenthetic vowel /i/, o, or u/ is inserted between the consonants and after the word-final consonant.

The mora plays a crucial role in the phonological and morphological structure of Japanese (Sugitoo 1989: 154-77; Kubozono 1989, 1995: 17-22). The “mora is a unit of timing. Each mora takes about the same length of time to say” (Ladefoged 1993: 251). A Japanese mora can be represented by one kana symbol

---

1 Ishino (1989: 100-101) says that in the Meiji period when the American baseball was introduced to Japan, the baseball term “strike” was also /sutoraiki/ (cf. Carr 1964: 31; Kaye and Nikiel 1979: 75-76; Maynard 1997: 67).
loanwords are usually rendered in katakana ‘angular syllabary’). It should be noted that syllables and moras are not identical. That is, while ordinarily syllables include a vowel, moras need not. The differences between the two are as follows: in Japanese special moras such as the mora nasal /N/ (as in /deNpoo/ ‘telegram’), the mora obstruent /Q/, that is, the first element of a geminate consonant /kk/, /ss/, /tt/ or /pp/ (e.g., /niQpoN/ ‘Japan’), the long vowel (e.g., /obaasaN/ ‘grandmother’), and the second element of the diphthong (e.g., /kau/ ‘buy’), are counted as moras; therefore denpoo consists of four moras (two syllables); Nippon four moras (two syllables); obaasan five moras (three syllables); and kau two moras (one syllable) (see Kindaichi 1966: 58-77; McCawley 1968: 131-34; Kawakami 1977: 95-103; Vance 1987: 63-64; Imada 1989: 70-81; Sugitoo 1989: 154-77; Backhouse 1993: 15-33; Tsujimura 1996: 64-66).

These special moras are independent as a timing unit, but they are not independent on the syllabic level. It can therefore be supposed that the concept of syllable in Japanese plays a supplementary part in Japanese phonological and morphological rules (Kubozono 1995: 17-22).

1.2. Epenthesis

PS 2. Insert an epenthetic vowel /i, o, or u/ to make an open syllable.

Because the consonant-vowel (CV) is the basic syllable type in Japanese, the breaking up of consonant clusters in English triggers epenthesis of an additional vowel. Since no consonant clusters occur in onset or coda position in Japanese syllables, an epenthetic vowel /i, o, or u/ is inserted between the consonants and after the word-final consonant when an English word with consonant clusters enters Japanese (Sonoda 1975: 110-19; Kokuritsu
Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 29-37). The following are some examples:

(1) a. benchi [bentʃi] ‘bench [bentʃ]’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 33)
    b. burijji [buridʒi] ‘bridge [buridʒ]’ (ibid.)
    c. deeto [de:to] ‘date [detʃ]’ (ibid.: 30)
    d. furendo [furendo] ‘friend [faend]’ (ibid.: 31)
    e. raisu [raisʊ] ‘rice [ɾas]’ (ibid. 34)
    f. tsuri [ʦʊri:] ‘tree [ʦiː]’ (ibid.: 32)

As shown in the above examples, the syllable final consonants of the original English terms become Japanese syllables with the addition of the epenthetic vowel. Epenthesis is used to integrate foreign elements into the native phonological system. These examples reveal that there is a correlation between the phonetic qualities of a consonant and the following epenthetic vowel: (i) the high front vowel [i] occurs after the affricates [ts] and [dʒ]; (ii) the low back vowel [o] occurs after the alveolar stops [t] and [d]; (iii) the high back vowel [u] occurs after the rest of the consonants; and (iv) after [k, g, z], [i] or [u] occurs. Note that after [t], [o] is normally added, but there are some exceptions like (1f). In this example, [u] is inserted and [t] becomes the alveolar affricate [ts] before [u]. Notice further that [i] and [u] are often “devoiced” between voiceless consonants, or after a word-final voiceless consonant (see Han 1962: 81-100; Vance 1987: 48-55; Maekawa 1989: 135-53; Neustupný 1992: 4-7).

---

2 Hyman (1970:146) says that because of its unmarkedness, /u/ is used as an epenthetic vowel in Japanese.
With regard to the issue of syllabification in Japanese, Polivanov reports the following anecdote:


As noted above, in modern standard Japanese, /o/ is inserted after /d/; therefore, the English word "drama" becomes dorama when transferred to Japanese. What is interesting about the above anecdote is that the Japanese person transferred the word as zurama as well as dorama. In the former case, /u/ is used and /du/ is realised as [dzu:] (see also Haugen 1950: 215).

1.3. Insertion of the Mora Obstruent /Q/

PS 3. Insert a mora obstruent /Q/ and devoice a voiced obstruent.

In the process of integrating lexical transfers, the mora obstruent /Q/ is inserted between short vowels and certain obstruents (stops [p, t, k, d, g], affricates [tʃ, dʒ], and fricative [ʃ]) (see Koizumi 1978: 299; Imai 1980: 63-65; Vance 1987: 39-44; Imada 1989: 72-78; Koo and Honma 1989; Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 37-49). Observe the examples below:

3 [nn, mm] are considered to be /Nn, Nm/ in Japanese, and therefore /Q/ does not occur before [n, m] (Kobayashi 1991: 99).
(2) a. kappu [kappu] ‘cup [kəp]’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 38)

b. matto [matto] ‘mat [mæt]’ (ibid.)

c. chekku [čekku] ‘cheque [tʃek]’ (ibid.)

d. beddo [beddo]/betto [betto] ‘bed [bed]’ (ibid.: 40, 120)

e. baggu [bægw]/bakku [bakku] ‘bag [bæg]’ (ibid.)

f. wotchi [wɔtʃi] ‘watch [wɔtʃ]’ (ibid.: 38)

g. bajji [bædʒi]/batchi [bætʃi] ‘badge [bædʒ]’ (ibid.: 33)

h. kyasshu [kuʃʃu] ‘cash [kæʃ]’ (ibid.: 37)

As seen in (2d), (2e), and (2g), /Q/ is inserted before “voiced” obstruents in the case of English loanwords (Kawakami 1977: 90-91). However, because the mora phoneme /Q/ usually occurs before voiceless obstruents in the native system, it is supposed that some Japanese speakers find it difficult to pronounce voiced geminate consonants (or long voiced obstruents) and are apt to “devoice” these voiced obstruents (cf. Akinaga 1985: 128). Bloch (1950: 160) says that voiced geminate consonants are one of the features of the “innovating” variety (see Vance 1987: 42).

With respect to the Japanese inclination to devoice a voiced obstruent after /Q/, Imada (1989: 75) reports an interesting example taken from a newspaper article (Asahi Shinbun 10 July 1979). When the English word “jogging” was borrowed into Japanese, it was first rendered as jokkingu, which then became joggingu. Finally, the current form jogingu appeared without gemination of the voiced obstruent /g/.

Regarding this issue, Quackenbush (1987) indicates that it is not only a matter of articulatory difficulty, but that there is sociolinguistic evidence for the coexistence of voiced and voiceless geminate consonants. Interviewing four different groups of Japanese speakers living in Tokyo (i.e., primary school
pupils, university students, office workers, and self-employed retailers),
Quackenbush examined their pronunciation of loanwords containing voiced
geminate consonants in three different styles (i.e., word-list, reading-passage,
and conversation). The result shows that with regard to long voiced obstruents
(e.g., beddo ‘bed’, handobaggu ‘handbag’), the frequency of devoicing is highest
in primary school pupils and lowest in office workers. That is, children tend to
devoice long voiced obstruents more frequently than adults. With respect to
styles, the devoicing rate is highest in conversation while it is lowest in word­
list where the subjects are tense (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 120-25).

1.4. Sound Substitution

PS 4. Substitute a native sound for an L2 sound.
PS 5. Adopt an innovating/bilingual mora.
PS 6. Pronounce an L2 morpheme based on the sound.

As a general rule, sounds that exist in English, but not in Japanese are
replaced by acoustically similar sounds in Japanese. For example, the apico­
alveolar tap [r] in Japanese is normally substituted for the lateral [l] in English.
The labio-dental fricative [v] in English is replaced by the bilabial stop [b] in
Japanese. Likewise, the dental fricatives [θ] and [Ø] in English are replaced by
the alveolar fricatives [s] and [z] in Japanese respectively. Hence, the phonemic
distinctions which exist between the English /r/ and /l/, /b/ and /v/, /s/ and /θ/, and
/z/ and /Ø/ are likely to be “under-differentiated” (Weinreich 1953: 18, 1957: 5)
by a native Japanese speaker. These phonemic pairs tend to be merged in the
Japanese phonological system and to be phonetically realised as the Japanese [r]
(for /r/ or /l/), [b] (for /b/ or /v/), [s] (for /s/ or /θ/), and [z] (for /z/ or /Ø/)
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(Tsujimura 1996: 98-100). Examine the following examples:

(3) a. raito [raito] ‘light [lart]/right [aart]’
   (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 75)
   b. besuto [besu:to] ‘best [best]/vest [vest]’ (ibid.: 78)
   c. basu [basuu] ‘bus [bas]/bath [bæθ]’ (ibid.: 77)
   d. kuroozu [kuro:zu:] ‘close [kləuz]/clothe [kləuθ]’

1.4.1. Substitution of Vowels

As far as vowels are concerned, the problem is that 12 vowels and 8 diphthongs in English (Mitchell and Delbridge 1965; Gimson and Cruttenden 1994; Bayard 1995; Burridge and Mulder 1998) which are phonemic, must be identified with only five vowels /i, e, a, o, u/ in standard Japanese. The following conversion table shows how English vowels correspond to their Japanese equivalents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vowels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) [i:]</td>
<td>[i:]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beef [bi:f]</td>
<td>biifu [bi:fi:]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) [r]</td>
<td>[i]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milk [milk]</td>
<td>miruku [miru:kuu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party [pa:u]</td>
<td>paattii [pa:tti:]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) [e]</td>
<td>[e]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
head [hed]  heddo [heddo] 
4) [æ]  [a] 
ham [hæm]  hamu [hamu]  [a] 
cap [kæp]  kyappu [k'appa:]  [a] 
gang [gæŋ]  gyangu [g'angu]  
5) [ə]  [a] 
about [ə'baut]  abauto [abau'to]  
6) [ɔː]  [aː] 
bird [bə:d]  baado [baːdo]  
7) [ɔː]  [aː] 
star [stɔː]  sutaa [stūta:]  
8) [ʌ]  [a] 
rough [ʌf]  rafu [rafu]  
9) [oː]/[o]  [o] 
hot [hot]  hotto [hotto]  [a] 

college [ˈkɔltdʒ]/'kɔltdʒ]  karejji [kareddʒi]⁴ 
10) [ɔː]⁵  [oː] 
call [kɔːl]  kooru [ko:ru]  

---

⁴ This form is based on the pronunciation of American English (i.e., [ˈkɔltdʒ]).

