

A Study of Code-Switching in Newsletter Articles Written by Native English Speakers Residing in Japan

Nigel Stott

Abstract: Code-switching is typically described as, “going from one language to the other in mid-speech” (Cook, 1996, p.83). Although most research concentrates on oral interaction, this paper looks at code-switching found in newsletter articles written by and for native English speakers residing in Japan, so it may help to broaden the picture in this field of sociolinguistics. In this investigation, it was found that Japanese words, phrases, or quotations occurred in 77.8% of articles and was employed by 88.9% of article writers. Suggestions are given as to why these writers used code-switching and statistical analysis of the data reveals that the greatest influence on switching was probably article topic, but that individual characteristics such as age may also have played a part, although Japanese ability did not seem to affect use.

Key terms: code-switching, lexical borrowing, sociolinguistics, writing

1. Introduction

Code-switching has been defined as “a change by a speaker (or writer) from one language or language variety to another” (Platt, Platt & Richards, 1992, p.58). Despite the inclusion of writers in this definition, most studies ignore writing and focus on spoken interaction between bilinguals, with code-switching typically being described as, “going from one language to the other in mid-speech when both speakers know the same languages” (Cook, 1996, p.83). The use of two languages in written texts may be less com-

mon but it certainly exists and the relative paucity of studies appears to constitute a gap in sociolinguistic research (see Buell 2004, p. 98).

The present study looks at English newsletter articles in which the inclusion of Japanese words or phrases was common even though the articles were written by and for native English speakers. The individuals involved were mainly Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs) – participants in the Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) Programme – and the

articles appeared in the Fukuoka group newsletter over a 20-month period. Most of the writers had been in Japan for between one and three years and came from the USA, the UK, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Ireland. Their use of Japanese words and phrases in English language articles was quite extensive and, of the 158 articles investigated, 123 (77.8%) included code-switching to a greater or lesser extent (see Section 3). It is believed that this phenomenon is worthy of study, not least because code-switching by writers may be subject to more conscious choice (and thus purpose) than seems to occur in spoken interaction. It may also be useful to draw it to the attention of these English teachers themselves to help combat their own negative attitudes (see Duran, 1994) to code-switching by Japanese people. For example, the group representative wrote sentence (1) below.

(1) Are you... ready to join battle against the forces of Japlish?

Ironically, however, the very thing criticized was equally common in the writing of these same individuals, the above writer providing an example (2) in his next paragraph.

(2) Thanks again for all your efforts. *O tsukare sama deshita.*

[= (lit.) you must be tired; = good job!]

Before making an examination of the data,

the following section will look briefly at code-switching and borrowing as they are discussed in the literature.

2. Code-Switching

Code-switching is a very common phenomenon among bilinguals and occurs in a variety of forms and for a wide number of reasons (see Li Wei, 2000, p.16). Romaine states:

Many linguists have stressed the point that switching is a communicative option available to a bilingual member of a speech community on much the same basis as switching between styles or dialects is an option for the monolingual speaker. Switching in both cases serves an expressive function and has meaning.

Romaine (1994, p.60)

It is unfortunate that there is still considerable disagreement among researchers regarding the correct terminology to use for the different types of language alternation and the situations in which these occur. Confusingly, some researchers (e.g. Kachru, 1983) make a differentiation between ‘code-switching’ and ‘code-mixing’, with the former referring to changes from one sentence to the next, and the latter indicating changes within one sentence. It seems more logical, however, to refer to both of these types as code-switching and specify whether an instance is inter-sentential or intrasentential. Another problem is the distinction between code-switching