⁵ Mitchel and Delbridge (1965: 39) state: “In Australian speech there is no opposition between [ə] and [ə]. Open syllables (as in four, shore) have [ə] and [ə] in free variation.” Note that their [ə] corresponds to our [ɔː]. According to Gimson and Cruttenden (1994: 110), “until relatively recently there was a contrast between /ɔː/ and /ə/ in RP, so that saw and sore were pronounced differently. Nowadays this contrast is generally not made, except for some older speakers.”

11) [u]  
book [buk]  

12) [uː]  
cool [kuː]  

Diphthongs

1) [ei]  
  cake [keik]  

2) [ai]  
  rice [rais]  

3) [ɔi]  
  coin [kɔin]  

4) [əu]  
  note [nəut]  

opal ['əupəl]  
open [open]  

5) [au]  
  house [haus]  

6) [æ]  
  earing ['ærəŋ]  

7) [eə]  
  hair [heə]  

8) [uə]  
  pure [pjʊə]  

---

The above table shows that the vowels [æ, θ, ʌ, a] in English are all replaced by [a] in Japanese (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyūjo 1990: 51). As in Vowel 4, palatalisation occurs after the voiceless and voiced velar stops [k, g]. As a result, [æ] becomes [a] in Japanese. The semi-vowel [j] tends to occur between two vowels in Japanese, as in Diphthongs 6 and 7 (Koizumi 1978: 307).

1.4.2. Substitution of Consonants

Under the influence of foreign sounds, non-native sequences of sounds are added to the phonological system of Japanese. The following table shows some of the new moras introduced into Japanese as a result of contact with non-Japanese sounds (Ishino 1989: 103; Loveday 1996: 115):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A.4.--Innovating/Bilingual Moras</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>si [si]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she [je]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zi [zi]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>je [ʒe]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ti [ti]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tu [tù]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>che [tʃe]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tyu [tju]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di [di]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du [du]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 In the case of “triple” vowels ([aiə], [auə], [eiə], [ɔiə]), the semi-vowel [j] is likely to occur after the second element; [w] is inserted as a substitute for [u]. Examples: taiya [taija] ‘tyre [ˈtɛəɻ]’, tawaas [tawaː] ‘tower [ˈtəʊəɻ]’, pureeyoa [pʊˈreɻjɑː] ‘player [ˈplɛɹəɻ]’, and empuroiyoa [ɛmpluɹoɪjɑː] ‘employer [ɛmplˈɹeɪəɻ]’ (Imai 1980: 42, Koizumi 1978: 307-8).

8 Note that some of these sequences of sounds were historically present and that some dialects preserve the older pronunciations (see Hattori 1960: 756-61).
The only foreign sequences of sounds are those moras which contain the labio-dental fricative [v]. The rest of the moras are not exactly new, because these moras are only different combinations of an existing consonant and a vowel (Ishino 1989: 104). Integration of foreign consonants takes place by replacing these consonants with the closest native equivalents and inserting native vowels after them to make open syllables.

One of the consequences of contact with non-Japanese sounds is that, as Ishiwata (1985: 156) says, foreign sounds make the Japanese phonological system more systematic. For instance, the class /ta, te, to/ has been expanded to /ta, ti, tu, te, to/. This phonological transference phenomenon explains why the English loanword for “team” is pronounced by some Japanese as *tiimu*, not *chiimu*. By the same token, the class /da, de, do/ has been expanded to /da, di,
du, de, do/. This enables us to see why some speakers say birujingu for “building” while others pronounce the same word as birudingu. These bilingual moras /ti, tu, di, du/\(^9\) conform to the already existing sequence of a consonant and a vowel and fill the phonological “gaps” in the sound system of Japanese (Hattori 1955: 169, 1960: 286-89, 317-18, 760).

In other words, bilingual moras introduced by foreign sounds are triggering the phonemic redistribution of the Japanese phonological system. To give another example, with the introduction of /si/ and /she/, the class /sa, shi, su, se, so/ has become /sa, si, su, se, so/, and the class /sha, shu, sho/ has been expanded to /sha, shi, shu, she, sho/. Likewise, the new moras /zi/ and /je/ have restructured the classes /za, ji, zu, ze, zo/ and /ja, ju, jo/, creating the classes /za, zi, zu, ze, zo/ and /ja, ji, ju, je, jo/ (Inoue 1989: 129). Innovating moras thus contribute to systematising the Japanese phonological system.

Another consequence of the Japanese contact with foreign sounds is that there appears a conflict between new moras and native counterparts. Bloch (1950) assigned variant forms of loanwords into one or other of the two following dialects: “conservative” and “innovating.” The conservative dialect uses native phonological elements while the “innovating” dialect adopts foreign phonological elements. Following this dichotomy, it can be said that conservative speakers use native moras while innovating speakers employ bilingual moras. The use of innovating moras depends on speakers’ competence in foreign languages.

Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo (1990: 67) suggests that whereas early borrowings use native moras, recent borrowings tend to employ foreign moras.

---

\(^9\) According to Hattori (1960: 318-22, 758), these sequences of sounds existed in Japanese until the thirteenth century before these moras became affricates.
The tendency for foreign sounds to be adopted in recent borrowings reflects the post-war generation's greater sensitivity to original sounds and their growing familiarity with foreign sounds through English education, mass media (Loveday 1996: 116), and overseas travel (Seeley 1991: 179-80).

The following subsections discuss conversion rules at work via PSs 4-6 for some of the moras shown in Table A.4.

1.4.2.1. [si, zi, dzi]

According to Neustupný (1978: 82), "[si] lies on the very periphery of the Japanese language." [si] is regarded as a "marked" sound in the phonological system of Japanese. In standard Japanese, this new mora becomes [ji]. /s/ is palatalised before the high front vowel /i/ and phonetically realised as [ʃ]. This phonological phenomenon can be conceived of as "regressive assimilation" (cf. Hattori 1960: 283-85). Examples:

(4) a. shiizun [ʃi:ziˈuɴ] 'season' (Ishino 1983: 94)
   b. shirubaa [ʃɪrˈuːbaː] 'silver' (Shoogakukan 1998: 271)
   c. shitii [ʃiˈtiː] 'city' (ibid.: 251)

Note, however, that [si] is also used, as in siizun [si:ziˈuɴ] and sitii [ˈsitiː] (Ishino 1983: 91; Akinaga 1985: 127; cf. Inoue 1989: 118). Shibata (1975: 169) reports his observation of an announcer adopting an Anglicised pronunciation for "season-off" 'off-season', suggesting that this type of attitude is connected with a prestige motive. From a sociolinguistic point of view, it can be said that the use of [si] is more prestigious or sophisticated than that of [ʃi] (Joo’o 1977: 137).
According to Inoue (1989: 126-27), a mora close to [si] is used by young women especially around the Tokyo metropolitan area and Kyushu. It is further pointed out by Inoue that the use of this mora is attributable to the effect of English education in Japan, and also that it is affected by such factors as sex, region, dialect, and so forth.

Along with [si], [dzi] (in word-initial position) and [zi] (in word-medial position) are also regarded as marked sounds in Japanese and are likely to be replaced by the native moras [dzi] and [zi] respectively. However, alternatively [dzi] and [zi] also occur in the innovating variety (Ishino 1983: 110). Examples:

(5) a. jiguzagu [d3i\guzag\u] ‘zigzag’ (Shoogakukan 1998: 248)
   b. myuujikaru [m\u:3ikaru] ‘musical’ (ibid.: 628)
   c. magajin [magazin]/magazin [magazin] ‘magazine’ (Ishino 1983: 94)

As seen above, the innovating moras [si] and [dzi]/[zi] tend to be replaced by the native equivalents which are unmarked in standard Japanese. The use of these foreign moras requires a higher degree of motivation due to their peripheral nature (Neustupný 1978: 95).

1.4.2.2. [se, 3e, d3e]

[se] is substituted for [Je] in early loans, though [Je] is used for recent borrowings. Examples:

(6) a. mirukuseeki [m\i\r\uk\use:k\i:] ‘milk shake’
   (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 72)
b. sepaado [sepa:do]/shepaado [jepa:do] ‘shepherd’ (ibid.)
c. shea [jea] ‘share’ (ibid.)

As shown in (6b), both [se] and [je] are used in certain loans, in which a process of re-borrowing has taken place in order to conform to the original pronunciation. The degree of integration of [je] is fairly high (Neustupný 1978: 82). For instance, (6c) appears to be in common use among Japanese speakers today (Koizumi 1991: 8-9).

With regard to [dʒe] (in word-initial position) and [ʒe] (in word-medial position), the native [dʒe] and [ʒe] respectively often act as substitutes. In certain loanwords, however, both [dʒe]/[ʒe] and [dʒe]/[ʒe] are used. Examples:

(7) a. zenereeshon [dʒenere:ʃon]/jenereeshon [dʒenere:ʃon] ‘generation’
   (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 73)
b. zerii [dʒerii]/jerii [dʒerii:] ‘jelly’ (ibid.)
c. zesuchaa [dʒesuʃtʃa]/jesuchaa [dʒesuʃtʃa:] ‘gesture’ (ibid.)
d. daijesuto [daiʒesuʃtuo] ‘digest’ (ibid.)

1.4.2.3. [ti, tu]

As seen in early borrowings, [ti] becomes [tʃi], but for items recently transferred into Japanese, [ti] is used. Observe the examples below:

(8) a. borantia [borantia] ‘volunteer’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 78)
c. chippu [tʃippu] ‘tip’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 65)
d. romanchikku [romantʃikku] ‘romantic’ (ibid.)
e. tii paatii \[ti:pa:ti:\] ‘tea party’ (Imada 1989: 47)

In (8b) [tʃi] is used for “team” while [ti] for “teaching.” This example shows that compared with chiimu, tiichingu is a recent borrowing (Imada 1989: 47). Note that tiimu is also employed in the innovating variety (Koizumi 1989: 18-19; Inoue 1989: 118). There are some cases where [te] is substituted for [ti] as in sutekki [sуюткki] ‘stick’ (NHK Hoosoo Bunka Kenkyuujo 1992: 205).

[tʊ] is usually replaced by [tsʊ], though it is also used especially for recent borrowings. Kawakami (1977: 63) says that a fairly large number of Japanese speakers can pronounce [tʊ] as well as [ti] (see also Hattori 1960: 760). Examples:

(9) a. doa-tsuu-doa \[doatsu:doa\]/doa-tuu-doa \[doatw:doa\] ‘door-to-door’
   (Shoogakukan 1998: 386)

b. tsuaa \[tsua:] ‘tour’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 65)

c. tsuu \[tsu:] ‘two’ (ibid.)

d. tsuuru \[tsu:ru] ‘tool’ (ibid.)

It is reported that sports announcers in Japan are inclined to use [tʊ:] rather than [tsʊ:] for “two” (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 66). Compared with [ti], however, the degree of integration of [tʊ] is considered to be lower (see Koizumi 1991: 9).

1.4.2.4. [di, duu]

Conservative speakers replace [di] with [d3i] (in word-initial position) or [3i] (in word-medial position). In the case of recent borrowings, however, [di] tends to
be used. According to Kawakami (1977: 62), [di] is fairly easy to pronounce. Examples:

(10) a. disukaunto [disʊkaunto] ‘discount’
   (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 67).
   b. jirenma [dɛremma]/direnma [diremma] ‘dilemma’ (ibid.)
   c. kurejitto [kʊrejitto] ‘credit’ (ibid.)
   d. sutajio [sʊtaɪo] ‘studio’ (ibid.: 68)

Notice that [di] is sometimes replaced by [de] as in handee [handes:] ‘handicap’ and kyandee [kəndes:] ‘candy’.

[du] is used for recent borrowings. Although this new mora is not well-integrated into Japanese (Koizumi 1991: 9), it is easy to pronounce (Kawakami 1977: 63; Hattori 1960: 760). One of the examples is Hinduu [hindwː]/Hinzuu [hinzwː] ‘Hindu’. Except for this example, the native mora [zʊ] is rarely substituted for [du] (see Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 68).

1.4.2.5. [tiw, diw]

[tiw] is normally replaced by the native mora [tsu], though it is used in the innovating variety. Examples:

(11) a. chuuba [tsu:bə]/tyuuba [tiw:ba] ‘tuba’
   (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 69)
   b. kosuchuumu [kosʊʧwuːmuː] ‘costume’ (ibid.)
c. suchuwaadesu [s[^t\j\j]uwa:des]\i] ‘stewardess’

(NHK Hoosoo Bunka Kenkyuujo 1992: 207)

In the conservative variety, [d\ju] is replaced by [d\3\u] (in word-initial position) or [\3\u] (in word-medial position). Examples:

(12) a. juusu [d\3\usj]\i] ‘deuce’ (ibid.)

b. purojuusaa [pu\ro\3\us\sa:] / purodyuusaa [pu\ro\di\us\sa:] ‘producer’

(ibid.; Koizumi 1991: 9)

c. dyuupurekkusu [\di\u:pu\re\kk\us\j]\i] ‘duplex’ (Shoogakukan 1998: 381)

d. dyuutii furii [\di\u:ti:fu\ur\i\i:] ‘duty free’ (Horiuchi 1996: 302)

Kawakami (1977: 65) says that a large number of Japanese speakers are capable of pronouncing [d\ju] as in (12b). Note that in the case of (12c, 12d), [d\ju] is always used. This fact suggests that dyuupurekkusu and dyuutii furii are fairly recent lexical transfers.

1.4.2.6. [\fa, \fi, \fe, \fo]

Because the English labio-dental [f] does not exist in Japanese, it is replaced by the closest native sound (bilabial fricative) [\f] that occurs before /\u/ ([\fu] is the native mora in the so-called /\ha/-line sequence [ha, c\i, \fu, he, ho]). In the innovating variety, however, [\f] occurs before all vowels. Hence, [\fa, \f\i, \fu, \fe, \fo] are employed to pronounce loanwords which contain the labio-dental [f] (cf. Akinaga 1985: 126). It should, however, be noted that the aforementioned
native moras in the /ha/-line sequence are also used to transcribe well-integrated loanwords (see Vance 1987: 21). Examine the following examples:

(13) a. fan [faN] ‘fan’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 71)
    b. firumu [firimu] ‘film’ (ibid.)
    c. feruto [feruto] ‘felt’ (Koizumi 1978: 309)
    d. fookudansu [fo:kudazji] ‘folk dance’
        (NHK Hoosoo Bunka Kenkyuujo 1992: 210)
    e. serohan [serohan]/serofan [serofan] ‘cellophane’ (Ishino 1983: 106)
    f. koochii [ko:ci:] ‘coffee’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 71)
    g. purattohoomu [purattoho:mu] ‘platform’ (Ishino 1983: 106)
    h. terehon [terehoN]/terefon [terefon] ‘telephone’ (ibid.)

As in (13e) and (13h), both native and foreign moras are employed for “cellophane” and “telephone” while native moras are only used for “coffee” and “platform” as in (13f) and (13g) (Ishino 1983: 106).

Notice that there is variation in the pronunciation of these loanwords. For example, (13a) is also pronounced as [fuwan]; (13b) [fu:rimu]; (13c) [fu:retu] (Koizumi 1978: 309-10; Akinaga 1985: 127; Inoue 1989: 118; cf. Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 71). These examples show that the native mora [fu] is likely to be transferred in producing loans. Or rather, because loanwords are rendered in katakana ‘angular syllabary’, the orthographic medium affects the pronunciation of these loanwords (see Umegaki 1963: 114; Endoo 1989: 229-31; Ishino 1991: 47; Loveday 1996: 114). According to Kawakami (1977: 67), [fa, fi, fe, fo] are difficult for Japanese speakers to pronounce.
1.4.2.7. [va, vi, vu, ve, vo]

The voiced labio-dental fricative [v] is normally replaced by the voiced bilabial stop [b] in Japanese. Because [v] does not exist in the Japanese phonological system, it is regarded as a marked sound for Japanese. Although attempts have been made to include /v/ in the Japanese orthography (see Endoo 1989: 225-27; Kisaka 1991; Seeley 1991: 180), the actual pronunciation by Japanese speakers is apt to become [b]. At best more sophisticated speakers produce [β], the voiced counterpart of Japanese bilabial fricative [ɸ]. It is usually difficult for Japanese to distinguish between [v] and [b]. It is generally recognised that /v/ is not an established phoneme in Japanese (Neustupný 1978: 77, 86-87; Ishino 1989: 104; Koizumi 1991: 11). Examples:

(14) a. baiorin [baiɔrin] ‘violin’ (Ishino 1983: 108)
  b. bideo [bideo] ‘video’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyūjo 1990: 78)
  c. doraibu [doraibw] ‘drive’ (ibid.)
  d. beeru [be:ru] ‘veil’ (ibid.)
  e. bookaru [bo:karw] ‘vocal’ (ibid.)

It should, however, be noted that, as Loveday (1996: 119) says, younger people (under 30) are more capable of pronouncing certain innovative sequences like /va/ owing to greater exposure to English sounds through English education, pop music, and other media (cf. Miyaji 1990: 19). Seeley (1991: 180) makes the point that fluctuation in the *katakana* representation occurs between native moras and innovative moras introduced in Western loanwords (e.g., /ba/ vs. /va/) and that owing to Western language learning and overseas travel, some Japanese are more likely to produce a form close
to that in the donor/source language.

1.4.2.8. [ʃu, ɯu]

[ʃu] is employed for recent transfers, though the native equivalent [ɕu] is also used. Examples:

(15) a. fyuujon [ʃu:3on] ‘fusion’  
(NHK Hoosoo Bunka Kenkyuujo 1992: 210)  
b. hyuuzu [ɕu:zu] ‘fuze’ (ibid.)

[ɯu] is normally replaced by [bɯ], as in the examples below:

(16) a. intabyuu [intabɯ:] ‘interview’ (ibid.: 207)  
b. rebyuu [rebɯ:] ‘review’ (Shoogakukan 1998: 703)

1.4.2.9. [wi, we, wo]

Compared with [v], [w] is easy to pronounce (Ishino 1989: 104). [w] normally occurs before [a], not other vowels in Japanese.10 Before [i, e, o], [w] tends to be replaced by [u], and therefore [wi, we, wo] are likely to become [ui, ue, uo] respectively (Ishino 1983: 91; Kawakami 1977: 67; Akinaga 1985: 127). Observe the examples below:

---

10 Kawakami (1977:55) says that [w] can occur before [o, e]. Examples: [kowo:gozaimasɯ] ‘I’m scared (polite)’ and [kowe:] ‘I’m scared (vulgar)’.
(17) a. uisukii [wisük]i:] ‘whisky’  
(NHK Hoosoo Bunka Kenkyuujo 1992: 208)  
b. uedingu [wedirgu] ‘wedding’ (ibid.)  
c. uootaa [wo:ta:] ‘water’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 84)  
d. su toppuwottchi [sútoppuwottfi] ‘stopwatch’ (Koizumi 1991: 9)  

As in (17d), [wo] can occur (ibid.).

1.4.2.10. [je]

In standard Japanese, [j] occurs before [a, u, o]. [je] is normally replaced by [ie] (see Vance 1987: 27) as in the following examples:

(18) a. iesu [iesü] ‘yes’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 85)  
b. ieroo [iero:] ‘yellow’ (ibid.)

1.4.2.11. [kwa, kwi, kwe, kwo]¹¹

[kwa, kwi, kwe, kwo] are normally replaced by [kwa, kwi, kue, kuo] respectively. These moras sometimes become [ka, kʰ, ke, ko]. Examples:

¹¹These moras existed until the thirteenth century, after which they merged with [ka, kʰi, ke, ko] respectively (Joo’o 1977: 130).
(19) a. sukuatto [sʊkwatto] ‘squat’ (Shoogakukan 1998: 286)
    b. kuiin [kwiːn] ‘queen’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 114)
    c. kuesuchon [kwesuʧɔn] ‘question’ (ibid.)
    d. kuootsu [kwoːtsũ] ‘quartz’
        (NHK Hoosoo Bunka Kenkyuujo 1992: 209)
    e. sukasshu [sʊkaʃũ] ‘squash’ (Shoogakukan 1998: 281)
    f. kiruto [kɪruto] ‘quilt’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 84)
    g. ikooru [ikoːru] ‘equal’ (ibid.: 54)

1.4.2.12. [gwa, gwe]¹²

[gwa, gwe] are replaced by [gua, gue]. Examine the examples below:

(20) a. Guamu [gwamu]/Gamu [gamu] ‘Guam’
        (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 114)
    b. Guen [gwen] ‘Gwen’ (ibid.)