and lexical borrowing (see Myers-Scotton, 1988; Poplack, 1999). While it is usually relatively easy to identify a longer instance of alternate language (i.e. intersentential) as an example of code-switching, the insertion of an individual word or phrase taken from the second language is less easy to categorize. It has been stated that borrowing involves individual words or phrases of the L2 which are “adapted phonologically and morphologically to the language being spoken” (Grosjean, 1982, p.308), but this is not always the case and is perhaps even more difficult to ascertain in studies of writing, such as the current one. In some cases, inserted second language words might be clear examples of code-switching, while in others the use of so-called loanwords obviously falls into the category of borrowing. The problem lies in the fact that, in a great many cases, the language alternation (word or set phrase) lies somewhere between these extremes. A group of individuals might have borrowed certain words for their in-group communication, but these words are not yet loanwords as such and are not recognized by people outside the group, nor perhaps by all members of the group itself. Some of these words may later become established as loanwords, however, and so it may be better to consider code-switching and borrowing as part of a continuum and not attempt to differentiate at all (see Myers-Scotton, 1993; Myers-Scotton, 1995). Thus, in the current paper, I will simply use the term code-switching as an umbrella term to

describe all kinds of language alternation in discourse, and only remove established loanwords from the analysis.

What is of enormous interest is when and why individuals choose to employ code-switching, particularly in situations such as the current one, where message-givers and receivers share one dominant language. One reason for code-switching is the reporting of another individual’s speech (Cook, 1996, p. 84). Another is that “some topics are more appropriate to one language than another” (p.85). Alternatively, the switch may occur because “speakers cannot express themselves adequately” in the main language (Crystal, 1997, p.365). Code-switching may also “signal the speaker’s attitude towards the listener” (p.365) and perhaps one of the most significant factors is its function as “a common means of showing solidarity with a social group” (p.365). Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 110) state that participants in a discourse attempt to “claim common ground” through the use of “in-group language,” indicating that they share similar background knowledge and values. Examples from the current study data and further discussion of the factors behind code-switching will be given in Section 4.

Linked to the questions of when and why code-switching occurs is the existence of variation both between and within individuals and one of the challenges for sociolinguistic

research is attempting to uncover systematicity in this variation (Ellis, 1994, p. 119). Gumperz (1982, in Ogane, 1997, p.109) “suggested that CS [code-switching] is a discourse strategy used by bilinguals in much the same way monolinguals use style shifting and prosody.” Similarly, Bickerton’s model (in Ellis, 1994, p.126) describes “intra-speaker variation” when speakers who are able to use more than one ‘lect’ code-switch during conversation and choose which to use “in accordance with situational factors such as the topic of discourse, its purpose, and the addressee” (p.126). As Gardner-Chloros (1991, in Ogane, 1997, p.110) states, variation in code-switching is also “connected with individual factors which concern people’s linguistic histories as well as their personalities.” In the present study, variation both between writers and within the writing of individuals was observed and an attempt is made in Section 5 to uncover systematicity in the data.

Based on the above discussion, the following constitute the research questions of this study:

1. To what extent is code-switching employed and what types occur? (Section 3)
2. When and why is code-switching employed? (Section 4)
3. What variation exists? What factors influence this variation? (Section 5)

3. Research Question One: To what extent is code-switching employed and what types of code-switching occur?

This section contains a categorization and examples of code-switching in articles written for the Fukuoka JET Programme newsletter entitled ‘True Gaijin’ [*gaijin* = foreigner]. As was discussed above, there is a certain amount of controversy over the differentiation of code-switching and borrowing. It could be said that many of the examples given in this paper are lexical borrowings from Japanese, but for simplicity, I am using the term code-switching to describe any use of Japanese that is not standardized. On the other hand, well-established Japanese loanwords – those appearing in the Cambridge International Dictionary of English (Procter, 1995) – are not included in this analysis. Thus, words such as karate and sake were not considered to be instances of code-switching, and so examples (3) and (5) below were not counted as code-switched. On the other hand, because the Japanese words in (4) and (6) are not established loanwords, these sentences were regarded as examples of code-switching.

(3) I do miss the friendships of my peers
from my karate club back home

(4) Hiroe and I changed into our karate
-*gi* and then walked to the *dojo*
[*gi* = karate/judo clothing; *dojo* = exercise hall]

(5) Andrew pulled out several beers and two bottles of sake

(6) Pack up the *onigiri* and sake on your way to the local park for some *hanami* action

[*onigiri* = rice ball; *hanami* = cherry blossom viewing]

In addition, only Japanese words and phrases used by authors who assumed common knowledge were counted, while those explained by the author were ignored in the analysis. For example, sentence (7) was regarded as code-switched but sentence (8a) was not and neither was (8b) in the same article.