As in (20a), [gwa] sometimes becomes [ga]. The above loanwords are
proper nouns. Shibata (1970: 8-9) points out that the assimilative degree of
transferred words differs between common nouns and proper nouns. According
to him, the degree of phonological integration of foreign words into Japanese
is highest in common nouns and that among proper nouns, place names are more
likely to be assimilated than personal names (ibid.).

¹² Like the voiceless counterparts [kwa, kwe], these moras existed until the thirteenth
century, but later they merged into [ga, ge] (ibid.).
In this section we have briefly discussed the Japanese treatment of some new sound sequences (i.e., innovating/bilingual moras) introduced in lexical transfers. Whereas the use of foreign sounds or foreign sequences of sounds contributes to structural systematisation of the Japanese sound system, it has also created a conflict between native and foreign sounds. The choice between integrating and not integrating foreign sounds depends on not only a speaker’s competence but also socio-psychological factors prevailing in a given situation (Weinreich 1953: 43). It is therefore important to note that the use of foreign sounds instead of native ones adds to speech such nuances as prestige, newness, fashionableness, and affectation. For some people, the adoption of foreign moras serves as a marker of social sophistication in Japan (Loveday 1996: 116).

1.5. Spelling Pronunciation

PS 7. Pronounce an L2 morpheme based on the spelling.

In the process of assimilating English words, spelling pronunciation is often employed. When the spelling of a word corresponds to a certain pronunciation, this pronunciation may be applied to the same spelling in different words. For example, the English word “age” is transferred to Japanese as eejī, and hence English words such as “image,” “average,” and “damage” which contain the spelling “age” may be transcribed by analogy as imeeji, abereeji, and dameeji respectively (Ishiwata 1983: 43).

Other examples of spelling pronunciation or “eye-loans” include: derikeeto ‘delicate’; puraibeeto ‘private’, guroobu ‘glove’, oobun ‘oven’, airon

According to Backhouse (1993: 77), there is a fairly regular correspondence between English final “-ng” and Japanese -ngu as in \textit{fookusongu} [fо:кусонгу] ‘folk song’, \textit{ibuningu} [ибунихгу] ‘evening’, and \textit{kuriiningu} [куриииггу] ‘cleaning’, although there are some exceptions such as \textit{saafin} [са:фин] ‘surfing’ and \textit{pin-pon} [пиимпо] ‘ping-pong’. These exceptions are considered to be “ear-loans” (PS 6) rather than eye-loans (PS 7).

These examples show that English lexical transfers are often integrated into Japanese based on English spelling. Although these forms of transfers may be wrong interpretations of the original sounds, spelling pronunciation or PS 7 is considered to be one of the important strategies for integration often adopted by Japanese speakers.

1.6. From Stress Accent to Pitch Accent

PRS 2. Employ a pitch accent rather than a stress accent.

With respect to the accent patterns of English loanwords, it is important to note that the stress accent in English is replaced by the pitch accent in Japanese when an English word is transferred into Japanese (see Umegaki 1963: 118-121; McCawley 1968: 134; Sonoda 1975: 318-37; Ishino 1983: 134-41, 1989: 104-6; Ishiwata 1985: 130-32; Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 102-10; Backhouse 1993: 31-33).

\textsuperscript{13} For “iron” there is another borrowed form \textit{aian} ‘golf-club’ (Backhouse 1993: 77).
Before discussing accent patterns in loanwords, mention must briefly be made of the characteristics of the standard Japanese pitch accent system. First of all, each mora in a word is either high- or low-pitched. However, there is only a single drop of pitch within a word. It is also important to note that the first two moras in a word differ with respect to pitch levels. Hence, if the first mora is high-pitched, the second mora is always low-pitched. Another point to be noted is that when the final mora in a word is high-pitched, two types of accent patterns occur, depending on whether the word is followed by a high-pitched particle or not (Imada 1989: 96-99; Backhouse 1993: 29).

In the Japanese accentual system, a pitch accent change from higher to lower position is important. The location of the high-pitched mora where this accent shift takes place is called the “accent nucleus” (Hattori 1954-55: 373). It can be said that words without an accent nucleus or an accented syllable are unaccented. In unaccented words, the initial mora is always low-pitched as in example (21) (Vance 1987: 80).

(21) a. ofu-ko^n- ‘office computer’ [L H H H]  
b. guraundo^- ‘ground’ [L H H H]

Accent patterns vary according to dialects. Consider the following examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tokyo</th>
<th>Kyoto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(22) a. ra^li^jo/r^ajio^-</td>
<td>r^aji^lo ‘radio’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. te^rebi</td>
<td>tere^bi ‘television’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. a^iron^-</td>
<td>a^iron ‘iron’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ishino 1983: 134, 137)
As shown in (22), accent patterns differ greatly between Tokyo and Kyoto dialects (Ishino 1983: 134; Kogure 1982: 39-40). In this study, the Tokyo-based accent rules are used as the standard Japanese accentual system (Akinaga 1981: 1-88, 1998: 174-221). However, accent patterns peculiar to regional dialects must be considered when discussing the influence of the original foreign accent pattern upon lexical transfers. According to Umegaki (1963: 120), each dialect has a so-called potential basic type of accent which also occurs in loanwords.

Keeping in mind what has been said above, let us now examine the accent placement rules employed for integrating English words into Japanese. One of the ways to classify the accent patterns of English loanwords is to measure these transfers in terms of the number of moras (Sonoda 1975). In the case of two- and three-mora words, the accent nucleus normally occurs on the head mora (Akinaga 1998: 186). Examples:

(23) Two-mora words:
   a. gaḷsu ‘gas’ (Akinaga 1998: 186)
   b. jaḷmu ‘jam’ (ibid.)
   c. paḷi ‘pie’ (ibid.)

(24) Three-mora words:
   a. goḷrufu ‘golf’ (Sonoda 1975: 320)
   b. poḷsuto ‘post’ (ibid.)
   c. reḷinzu ‘lens’ (ibid.)

However, there are some exceptions like the following examples:
(25) Three-mora words:

a. burulū ‘blue’ (Akinaga 1998: 186)

c. gurele ‘grey’ (ibid.)

d. sukili ‘ski’ (ibid.)

e. sutala ‘star’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 109)

Examples in (25) show that when three-mora words end in long vowels, these loans tend to preserve the location of the original accent (Akinaga 1981: 14; Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 109). Thus, the accent nucleus occurs on the second mora from the last in these examples.

With regard to loanwords containing more than four moras, the accent nucleus tends to fall on the antepenultimate position, that is, the third mora from the end14 (McCawley 1968: 134; Sonoda 1975: 323; Ishino 1983: 135; Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 108; Akinaga 1981: 14, 1998: 186). Observe the examples below:

(26) Four-mora words:

a. imeleji ‘image’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 108)

b. oreñji ‘orange’ (ibid.)

c. pokeçtto ‘pocket’ (ibid.)

d. risaçachi ‘research’ (ibid.)

---

14 Ishino (1983: 139-40) reports that Japanese children who have no knowledge of English are likely to employ the antepenultimate accent pattern when reading English loanwords. The antepenultimate accent is regarded as the accent pattern peculiar to loanwords in Japanese (Ishino 1989: 106; cf. Asano 1999).
(27) Five-mora words:
   a. chokoreleto ‘chocolate’ (Akinaga 1998: 186)
   b. natoryulumu (G. Natrium) ‘sodium’ (ibid.)
   c. sutora‘iki ‘strike’ (ibid.)
   d. patoro‘oru ‘patrol’ (Sonoda 1975: 323)

(28) Six-mora words:
   a. afutanulun ‘afternoon’ (ibid.)
   b. ekisupalato ‘expert’ (ibid.)
   c. ekizochilkku ‘exotic’ (ibid.)
   d. jaanarisuto ‘journalist’ (ibid.)

As shown in these examples, a large number of lexical transfers of polysyllabic nature take the accent nucleus on the third mora from the last. There are, however, exceptions to this accent placement rule. Examine the following examples:

(29) Words of four moras and over:
   a. sutolorii ‘story’ (Akinaga 1981: 14)
   b. esukareletaa ‘escalator’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 107)
   c. adoba‘iza‘ ‘adviser’ (ibid.)
   d. kare‘ndaa ‘calendar’ (ibid.)
   e. disuka‘sshon ‘discussion’ (ibid.)

15 It is reported that of the total number of loanwords listed in NHK’s *Nihongo Hatsuon Akusento Jiten* (1985), 1311 words (52.5%) are classified into this category (Ishino 1983: 138).
f. konpurekkusu ‘complex’ (ibid.)
g. bekutoru ‘vector’ (Mogami 1994: 79)

Close examination of these examples reveals that the phonetic qualities of the third mora from the end are responsible for the accent nucleus shift to the left. That is, if the third mora from the last happens to be the second element of a long vowel or diphthong as in (29a-c), a mora nasal as in (29d), a mora obstruent as in (29e, 29f), or a devoiced vowel as in (29g), the accent nucleus is shifted one mora to the left, namely, from the third to the fourth mora from the end (see Kanno 1971: 15-23; Sonoda 1975: 328-29; Ishino 1983: 135-36, 1989: 105; Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 107; Mogami 1987: 38, 1994: 76; Akinaga 1981: 14, 1998: 186). Due to the less independent nature of these special moras in terms of accent placement rules, the accent nucleus falls on a syllable which contains the antepenultimate mora (Kubozono 1995: 19-20).

Another group of loanwords which does not follow the antepenultimate accent pattern consists of early loans familiar to Japanese for a long period of time or loans frequently used in everyday life (including technical terms). The following examples show that these loanwords tend to be unaccented16 (see Sonoda 1975: 325-26; Akinaga 1981: 14, 1998: 186-87; Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 105-7; Inoue 1992, 1998b: 167-86):

---

16 Mogami (1994: 77) reports that among two- to six-mora words listed in NHK’s Nihongo Hatsuon Akusento Jiten (1985), the frequency rate of the unaccented pattern is 24.3% for four-mora words, 10.2% for five-mora words, 9.5% for three-mora words, 2.5% for six-mora words, and 2.2% for two-mora words. According to Shibata (1995: 182), the unaccented pattern is predominant over the accented patterns in Japanese.
(30) Three-mora words:

a. baketsu− ‘bucket’ (Sonoda 1975: 333)

b. beniya− ‘veneer’ (ibid.)

c. jaketsu− ‘jacket’ (ibid.)

d. taiya− ‘tyre’ (ibid.)

(31) Four-mora words:

a. airon− ‘iron’ (ibid.: 325)

b. Amerika− ‘America’ (ibid.)

c. eakon− ‘air conditioner’ (Kindaichi and Akinaga 1981: 70)

d. haikara− ‘high collar’ (Kanno 1970: 12)

e. infure− ‘inflation’ (ibid.)

f. konbini− ‘convenience store’

(NHK Hoosoo Bunka Kenkyuujo 1998: 330)

g. masukomi− ‘mass communication’ (Kanno 1970: 12)

h. masupuro− ‘mass production’ (ibid.)

i. semento− ‘cement’ (ibid.)

j. teeburu− ‘table’ (ibid.)

(32) Five-mora words:

a. ammonia− ‘ammonia’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 106)

b. arukooru− ‘alcohol’ (ibid.)

c. baiorin− ‘violin’ (ibid.)

d. inshurin− ‘insulin’ (ibid.)

e. kanningu− ‘cunning’ (Sonoda 1975: 334)
It is reported that among two-to six-mora loans, four-mora loanwords achieve the highest percentage of the unaccented pattern (Mogami 1994: 77). Another feature of four-mora unaccented loans is that, as examples (31) show, there are a great many clipped forms as in (31e, 31f) and clipping compounds as in (31c, 31d, 31g, 31h) (Kanno 1970). The above unaccented loans are taken to demonstrate a greater degree of assimilation of these items into Japanese. It can be assumed from these examples that morphological strategies such as clipping and compounding also play a significant role in promoting prosodic integration of loanwords into Japanese.\(^\text{17}\)

The recent tendency to use the unaccented pattern is pointed out by many researchers and intellectuals (e.g., Mogami 1987, 1994; Ishino 1989: 105; Inoue 1992, 1998b: 167-86; Shibata 1995: 127-87; Chuunichi Shinbun 11 May 1998). According to Mogami (1994: 80-82), there are two main reasons why the unaccented pattern tends to become predominant. The first reason is to facilitate pronunciation. Most of the loanwords which tend to shift to the unaccented pattern are three-, four-, or five-mora words whose accent nucleus falls on the head mora or the second mora from the head (cf. Shibata 1995: 182). As these accented patterns require more energy in articulation, the unaccented pattern is likely to be used. Notice further that these three- to five-mora loans usually contain special moras (i.e., a long vowel, a mora nasal, a mora obstruent, the second element of a diphthong, and a devoiced vowel) which are not independent on the syllabic level. These mora phonemes are dependent on the preceding element despite their independence as moras (Kubozono 1995: 17-18). It is thus

\(^{17}\)Bekku (1977: 187-97) suggests that the prosodic feature peculiar to Japanese is the four-mora pattern.
supposed that the weaker nature of these moras is responsible for the shift to the unaccented pattern (Mogami 1994: 81).

Another reason for the use of the unaccented pattern is that many unaccented loanwords belong to the category of technical terms (ibid. 81-82; Inoue 1992). The frequent use of technical terms in everyday life promotes the unaccented pattern of these words. It can be assumed that the use of the unaccented pattern increases when the semantic distinction made by the accent loses its significance owing to the frequent daily use of technical register among a certain group of people (Mogami 1994: 82).

Shibata (1995: 180) indicates that the adoption of the unaccented pattern engenders such images as “new,” “youthful,” “urban,” and “among fellows,” and prevails especially among the younger generation (see also Akinaga 1998: 187). The emergence of the unaccented pattern contributes to the semantic division of a word. For example, \textit{pašatī} is an expensive, gorgeous get-together while \textit{paatī} is a cheap, informal gathering (Shibata 1995: 179).

Whereas well-integrated, old loanwords and frequently used items tend to become unaccented, recent borrowings which are not yet well-assimilated into Japanese are likely to employ an accent close to the original one. Those who are familiar with foreign languages tend to preserve the location of the original accent (Akinaga 1981: 14, 1998: 187; cf. Asano 1999). Examples:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(33)] a. \textit{a̱kusento} ‘accent’ (Akinaga 1998: 187) \\
    b. \textit{ga̱idansu} ‘guidance’ (ibid.) \\
    c. \textit{ta̱laminaru} ‘terminal’ (ibid.) \\
    d. \textit{ti̱pikaru} ‘typical’ (ibid.)
\end{enumerate}
The pitch accent employed in Japanese borrowings is different from the original stress accent of English words. Umegaki (1963: 118-21) says that the loanword accent has nothing to do with the original accent. As the following examples show, in the case of three-mora words the accent nucleus frequently occurs on the head mora which is syllabified by epenthesis (Umegaki 1963: 121; McCawley 1968: 134):

(34) a. bu[rashi ‘brush’ (Umegaki 1963: 121)
   b. do[rama ‘drama’ (ibid.)
   c. do[resu ‘dress’ (ibid.)

Finally, mention must be made of the accent rule of compounds. As a general rule, the first element of a compound becomes unaccented, while the location of the accent in the second element remains the same. However, if the second element is originally unaccented, the accent nucleus falls on the first mora of the second element of the compound (Ishino 1989: 105; Akinaga 1998: 187). Examples:

(35) a. basu ta[laminaru (ba[+ + ta[laminaru) ‘bus terminal’
   (Akinaga 1998: 187)
   b. aisu kuri[limu (a[ + kuri[limu) ‘ice cream’ (ibid.)
   c. purasu ma[linasu (pu[rasu/purasu + mainasu) ‘plus minus’ (ibid.)
   d. suchiimu a[iron (suchi[limu + a[iron) ‘steam iron’ (Ishino 1989: 105)

In this section we have briefly examined the basic accent patterns of English loanwords in Japanese. It should be kept in mind that the antepenultimate accent and the unaccented pattern generated by means of PRS 2 are important ordinary

1.7. Varieties of English

PS 8. Adopt the pronunciation of Standard British English as a model.


The question of which variety of English (e.g., British, American, Canadian, Australian, or New Zealand) is adopted as a model plays a crucial role in determining the kinds of phonological rules used for integration of English sounds into Japanese phonology as well as the types of loans introduced into the Japanese vocabulary. Standard British English works as a model for phonological integration of English loanwords into Japanese (PS 8). However, as the influence of American English on Japanese learners of English is significant, the pronunciation of Standard American English is also considered to be a model for integrating English items into Japanese (PS 9) (see Neustupy 1992).

2. Morphological Aspect

Along with phonological strategies and rules, morphological strategies (MSs) and rules for integration are simultaneously applied to English lexical items transferred into Japanese.

2.1. Morphological Adaptation

It is recognised that Japanese has a structure that is convenient for
the assimilation of loanwords (Umegaki 1963: 22-28; Shibata 1970: 4; Iwabuchi 1977: 13). Due to the lack of nominal inflections in terms of gender, person, number, and case, Japanese can easily transfer English nouns without any morphological readjustment (Shibatani 1990: 144). As the majority of foreign lexical items are transferred as nouns, this Japanese characteristic is considered to be conducive to the importation of foreign words.

Another factor which facilitates the introduction of loanwords is taken to be the presence of a syllabic writing system in Japanese. The use of *katakana* ‘angular syllabary’ helps to distinguish foreign items from the other lexical strata in writing, and therefore contributes to promoting lexical transference into Japanese (Umegaki 1963: 24; Shibatani 1990: 144-45).

It is pointed out that previously established Japanese calques (i.e., loan translations) are being replaced with their *katakana* representations, as in *nooto* for *choomen* ‘notebook’, *depaato* for *hyakkaten* ‘department store’, *kamera* for *shashinki* ‘camera’ (Shibatani 1990: 153; Loveday 1996: 79). Although the contemporary trend is to employ the *katakana* rendering of the original sounds, loan translation is still used to denote the meaning of loanwords. There were times when loan translation was a norm for borrowing new foreign words. When foreign objects or concepts were introduced, semantically appropriate Sino-Japanese words were first assigned to foreign words to designate these imported items. Examples: *denshikeisanki* ‘computer’, *denwa* ‘telephone’, *tetsudoo* ‘railway’, *jooken* ‘steamship’, *matenroo* ‘skyscraper’ (see Umegaki 1963: 189-91; Shibatani 1990: 194-50; cf. Weinreich 1953: 51; Haugen 1956: 60-61).

Although nouns may be borrowed into Japanese with no morphological modification, verbs and adjectives cannot be transferred without following the

English verbs (and some nouns) are categorised into Japanese verbs by adding the (light) verb *suru* ‘do’ to these transferred items, as in *arenji suru* ‘to arrange’, *rirakkusu suru* ‘to relax’, *adobaisu suru* ‘to advise’, *saabisu suru* ‘to service’. English verbs are re-categorised as verbal nouns which are suffixed by *suru*. This verbal noun construction plays a significant role in integrating English verbs into Japanese verbal morphology.

Sometimes the verbal suffix -*ru* is attached to the clipped forms (first 2-3 moras) of certain verbs and nouns so that these words fit in the Japanese verbal category. Examples: *aji-ru* ‘to agitate’, *misu-ru* ‘to mistake’, *sabo-ru* ‘to sabotage’, *dabu-ru* ‘to double’, *torabu-ru* ‘to trouble’. Notice that in the last two examples, the word-final mora *ru* is phonetically mapped onto the verbal suffix -*ru*.

English adjectives are given the adjectival noun status in Japanese by attaching the *na* ending (the attributive form of the copula) to these transferred adjectives as in *puraibeeto na* ‘private’. In the predicative function, the *na* ending becomes *da*. When English colour terms are transferred, these adjectives become adjectival nouns, and with the particle *no* attached modify the following noun in each case. Examples: *buruu no doresu* (blue + Gen + dress) ‘blue dress’, *guree no sakaato* (grey + Gen + skirt). Note that when borrowed into Japanese, the English word ‘now’ becomes the adjective *nau-* by adding the suffix -*i* to it.18

Transferred English adjectives are occasionally adverbialised in Japanese by the

---

18 In *Shin Meikai Kokugo Jiten* (1997: 1033), *nau* is interpreted as an adjectival noun (i.e., *nau na/nau da*) rather than an adjective (i.e., *nau-i*) (see also Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 8-9).
addition of the particle *ni*, as in *shiriasu ni* (serious + *ni*) ‘seriously’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 9; Backhouse 1993: 67-70).