(7) *Monbusho* and the government are trying to change

[*Monbusho* = Japanese Ministry of Education, Science and Culture]

(8a) [he was] on a *Monbusho* (Japanese Ministry of Education) scholarship

(8b) a *Monbusho* scholarship student

Using these identification criteria, the 158 articles in the investigation included 123 (77.8%) with at least one instance of code-switching and, of the 63 authors, 56 (88.9%) utilized code-switching at some point. Of the total count of 6790 sentences in the code-switched articles, 677 sentences (10%) were considered to exhibit switching. In order to look more closely at the motives behind the use of code-switching, the occurrences were categorized into three main types: intrasentential, intersentential, and tag. The first two refer to changes over sentence or clausal boundaries (intersentential), or to changes within these boundaries (intrasentential). Tag-switching involves the use of second language add-ons such as “a tag, an exclamation, a formulaic expression, or a discourse particle” (Ogane, 1997, p.107). Table 1 shows the numbers of sentences that contained each of these types of code-switching.

TYPE OF SWITCHING	NUMBER OF SENTENCES	PERCENTAGE
INTRASENTENTIAL	598	88.3%
Single point	(527)	(77.8%)
Multi-point	(61)	(9.0%)
Word internal	(10)	(1.5%)
INTERSENTENTIAL	48	7.1%
TAG	31	4.6%
TOTAL	677	100%

Table 1: Types of code-switching in the Fukuoka JET Programme newsletter.

3.1 Intrasentential switching

Intrasentential switching made up the bulk of the data (88.3% of switched sentences), and was subdivided according to the position of the switch(es) into: single point (examples 9 and 10), multi-point (examples 11 and 12), and word-internal (examples 13 and 14). Single point intrasentential switches were most numerous and the figure of 77.8% here is similar to the 84% reported by Cook (1996, p.85).

(9) across the *inaka* of Japan, it's harvest time again

[*inaka* = rural districts]

(10) my quickly becoming *kusai* garbage

[*kusai* = smelly]

(11) Women are moving up from the *jimusho* to the *kyoto-sensei*'s desk [but] *kocho* is still out of sight

[*jimusho* = office; *kyoto-sensei* = vice-principal; *kocho* = principal]

(12) *Tatema*, *gomasuri* and *oseji* may be effective techniques of socialization, but they've hampered my *hon*ne.

[*tatema* = surface or professed intention; *gomasuri* = flattery; *oseji* = compliment; *hon*ne = true feeling or intention]

(13) in the *genki*est voice I can muster

[*genki* = cheerful, enthusiastic]

(14) I was *naru hodo*'d to learn that Tanaka-*sensei* had been to twenty countries

[*naru hodo* = of course, now I see]

[-*sensei* = suffix for teachers' names]

3.2 Intersentential switching

Intersentential switching occurred in 7.1% of code-switched sentences and was used primarily in quoting what people had said in conversations. Quotes were from both native Japanese speakers (example 15) and the authors themselves (example 16).

(15) she immediately went into hysterics:

“*Wakata! Wakata! Wakata! Eigo!*”

[= “I understood! I understood! I understood English!"]

(16) I gave a remarkably short speech...

“*Tammy Hennessy desu. Canada no Toronto kara kimashita. Doozo yoroshiku onegaishimasu.*”

[= “I'm Tammy Hennessy. I come from Toronto, Canada. Please look after me.”]

3.3 Tag switching

Tag switching constituted 4.6% of switches and took the form of parenthetical comments (example 17) or formulae inserted into the text (example 18).

(17) Non-renewers split (*samishii ne*), newcomers arrived, chaos ensued
[= sad/lonely, isn't it] [The English slang 'split' means 'departed']

(18) a huge *gokekko omedetou gozaimasu* to all those JETs who have just gotten married
[= congratulations on your wedding]

The distinction between intersentential switching and tag switching was not always clear because some formulaic tags were outside sentence boundaries (example 19).

(19) Once again I ask for your consideration and support. *O negai itashimasu!*
[= Please!]

For the purposes of this study, formulae were called tag switches even when occurring intersententially. One case (example 20) stood out, however, both for its indeterminate nature (tag or intersentential switch) and the fact that it included three languages (English then Spanish/Japanese).

(20) The door's always open: *mi jutaku es su jutaku desu.*
[*jutaku* = house; phrase from Spanish: *mi casa es su casa* = my house is your house]

This section has described the incidence and categorization of code-switching found in the data. The following section provides a more

in-depth analysis of the instances of code-switching and possible reasons for their occurrence.

4. Research Question Two: When and why is code-switching employed?

Perhaps above all else, use of code-switching would appear to demonstrate a desire to claim membership of the 'in-group' and thus create solidarity (see Section 2; and Crystal, 1997, p.42). The in-group in the current study refers primarily to the JET Programme participants in Fukuoka (approximately 150 people) but also includes the community of Westerners residing in Japan. The title of the publication, 'True Gaijin' [*gaijin* = foreigner/outsider], is interesting because Japanese use of the word *gaijin* often offends members of this group. The word *gaijin* also occurred in 25 (16%) of the articles analyzed, sometimes in a neutral way (example 21) and sometimes to reflect perceived discrimination (example 22).

(21) a club frequented by many *gaijin*

(22) No matter how great I get at *Ikebana*, I'm only ever going to be a *gaijin*
[*ikebana* = Japanese flower arranging]

Contributors to and readers of this newsletter were almost all members of the same group and so most writers were well aware of the abilities and personalities of their audience.

This may have influenced the use of code-switching through positive feedback in that, because authors knew their audience inserted Japanese into their everyday speech, and because previous articles included code-switching, it may have seemed normal (“unmarked” in Myers-Scotton 1988). Authors may also have thought that they would be seen as patronizing if they translated everything into English. In addition, the writers came from several different countries and were perhaps conscious of differences in the varieties of the English their readers spoke (especially American and British English), so they might have been even more inclined to use Japanese in order to make certain words neutral. Examples of this would be *kocho* [AmE = principal; BrE = headteacher] or *shogakko* [AmE =

elementary school; BrE = primary school].

For convenience, the data will be divided into the three code-switching categories described in Section 3 although, inevitably, there will be some overlap in the motivation for their utilization.

4.1. Intrasentential Switching

As reported in Section 3, intrasentential switching was the most frequently occurring type, with a total of 196 different Japanese words involved in these switches. There is no space here to give the full list, but a few categorized examples of some of the words are presented in Table 2 below. Incidences were based on numbers of articles in which words appeared rather than word counts because it was felt

WORD GROUP	EXAMPLES	INCIDENCE (No. of articles)
Work	<i>kencho</i> [local government office] ; <i>kocho</i> * [principal] ; <i>monbusho</i> [Ministry of Education] ; <i>nenkyu</i> [paid leave] ; <i>shutcho</i> [business trip] ; <i>meishi</i> [business namecard]	108
People	<i>gaijin</i> [foreigner] ; <i>sensei</i> [teacher] ; <i>kocho</i> * [principal] ; <i>sarariiman</i> [businessman] ; <i>-san</i> [polite address form]	105
Food/drink	<i>natto</i> [fermented soybeans] ; <i>obento</i> [lunchbox] ; <i>ocha</i> [green tea] ; <i>onigiri</i> [riceball] ; <i>yakitori</i> [grilled chicken] ; <i>yatai</i> [food stall]	92
Culture	<i>ikebana</i> [flower arranging] ; <i>enka</i> [old Japanese songs] ; <i>shodou</i> [calligraphy] ; <i>hanami</i> [cherry blossom viewing]	43
Language	<i>kanji</i> [Chinese characters] ; <i>kotowaza</i> [proverb/saying] ; <i>nihongo</i> [Japanese] ; <i>pera pera</i> [fluent]	27
Travel	<i>shinkansen</i> [bullet train] ; <i>onsen</i> [hot spring] ; <i>omiyage</i> [souvenir gift]	25
Home/life	<i>gomi</i> [rubbish/trash] ; <i>kyoshokuin jutaku</i> [teachers' apartments] ; <i>tatami</i> [reed matting] ; <i>kotatsu</i> [heated table]	24
Adjectives or feelings	<i>genki</i> [cheerful/healthy] ; <i>kawaii</i> [cute] ; <i>sukebe</i> [lewd] ; <i>oishii</i> [delicious]	21
Other	<i>man</i> [ten thousand] ; <i>inaka</i> [rural district] ; <i>tatemaie</i> [professed intention]	39