2.2. Clipping

MS 1. Truncate part of a free morpheme or morphemes to conform to the native or Sino-Japanese prosody.

One of the most common strategies for integrating English words is “clipping,” which refers to the abbreviation of a word. Clipping occurs when the original word is long and frequently used. If the word is long but rarely used, clipping does not normally occur. The use of abbreviations is therefore associated with a particular domain and a certain group (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1985a: 69) (see also Ishiwata 1983: 46-68; Ishino 1983: 119-33, 1989: 106-7; Sonoda 1983: 36-37; Kanno 1985: 54-64; Morioka 1988: 10-12; Hoffer 1990: 6-7; Shibatani 1990: 254-56; Kubozono 1995: 21-22; Loveday 1996: 79, 143; Takagi 1997: 52-56; Hatch and Brown 1995: 208-10). Observe the following examples:

(36) Two-mora words:


b. *bی̷ru* (bi’rudingu/bi’rujingu) ‘building’ (ibid.)

c. *o̷pge* (opere’eshon) ‘operation’ (Shoogakukan 1998: 117)

d. *ne̷ru* (fura’inneru) ‘flannel’ (Sonoda 1983: 36)

(37) Three-mora words:

a. *da̷li(y)a* (da(y)amo’ndo) ‘diamond’ (ibid.)
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These examples illustrate how back-clipping or truncation of the final part of a word occurs. Back-clipped words of this kind constitute the majority
of loan abbreviations (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1985: 72). As in (36d, 37d-f), front-clipping also occurs, though it is rare. (38e-l) are examples of clipping compounds (ibid.: 72-73). Here, the first two moras of each element are combined after the process of back-clipping (Tsujimura 1996: 153). These clipping patterns totally disregard the original morphological structure of English, following the mora-timed prosodic pattern in Japanese. The resulting clipped words are taken to be a kind of sign or technical term (Morioka 1988: 10-12). Note that, as Kubozono (1995: 21) points out, clipping is constrained by not only the mora structure (i.e., 2-4 moras) but also the syllable structure (i.e., more than two syllables). It can therefore be assumed that there is a morphological rule (i.e., shorten to 2-4 moras but more than two syllables) operating through MS 1.

It is reported that among clipped loans, four-mora words make up the largest group (Kanno 1985: 57-58; Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1985: 72; Takagi 1997: 51). According to Takagi (1997: 51-56), four-mora clipped loans have something in common with four-mora clipped Sino-Japanese words (e.g., gunbi-shukushoo → gun-shuku ‘disarmament’; genshiryoku-hatsudensho → gen-patsu ‘nuclear power plant’). In Sino-Japanese words, too, four-mora words are the largest group. Both Western loanwords and Sino-Japanese words often contain the mora nasal /N/ and are also similar in word formation rules for clipping compounds (i.e., the first two moras are taken from each element and combined after the back-clipping process). Thus, Takagi assumes that the four-mora pattern plays a significant role in the integration of Western loanwords into Japanese (see also Bekku 1977: 187-97; Kanno 1985: 63).

One of the important features of clipping is that dropping an inflectional morpheme frequently occurs because once an English word is borrowed into Japanese, the bound morpheme of English loses its grammatical function in
Japanese. Hence, morphemes for marking the plural (-s), the past participle (-ed), the present participle (-ing), the possessive case (-’s/-s’), and so on are likely to be omitted. These bound morphemes are those required by the grammatical rules of English only. The morphological structure of the English word is thus ignored. (see Sonoda 1983: 36; Ishiwata 1983: 55-68, 1985: 132-33; Ishino 1983: 121-27; Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1984: 137-38; 1990: 10-11). Consider the following examples:

(39) a. san gu’rasu ‘sun glasses’ (Sonoda 1983: 36)
   b. sarari’i-man ‘salaried man’ (ibid.)
   c. sukeeto-ri’inku ‘skating rink’ (Ishiwata 1985: 133)
   d. uuman-ri’ibu ‘women’s lib’ (Ishino 1989: 107)
   e. on-e’la ‘on the air’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 11)
   f. hamu-e’ggu ‘ham and eggs’ (ibid.)

As in (39e, 39f), English articles and conjunctions can be omitted as well. Note that omission of English bound morphemes does not always occur as in pantsu ‘pants’, furaido poteto ‘fried potato’, kukkingu wain ‘cooking wine’, menzu shoppu ‘men’s shop’, on-za-roku ‘on the rocks’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 11-12).

Many homonyms result from a back-clipping process, as shown in the examples below:

(40) a. da’iya ‘diagram/diamond’ (Sonoda 1983: 37)
   b. mi’su ‘mistake/miss/Miss’ (ibid.)
   c. pu’ro ‘professional/prostitute/program/production’
      (ibid.; Ishino 1989: 107)
2.3. Initialisation and Acronyms

MS 2. Combine the initials of two or more L2 free morphemes.

In the process of integrating English lexical items “initialisation” and “acronyms” are frequently employed. These strategies are concerned with the formation of types of abbreviations by combining the initials or initial letters of two or more words (see Sonoda 1983: 37-38; Ishiwata 1985: 123-24; Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1985: 126; Kanno 1985: 59; Tanabe 1988: 18-21; Hoffer 1990: 5-6; Loveday 1996: 80; Hatch and Brown 1995: 210). Both initialisms and acronyms are regarded as integration strategies, but the difference between the two is that although all the letters of initialisms (or alternatively called alphabetisms) are separately pronounced, acronyms are pronounced as single words rather than a mere list of initials (Crystal 1997: 1). Japanese has borrowed English initialisms such as “FBI” ‘Federal Bureau of Investigation’, “SF” ‘science fiction’, “IQ” ‘intelligence quotient’, “CPI” ‘consumer price index’, and “PTA” ‘parent-teacher association’, creating their own initialisms based upon English models. Observe the following examples:

(41) a. BG (bii-jii) ‘business girl’ (Sonoda 1983: 37)
    b. OB (oo-bii) ‘old boy’ (ibid.)
    c. OG (oo-jii) ‘old girl/office girl’ (ibid.)
    d. OL (oo-ero) ‘office lady’ (Ishiwata 1985: 133)
    e. LDK (eru-dii-kee) ‘living-dining-kitchen’ (Loveday 1996: 80)
It is reported that, as example (41a) has a negative connotation as *puro* ‘prostitute’, it was replaced by (41d) that appeared around 1964 (Ishiwata 1983: 81, 1985: 133; Horiuchi 1996: 99).

The following acronyms and initialisms are recent borrowings from English:

(42) a. AIDS (eizu) ‘acquired immune deficiency syndrome’
   (Shoogakukan 1998: 80)

b. LASER (reezaa) ‘light amplification by stimulated emission of radiation’ (ibid.: 696)

c. LAN (ran) ‘local area network’ (ibid.: 799)

d. CD (shii-dii) ‘compact disc’ (ibid.: 745)

e. DVD (dii-bui-dii) ‘digital versatile disc’ (ibid.: 759)

f. ISDN (ai-esu-dii-enu) ‘integrated services digital network’ (ibid.: 789)

(42a-c) are examples of acronyms, as they are pronounced as single words. Examples (42c-f) reflect the recent development of information technology, new media, the Internet, and computers. According to Yonekawa (1991: 43), since 1983 there has been a steady increase in the number of technical loanwords in the field of new media and computers (see also Seeley 1991: 179).

The increasing use of initialisms and acronyms is one of the characteristics of modern Japanese (Yonekawa 1991: 43; Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1985: 72; Seeley 1991: 182). The recent tendency is seen in an effort to create acronyms, so that they can be connected with certain meanings. One of the examples is AMEDAS ‘automated meteorological data acquisition system’. It can be pronounced *amedasu* as a four-mora word associated with the meaning: ‘rain falls’ (Kanno 1985: 64; Tanabe 1988: 19).
2.4. Compounding

MS 3. Combine L2 free morphemes or clipped elements; combine L2 free morphemes or clipped elements with native or Sino-Japanese free morphemes.

“Compounding” is a strategy for forming words consisting of two or more lexical items which can function independently in other circumstances (see Kageyama 1982; Sonoda 1983: 40-42; Shibatani 1990: 237-54; Hatch and Brown 1995: 189-96; Kubozono 1995: 51-141; Tsujimura 1996: 150-52). A notable feature of borrowed compounds in Japanese is that some loanwords which are elements of compounds are not employed independently. For example, gaaru in gaarufirendo ‘girlfriend’, fiudo in doggu fiudo ‘dog food’, and baado in baado wotchingu ‘bird watching’ are rarely used singly (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1984: 137; Ishino 1989: 13).

Through the process of juxtaposing English words, the following compounds or words made up of two or more free morphemes have been created by Japanese (see Shibata 1970: 9-12, 1984: 21; Ishiwata 1983: 71-103; Kojima and Takebayashi 1990: 1795; Loveday 1996: 142-43):

(43) a. afutaa-salabisu (after + service) ‘after-sales service’
(Kojima and Takebayashi 1990: 1795)
b. bakku-mira (back + mirror) ‘rear-view mirror’ (ibid.)
c. beddo-talun (bed + town) ‘bedroom suburbs’ (ibid.)
d. beesu-a[lppu/-da]lun (base + up/down) ‘raising/lowering average salary’ (Loveday 1996: 142)
e. gooruden-aiwaa (golden + hour) ‘prime (television) time’
   (Kojima and Takebayashi 1990: 1795)
f. goorul-in (goal + in) ‘attainment of one’s goal, esp. of marriage’
   (ibid.)
g. mooningu-salabisu (morning + service) ‘special rate in the
   morning at a coffee shop’ (ibid.)
h. noo-taletchi (no touch) ‘untouched/nothing to do with’
   (Loveday 1996: 142)
i. oodaa-me’edo (order + made) ‘made-to-order/custom-made’
   (Kojima and Takebayashi 1990: 1795)
j. oorudo-mis (old + Miss) ‘spinster/old maid’ (ibid.)
k. teeburu-supilichi (table + speech) ‘after-dinner speech’ (ibid.)

These Japanese-made compounds are also regarded as loanwords in the present
study (see Ishino 1989: 99).