Table 2: Categorization and examples of Japanese lexical items found in the study articles

[*note: there is some overlap because words fall into more than one category, e.g. *kocho* is in both the work-related group and the people group.]

that word counts would misrepresent the situation. For example, the word *bunraku* [= Japanese puppet show] appeared in only one article but occurred 13 times, whereas *tatami* [= reed matting] appeared in six articles but the word count was just eight.

As might be expected, most Japanese words were related to life in Japan – work, people, food and drink, culture, language, travel and so on. Although knowing these words is beneficial, this does not directly explain their use in articles written for fellow English speakers. In many cases it seems that, because the concepts involved are Japanese, the use of Japanese follows in much the same way as kimono has been adopted into the English lexicon. Examples of such words include foods such as *natto* [fermented soybeans], *onigiri* [rice balls] and *yakitori* [grilled chicken]; other examples include *yukata* [light cotton kimono], *tatami* [reed matting], *enka* [old Japanese songs], *hanami* [cherry blossom viewing], and so on. English equivalents were often absent perhaps because authors felt that, in this situation, it was more appropriate or accurate to use Japanese. This may explain the incidence of words such as *shodou* [Japanese calligraphy], *ocha* [green tea], *budo* [martial art], *ikebana* [flower arranging], and *onsen* [hot spring]. Many of these words describe aspects of Japanese culture that the writers were studying and so may also reflect genuine interest in and respect for Japanese language and culture. Respect probably also accounts for the

adoption of the Japanese terms of address such as *-san* and *-sama* [honorific suffixes for names], and *sensei* [teacher]. For example (23) and (24) below.

(23) we've asked... the legendary Inoue
-sensei to add an air of refinement

(24) Day Smith is one of the most well-
known and best professional [BMX]
freestyle riders in the world... the ever-
present presence of Day Smith-*sama*...

Interestingly, Japanese adaptations of English words also appeared; for example, *sarariiman* [businessman; office worker], and *yankii* [youths who dye their hair and behave anti-socially; not equivalent to “Yankee” as in American]. Despite criticism of such ‘Japlish’ when used by Japanese speakers, these words occurred in articles quite frequently (*sarariiman*: 8 times; *yankii*: 4 times) in sentences such as (25) and (26).

(25) I sat next to a traditional-looking
sarariiman

(26) a *Yankii* pulled up next to me

It could be argued that the use of such Japanese loanwords does not demonstrate code-switching, but I believe that it does because normal native English speakers would probably not understand these sentences correctly and the writers could have

used English terms, such as, “Japanese businessman” instead of *sarariiman*. To the English-speaking community in Japan, these terms may activate relevant schemata (see Carrell, 1983) more fully than their (native) English equivalents. They may, for instance, distinguish between Japanese *sarariiman* and Western male office workers, with a *sarariiman* schema including perhaps: working long hours, always wearing a suit, going to karaoke bars after work, and so on.

The authors were mainly recent university graduates and many probably had no direct prior experience of some work-related concepts, leading them to adopt Japanese terms such as: *nenkyu* [paid leave], *shutcho* [business trip], and *meishi* [namecards]. Also, as teachers in Japanese schools, they would be used to referring in Japanese to the people they meet in this environment: *kocho* [principal], *-sensei* [teacher honorific suffix], *ichinensei* [first year students], etc.. Thus, example (27) may invoke a richer schema than its English equivalent.