Another integration strategy frequently employed in Japanese-English
contact is “hybrid compounding” (Weinreich 1953: 51-53) which involves
combining lexical items from foreign languages with native or Sino-Japanese
words. A number of English words have been incorporated into Japanese and
used in combination with native or Sino-Japanese words (see Umegaki 1963:
hybrids are indicative of the higher degree of integration of foreign lexical items.
There are basically two types of hybrid compounds, depending on whether
Japanese (including Sino-Japanese) words are used as heads or foreign words as
heads (Miyaji 1990: 22). Note that heads or category-determining elements are
normally located on the right hand side (Kageyama 1982: 215; Tsujimura 1996: 155-56). The following are some examples of hybrid compounds:

(44) Japanese words as heads:

a. doru kai'/dorul kai (dollars + buying) [foreign + native]
   (NHK Hoosoo Bunka Kenkyujo 1998: 648)

b. aidoru ka'shu (idol + singer) [foreign + Sino-Japanese]
   (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 19)

(45) Foreign words as heads:

a. nama bi'iru (draft + beer) [native + foreign] (ibid.)

b. kisei ra'sshu (going home + rush) [Sino-Japanese + foreign] (ibid.)

With regard to hybrid compounds, as Miyaji (1990: 22) says, the particle no is sometimes affixed to the first element, as in taimuragu no mondai ‘the problem of time lag’, and ichigo no suupu ‘strawberry soup’. Compared with other compounds, hybrid compounds are considered to be more like noun phrases in that the relation between two elements are looser (Janis Melvold, personal communication 1991).

On the other hand, ordinary compounds are taken to be one word rather than phrases, though errors made by learners suggest that not all compounds are learned as single lexical items (Hatch and Brown 1995: 194-95).

Finally, Japanese has created a large number of clipping hybrid compounds as in the following examples:

(46) a. asa-shan^ (morning + shampoo) ‘shampooing one’s hair in the morning’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1990: 19)
b. kara-oke (empty + orchestra) ‘singing to (a) taped music accompaniment’ (ibid.)

c. zai-teku (money + technology) ‘financial management’ (ibid.)

d. oku-shon (one hundred million + mansion) ‘an apartment which costs one hundred million yen’ (Miyaji 1990: 22)

2.5. Blending

MS 4. Combine two elements that do not normally co-occur to create new free morphemes.

“Blending” is a strategy for creating new words by combining “two elements which do not normally co-occur “ (Crystal 1997: 44-45) (see also Umegaki 1963: 150-51; Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1985: 66-67; Hatch and Brown 1995: 211-13; Kubozono 1995: 143-202; Lehrer 1996). Although blending and compounding show similarities, the principal difference between the two is that “in compounding, complete morphemes are presented, whereas in blending, one or both parts are clipped” (Lehrer 1996: 360). We have seen that there are truncated forms of compounds and hybrid compounds. However, clipping compounds and clipping hybrid compounds should be distinguished from blends, because these abbreviations are formed as a strategy for prosodic integration into Japanese rather than to produce new words to designate new objects or discoveries (cf. Kubozono 1995: 145-48). Speech-error blends may result in existing words (Lehrer 1996: 385), but word-formation blends play a significant role in the creation of new lexicon through the process of combining parts of conventional words. The following blends or portmanteau words have been transferred from English as single words like other conventional loans:
(47) a. buralrtchi ‘brunch’ (breakfast + lunch) (Kubozono 1995: 143)
   b. sumolggu ‘smog’ (smoke + fog) (ibid.)
   c. mo‘oteru ‘motel’ (motorists + hotel) (ibid.: 148)
   d. ne‘chizun ‘netizen’ (network + citizen) ‘Internet users’
      (Shoogakukan 1998: 423)
   e. waakaholrikkulwaakahorilkku ‘workaholic’ (work + alcoholic)
      (ibid.: 717)

These examples show that blends are normally composed of parts of words (Lehrer: 361-62). (47a-d) all consist of two parts which are less than full morphemes. Notice, however, that in (47e) one word is followed by part of another word.

Japanese-made blends have been coined as shown in the following examples (see Umegaki 1963: 150; Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1985: 67; Morioka 1985: 47; Miyaji 1990: 22; Horiuchi 1996: 99; Loveday 1996: 80):

(48) a. hoteshon (hotel + mansion) ‘an apartment in town used for business’
      (Loveday 1996: 80)
   b. malmagon (mama + dragon) ‘a horrible mother’
      (Kubozono 1995: 144)
   c. obata‘rian (obasan + battalion) ‘a middle-aged woman who does not care what others say’ (Horiuchi 1996: 99)
   d. te‘kushii (tekuru + taxi) ‘walking instead of taking a taxi or bus’
      (Umegaki 1963: 150)

Examples (48c, 48d) are types of “hybrid blends” (Umegaki 1963: 150).
2.6. Affixation

MS 5. Append an L2 affix to a native or Sino-Japanese free morpheme (or a native or Sino-Japanese affix to an L2 free morpheme)

Another integration strategy that plays a significant role in forming new words is "affixation." Appending prefixes or suffixes from English to existing words in Japanese (i.e., native, Sino-Japanese, mimetic, and foreign), affixation makes a great contribution to enriching the Japanese vocabulary. Based on Sino-Japanese word-formation patterns, a large number of Anglo-Japanese coinages have been made by adopting English affixes which are transferred into Japanese normally as part of loanwords (see Umegaki 1963: 151; Sonoda 1983: 38-40; Morioka 1985; Ishino 1989: 113; Yonekawa 1989: 360-62; Shibatani 1990: 151; Jinnouchi 1992: 79; Loveday 1996: 80, 143). Some examples of Anglo-Japanese affixes are presented below:

(49) Anglo-Japanese prefixes

a. anchi- 'anti-' (against, opposite)
   *anchi-Kyōjin 'anti-Giants' (Sonoda 1983: 38)

b. maruchi- 'multi-' (many, more than one)
   *maruchi-ningen (multi + human being) 'a multifaceted person'
   (Ishino 1989: 113)

c. non- 'non-' (not)
   *non-pori (non + political) 'a person/student who is not politically-minded' (Horiuchi 1996: 343; Takagi 1997: 53)
d. semi- ‘semi-’ (half)

\textit{semi-sho\,loto} (semi + short) ‘longish short (hairstyle)’

(Horiuchi 1996: 255)

e. za- ‘the’

\textit{za\,-manza\,li} ‘the (best) comic dialogue’ (Ishino 1983: 124, 159)

(50) Anglo-Japanese suffixes

a. -eedo ‘-ade’ (a sweetened drink made of various fruits)

\textit{ichigo\,eedo} (strawberry + -ade) ‘strawberryade’ (Sonoda 1983: 38)

b. -aa ‘-er’ (a person or thing that performs a specified action)

\textit{kore\,kushona\,a} (collection + -er) ‘collector’ (ibid.: 46)

\textit{na\,lita\,a} (night + -er) ‘night game’ (ibid.: 39)

c. -isuto ‘-ist’ (a person who performs a certain action)

\textit{Sayuri\,isuto} (Sayuri + -ist) ‘a devoted fan of actress Sayuri Yoshinaga’

(Shibatani 1990: 151)

d. -izumu ‘-ism’ (indicating a principle or doctrine)

\textit{ganbari\,izumu} (trying one’s best + -ism) ‘the principle of trying one’s best’ (Ishino 1989: 113)

e. -shippu ‘-ship’ (indicating state or condition)

\textit{sukinshi\,lppu} (skin + -ship) ‘skin contact, close bodily contact’

(ibid.; Loveday 1996: 80)

f. -chikku ‘-tic’ (-type)

\textit{mangachi\,lkk\,u} (cartoon + -tic) ‘like a cartoon’ (Ishino 1989: 113)

(49a, b, e) and (50a, c, d, f) are examples of “hybrid affixing” (Loveday 1996: 80). The rest of the examples are Anglo-Japanese innovations containing English-based affixes. As Morioka (1985: 46) points out, Sino-Japanese affixes
are connected with the productive process of foreign affixing. For example, the English prefix in (49a) corresponds to the Sino-Japanese han- ‘anti-’ (see (51c) below); and that in (49c) is relevant to negative prefixes such as fu-, hi-, mi-, and mu- (Jinnouchi 1992: 79; Loveday 1996: 147). As in (49e), the English article “the” is transferred into Japanese as a kind of emphatic prefix. This phenomenon is also regarded as associated with the use of Sino-Japanese prefixes such as zen- (e.g., zen-chiji ‘ex-governor’), kon- (e.g., kon-kokkai ‘present Diet’), and the above-mentioned han- (e.g., han-koogai ‘anti-pollution’) (Ishino 1983: 160; Loveday 1996: 134). These familiar Sino-Japanese prefixes facilitate introduction of the corresponding foreign affixes. Notice that (50f) is equivalent to the Sino-Japanese suffix -teki ‘-type’ that is fairly productive (see (52e) below; Umegaki 1963: 151; Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1985: 54; Yonekawa 1989: 360; Jinnouchi 1992: 79).

Japanese affixes are also attached to foreign bases to create derivatives, as shown in the examples below (see Sonoda 1983: 39-40; Morioka 1985: 50; Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1985: 46-54; Shibatani 1990: 219-20; Loveday 1996: 80; Takagi 1997: 56):

(51) Japanese prefixes

a. choo- ‘super-, ultra-’
   cho-beri-ba /gu− (choo- ‘super-’ + berii ‘very’ + baddo/guddo ‘bad/good’) ‘extremely bad/good’ (Takagi 1997: 56)

b. dai- ‘large, great’
   dai-nyu/usu ‘big news’ (Sonoda 1983: 39)

c. han- ‘anti-, pan-, half’
   ha\n-oote-ma-ka/ha\n-oote-ma ‘anti-automation’
   (cf. Shoogakukan 1998: 105)
“han-poˇndo” ‘half pound’ (Sonoda 1983: 39)

d. o- (honorific, beautificatory)\textsuperscript{19}

\textit{o-biˇliru} (o + beer) (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1985: 48)

e. zen- ‘all, complete’

\textit{zen-suto} (all + strip) ‘all nude show/complete strip’

(Sonoda 1983: 40)

(52) Japanese suffixes

a. -ka ‘-ise/-fy’

\textit{dorama-ka} ‘dramatise’ (Shibatani 1990: 219)

b. -sei ‘-made’

\textit{Amerika-sei} ‘American-made’ (Sonoda 1983: 40)

c. -ru (verb-forming suffix)

\textit{demo1-ru} (demonstration + -ru) ‘to demonstrate’

(Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1985: 53)

d. -shugi ‘principle, doctrine’

\textit{mai-hoomu-shuigi} (my + home + -shugi) ‘family-oriented’ (ibid.: 52)

e. -teki ‘-type’

\textit{Hamuretto-teki (na)} ‘like Hamlet’ (ibid.: 54)

As the above examples suggest, except for a few native affixes like (51d)
and (52c), which are occasionally employed with English-based stems, most are
Sino-Japanese affixes (Morioka 1985: 49). It is recognised that the number of

\textsuperscript{19} The polite prefix \textit{o}- cannot normally be attached to Western loanwords except for
some well-integrated loans like \textit{biiri} ‘beer’, \textit{tabako} ‘tobacco’, and so on.
native affixes is quite small (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1985: 57).

Generally, derivational affixes can change the grammatical class of morphemes to which they are attached (Crystal 1997: 111). With regard to Japanese affixation, however, prefixes do not normally play any part in category conversion,\(^\text{20}\) while suffixes do (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1985: 46-49; Tsujimura 1996: 155-56). For instance, (52c) shows that the nominal category of “demo” is converted to the verbal one with the suffix \(-ru\) attached to the word. (52a) is also an example of the noun-to-verbal noun conversion. As in (52e), the suffix \(-teki\) changes the word category from a noun to an adjectival noun.

_CHO-beri-ba’gu_ in (51a) is a recent hybrid innovation coined by Japanese girls’ high-school students, reflecting one aspect of the youth culture in contemporary Japan (Takagi 1997: 56). The life of this type of word in vogue may be short and ephemeral, but what is interesting here is that even this slang expression itself is formed by complying to the (Sino-) Japanese morphophonological pattern. That is, each element of the phrase is clipped and combined together to conform to the four-mora sequence, easing integration of this neologism into the Japanese lexical inventory.

In this section we have examined the morphological aspect of English lexical adaptation in Japanese. Word-formation strategies such as clipping, compounding, and affixation are applied to incoming foreign items, based on the Sino-Japanese model. The structure of Sino-Japanese words functions as a framework for the process of adaptation and creation of English-based lexicon.


---
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3. Semantic Aspect

Prestige motives and euphemistic needs trigger the transference of synonymous Western loans to Japanese. Foreign lexical items unnecessarily transferred into Japanese (i.e., core lexical transfers) go through such processes as semantic shift, coexistence, and replacement by means of semantic strategies (SSs).

3.1. Semantic Change

SS 2. Specialise or restrict the original meaning.
SS 3. Extend the original meaning.
SS 4. Change the original meaning.

Generally, immediate integration of foreign words takes place when there are no native equivalents in the recipient language (i.e., cultural lexical transference). Many technical terms belong to this group of borrowings whose meanings are close to those of the original words (Ishino 1983: 143). However, in the case of those words which have their native counterparts (i.e., core lexical transfers), semantic change frequently occurs. English words are normally assigned a specific semantic place in the recipient lexicon as they are transferred to Japanese. A large number of English loanwords acquire new meanings and are used as slang in Japanese. The following examples show three types of semantic change (i.e., semantic specialisation/restriction, extension, and transfer/shift) which occur via SSs 2-4 in the integration process of English lexical items in Japanese (see

(53) Specialisation or Restriction
   a. *bilru/bilrudingu* (building) ‘Western-style high rise’
      (Ishiwata 1985: 135)
   b. *ralisu* (rice) ‘cooked rice served on a flat plate, especially in a
      Western-style restaurant’ (Shibatani 1990: 150)
   c. *sutoʃobu* (stove) ‘room heater’ (ibid.)

(54) Extension
   a. *dorali* (dry) ‘unsentimental, business-like’ (Sonoda 1983: 45)
   b. *sebiro−* (civil/civilian clothes) ‘men’s suits’ (ibid.: 45)
   c. *reji* (register) ‘cash register, cashier’ (Shibatani 1990: 151)

(55) Transfer or Shift
   b. *femininsuto* (feminist) ‘a man who is sentimentally fond of women
      or who treats women kindly with secret intention’ (ibid.)
   d. *maʃen-hon* (mansion) ‘condominium’ (Shibatani 1990: 151)
   e. *panku−* (puncture) ‘delivery of a baby’ (Sonoda 1983: 46)
   f. *salabisu* (service) ‘free, discount’ (Shoogakukan 1998: 224)
Note that these semantic differences between lexical transfers and their original words are ascribed to circumstances and conditions under which these foreign lexical items are transferred to Japanese (Ishiwata 1985: 137).

3.2. Coexistence.

SS 1. Transfer a word in meaning only.
SS 5. Assign a semantic place to a lexical transfer to avoid a conflict with its native equivalent.
SS 6. Adopt a synonymous transfer (or core lexical transfer) in a compound.

When a foreign lexical item is transferred into Japanese, its loan translation utilising Sino-Japanese words and/or morphemes can be created (SS 1). It is therefore possible that a conflict between the lexical transfer and its Sino-Japanese equivalent occurs, as in the doublets konpyuutaa/denishikeisanki ‘computer’, and wain/budooshu ‘wine’ (Shibatani 1990: 150). New meanings are sometimes added to existing words to refer to newly introduced objects or concepts (SS 1). To give an example, the importation of “automobiles” has given rise to loan shift by extending the meaning of the native word kuruma ‘wheel, rickshaw’ to refer to automobiles (Jinnouchi 1992: 78; Suzuki 1996: 226-27).

When a foreign word is unnecessarily transferred into Japanese despite the existence of its native equivalent (i.e., core lexical transference), a conflict between the lexical transfer and the native counterpart also arises, often resulting in the coexistence of these items as in biru/tatemono ‘building’ and resutoran/ryooriya ‘restaurant’. These synonymous doublets normally split semantic fields (SS 5). That is, whereas a foreign word refers to a Western phenomenon, its
Japanese counterpart refers to a native phenomenon (Loveday 1996: 81). For example, as seen in (53b) above, * raisu ‘rice’ means cooked rice to be served on a flat plate in a Western-style restaurant, while the native * gohan refers to cooked rice served in a rice-bowl. Likewise, * sutoroberii ‘strawberry’ may be used rather than the native * ichigo when these are served with cream in a glass in a restaurant. These English-based words and their associated native words are considered to be complementary to each other in terms of semantic assignment according to context (Loveday 1996: 81-83). It can also be said that the semantic characteristic of English-derived loans is “modern” and “Western” (Ishino 1989: 114-15).

A significant feature of core lexical transfers such as * sutoroberii ‘strawberry’ and * biifu ‘beef’ is that these unnecessarily transferred items tend to be adopted in compounds as in * sutoroberii sheeku ‘strawberry shake’ and * biifu shichuu ‘beef stew’ (SS 6). When the Japanese equivalents * ichigo and * gynamiku are used, they normally refer to the natural condition of the referents, namely, raw strawberries and uncooked beef (Loveday 1996: 83).

Related to this issue is that loanwords play a significant role in the semantic distinction between natural and artificial referents. With respect to the colour term * guriin ‘green’, Shibata (1984: 17-18) remarks that * guriin tends to refer to artificial objects or products as in * guriin no wanpiisu (green + Gen + one-piece garment), while the native * midori is normally used with reference to natural phenomena as in * midori no wakaba (green + Gen + young leaves). What is important to note here is that such semantic distinction is only made after the introduction of loans (ibid. 18) (SS 5).

Another notable feature of core lexical transfers is that whereas lexical transference principally occurs on the concrete level of reference, abstract concepts are likely to be transferred through the medium of Sino-Japanese words (Loveday 1996: 85) (SS 7). Sino-Japanese words are prominent in fields relating
to abstract concepts. Loveday (ibid.) makes the point that the use of calques for abstract concepts has to do with the Japanese tendency to put more intellectual weight on Sino-Japanese words than native Japanese words or Western loanwords. As a result, the semantic opacity of transferred items can be avoided (ibid.: 85-88; Suzuki 1990: 134). The use of unassimilated foreign loans in official documents is inappropriate, as it can give rise to a comprehension problem on the part of the general public. A recent survey conducted by the Agency for Cultural Affairs in Japan reveals that about 90% of the informants had difficulty in understanding the meanings of loans such as sukiimu ‘scheme’, akauntabiritii ‘accountability’, and konsensasu ‘consensus’ (Asahi Shinbun 29 April 1999). Because of the semantic transparency, the Sino-Japanese equivalents are preferred in the domains of politics and law.

3.3. Replacement

SS 8. Play up the [+ prestigious] or [− direct] semantic feature of a synonymous/core lexical transfer.

Replacement of indigenous words with borrowings can occur. Compared with native or Sino-Japanese words, Western loans have word impression/feeling such as newness and sophistication (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1985: 97-98). Thus, okurimono tends to be replaced by purezento ‘present’; reigi by echiketto ‘etiquette’; and ubaguruma by bebiikaa ((lit.) baby car) ‘perambulator’ (Iwabuchi 1977: 12). Note, however, that since connotative and affective meanings of the word differ according to individual experiences, word impression is more or less subjective (Ishino 1989: 116; Nishio 1989: 290-92, 294-95, 306).
One of the important features with core lexical transfers is their euphemistic function. Indigenous taboo words are frequently replaced by transfers for euphemistic needs. Lexical transfers are employed to avoid the direct referential function performed by native or Sino-Japanese words, as in *toire* ‘toilette’ for *benjo*, *sekkusu* ‘sex’ for *seikoo*, and *demeritto* ‘demerit’ for *tansho* (Toyama 1976: 38; Shibata 1984: 21; Jinnouchi 1992: 79; Suzuki 1996: 220). Note, however, that the degree of euphemism varies with the frequency of use of transfers. It is acknowledged that word meanings and referents belong to different dimensions (Ikegami 1986). In contrast to the semantic transparency of native or Sino-Japanese words, the semantic opacity of transfers plays a part in creating a kind of fictitious world to appeal to a desire on the part of speakers for indirectness and sophistication.

In this appendix we have examined the integration process of English lexical items in Japanese in terms of phonological, morphological, and semantic aspects. Several strategies and rules for lexical integration were identified on these three levels. English items transferred into Japanese undergo changes according to these strategies and rules, but it is important to bear in mind that these are “normative” integration strategies and rules adopted in the language environment of Japan, which is dominated by Japanese and that, as we noted, there is inter-speaker variation in the application of these strategies and rules, as individual competence and experiences differ.
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