(27) [I was] trailed by a growing procession of curious *shogakusei*
[*shogakusei* = primary school students]

Some Japanese words might have been used because they were shorter or more efficient in expressing certain concepts, which possibly accounts for the occurrence of: *kencho* [local government office of the prefecture] ;

monbusho [Ministry of Education, Science and Culture]; *kanji* [Chinese characters]; and *inaka* [isolated rural districts]. The same may be true for sentences that referred to money, a common unit of currency being the *man* [ten thousand] yen note (example 28).

(28) [My boss said] if you earn 10 *man* a month I want you to work as if you are getting 25 *man*

Another important and extremely interesting reason for the use of intrasentential code-switching is the humorous effect it can produce: heightening contrast (example 29); substitution in common sayings (examples 30 and 31); and word internal lexical surprises (examples 32-35). Note that example (30) includes the Japanese loanword *bijinesu* originally borrowed from the English word business, but now used in its Japanese form by a native English speaker. This spelling might not even be recognized as the word business by most native English speakers. Some researchers might argue that this is not code-switching, but I have included it because the writer has obviously made a choice to use the non-typical spelling to indicate how a Japanese person might say the word, and is therefore using code-switching as a kind of parody.

(29) what started out as a *kawaii* monkey, ended up as a chest-pounding freaked-out angry ape [*kawaii* = ‘cute’]

(30) [While practising Judo] I'm going about my *bijinesu* throwing poor Ishii *-kun*

[*-kun* = name suffix for boys; *bijinesu* = business; play on English phrase: going about my business]

(31) I still remember my first *gomi* expedition... like it was *kinou*

[*gomi* = junk, rubbish; *kinou* = yesterday; play on the English phrase: like it was yesterday]

(32) This is a great chance to promote *kenship*

[“*ken*” = prefecture; *kenship* alludes to ‘kinship’]

(33) one bright and breezy morning we *ikimashooed*

[“*ikimashoo*” = “let’s go” (volitional form of verb *iku* = to go)]

(34) another ten minutes of *yoroshikuing*, *doozoing*

[“*doozo yoroshiku*” = a greeting phrase, and not a verb!]

(35) an aloof man who seemed uncomfortable with my *gaijinity*

[*gaijin* = foreign; *gaijinity* = foreignness, but humorously alluding to virginity?]

It should be mentioned that some instances of multi-point intrasentential switching (see

example 12 above) might be attempts at humor in that the writer presumably realizes that it is uncomfortable to read such sentences and has therefore marked the sentence. Alternatively, these kinds of sentence could have been written by authors who wanted to show off their extensive knowledge of Japanese. It is hard to understand the motives of these writers without interviewing them individually. In addition, the way in which these sentences are understood or the audience’s reaction to them would be very interesting to discover.

4.2. Intersentential Switching

Intersentential switching was mainly to report speech (examples 36–38). It could be said that such quotation is not really code-switching in that it is simply an exact repetition of what was said, but this argument misses the point that the writer could have provided a translation instead of the original language and has therefore made a conscious decision to switch. The writer makes the assumption that his or her audience will understand the Japanese in the quotation. In most cases, this choice of style was probably used to enliven the text, making the situation more realistic and/or dramatic.

(36) So I said, “*nihongo de ii deshou.*” His jaw dropped...

[= “it’s OK to speak Japanese (I understand).”]

(37) a Japanese cowboy yelling at my

riding technique in Japanese. His final verdict was that I was “*chotto ma ma jozu desu.*”

[= “not too bad.”]

(38) [When looking for jobs] I got the same reply: “*Gaijin desu ka... gaijin wa dame!*”

[= “A foreigner? We don’t want foreigners.”]

Another use of intersentential switching was found in one article, about the experience of participating in a traditional Japanese festival, where the author used the same phrase (capitalized) eight times as a kind of framing device, as the extract (39) below demonstrates.

(39) ...The heat was intense as I stumbled along, trying to keep my feet under me, literally running with bodies packed all around. “*WASHOI! WASHOI!*”

I tried to ignore the obvious pain and discomfort and tried to flow with the crowd. Greg’s face flashed by mine, and I saw he was in a rip tide of half naked bodies surging the opposite way of my crowd. “GREG!” “TIM!” “Aaahhhhhh!” “*WASHOI!*”... [“*Washoi!*” = a team shout or cheer]

4.3. Tag Switching

As shown in Section 3, tag switching generally took the form of comments and Japanese polite formulae, which normally only occur in spoken discourse. McCarthy and Carter (1994, p.8) point out that, although written text usually contains features of written mode, the occasional introduction of speech mode forms may be highly effective in certain contexts. Thus, the untypical insertion of Japanese tags can be seen to create a special effect, perhaps lightening the tone, such as in (40) and (41).

(40) [Hokkaido is] home to only about 114 ALTs (*sabishi, ne*)

[*sabishi, ne* = lonely, eh]

(41) and a hearty *o kaeri nasai* to all those who took trips over Golden Week

[*o kaeri nasai* = welcome back]

Also, in some instances, a Japanese formula may emphasize the message both by its untypicality (therefore markedness) and by demonstrating the special in-group relationship between the message-giver and recipient (examples 42 and 43).

(42) A big *domo arigato gozaimashita* to Kay.

[*domo arigato gozaimashita* = thank you very much indeed]

(43) I would like to acknowledge the ladies who prepared the food. *Otsukaresama deshita!*

[*Otsukaresama deshita* = (lit.) You must be tired; = Good job!]

From the foregoing discussion, it can be seen that there are numerous potential reasons for the presence of code-switching in these articles. However, there was much variation, both between articles written by different authors and within the work of a single author, and this is the subject of the next section.

5. Research Question Three: What variation exists and what factors influence this variation?

The 158 newsletter articles in this study were written by 63 authors and there was considerable variation in the incidence of code-switching both between authors and within the work of individuals. The majority (56 writers) utilized Japanese words or phrases but seven writers used no Japanese and 20 of those who did code-switch also produced at least one article with no switching.

5.1. Inter-writer Variation

In an attempt to find possible sources for variation, statistical analyses were performed to test the following three factors: Japanese ability, age, and article topic.

5.1.1. Japanese Ability

Based on the researcher's personal knowledge and information from other sources (mainly subjects' own self-estimates), the 49 article writers for whom information was available were divided into four levels of Japanese ability, from 1 to 4 (1 denoting advanced level; and 4 denoting low level). The incidences of code-switching (percentage of article sentences) used by these four groups were compared using a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) (see Table 3).

The F-ratio for the between-group estimate and the within-group estimate was 1.64 ($p > 0.1$) so there was not a statistically significant difference between any of the means of the four groups. It would therefore appear that the degree of use of code-switching by these authors was not related to their Japanese ability. However, caution should be exercised because, firstly, ability levels were mainly self-estimates and, secondly, not all authors were included in the analysis.

5.1.2. Age

Authors were divided into three groups according to age: Group A (23–25 years old), Group B (26–28 years old), and Group C (29+ years old). It should be noted that age did not indicate length of time in Japan, since most individuals had come on the JET Programme and had therefore been in the country for less than three years. For example, one person in his mid-thirties had only

Japanese Ability (1= high; 4= low)	N	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
1	8	10.23%	7.21	0.0%	23.7%
2	8	12.46%	7.45	0.0%	24.2%
3	22	7.37%	6.07	0.0%	18.0%
4	11	6.97%	5.74	0.0%	15.7%

Source	Sum of squares	DF	Mean square	F-ratio	P-value
Between Groups	202.942	3	67.647	1.64	0.1937
Within Groups	1857.400	45	41.275		
TOTAL (corr.)	2060.340	48			

Table 3. ANOVA results for comparison of Japanese ability and percentage of code-switched sentences.

Age group	N	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
A (23-25 years)	25	10.54%	5.40	0.0%	20.0%
B (26-28 years)	14	7.89%	7.44	0.0%	23.7%
C (29+ years)	8	2.84%	3.41	0.0%	8.88%

Source	Sum of squares	DF	Mean square	F-ratio	P-value
Between Groups	365.248	2	182.624	5.35	p < 0.01
Within Groups	1501.24	44	34.119		
TOTAL (corr.)	1866.49	46			

Table 4. ANOVA results for comparison of author age and percentage of code-switched sentences. [Please note that author age does not indicate length of time in Japan]

been in Japan for six months, while one 24-year-old had lived in Japan for three years.

A one-way ANOVA was applied to compare code-switching by the three age groups and the F-value was calculated to be 5.35 ($p < 0.01$), thus showing a statistically significant difference between the means at the 1% significance level (see Table 4). To determine which means were significantly different, an LSD range test was performed using Fisher's Least Significant Difference procedure (see Table 5). From this it was found

that the means for the younger age group (A) and the older group (C) were significantly different from one another, which would seem to indicate that age might have been a factor in determining the amount of code-switching, with younger authors tending to employ a greater number of switches than older authors. If true, this may reflect a stronger desire on the part of younger people to belong to the in-group and to appear trendy, older authors either writing from outside the group or not feeling the same pressure to conform to in-group language. Of course, this

RESPONSE VARIABLE = % code-switched sentences METHOD: 95.0% LSD			
Group	Count	Mean	Homogenous groups
C	8	2.84	X
B	14	7.89	XX
A	25	10.54	XX
Contrast		Difference	+/- Limits
A-B		2.647	3.929
A-C		*7.699	4.782
B-C		5.052	5.217

Table 5. Range test to compare the code-switching means of three age groups.
(* denotes a statistically significant difference)

needs to be investigated further through author surveys and interviews.

5.1.3. Article Topic

For the purposes of analysis, articles were divided into ten categories according to topic (and one miscellaneous category). The topics were as follows. A: group information; B: computers; C: editorial; D: education/work;

E: Japanese culture; F: life/experiences in Japan; G: travel in Japan; H: music; I: travel overseas; J: life/experiences in home country. The means for the percentage of code-switched sentences for each of these groups were compared by ANOVA and this generated an F-value of 8.133 ($p < 0.05$), indicating that the means were significantly different at the 5% significance level (see Table 6). Information

Article Type	N	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
A	15	15.40%	6.71	1.6%	31.8%
B	4	0.25%	0.50	0.0%	1.0%
C	17	12.70%	7.37	4.3%	30.8%
D	15	8.85%	7.70	0.0%	22.7%
E	12	15.40%	10.10	2.6%	31.0%
F	39	10.20%	9.14	0.0%	38.6%
G	13	12.30%	7.08	2.6%	31.5%
H	5	2.40%	5.37	0.0%	12.0%
I	18	1.14%	1.85	0.0%	7.0%
J	12	1.15%	2.69	0.0%	7.0%

Source	Sum of squares	DF	Mean square	F-ratio	P-value
Between Groups	3910	9	434.500	8.133	p < 0.05
Within Groups	7480	140	34.119		
TOTAL (corr.)	11390	149			

Table 6. ANOVA results for comparison of article type and percentage of code-switched sentences

from the group representatives (A), editorials (C), and articles about Japan (topics E, F, G), were more likely to have a high incidence of code-switching; while articles about computers (B), music (H), overseas travel (I), and home countries (J) were more likely to have low use of switching. Education or work-related articles (D) fell somewhere between high and low use.

This finding is not altogether surprising in that it is only natural for articles about Japan to contain more Japanese words than articles unrelated to Japan. The editorials and local group information were also high in Japanese use and this may be due to the mainly light-hearted nature of their content, the authors also, perhaps, wishing to appear trendy and to establish rapport with the readership by using the in-group language. Education and work-related articles, however, despite being related to experiences in Japan, were more serious and used less Japanese, authors usually writing from an expert standpoint.

5.2. Intra-writer Variation

Where authors had contributed more than one article, considerable intra-writer variation in the amount of code-switching was observed (although not for all individuals). This variation can, to a large extent, be explained by topic (see section 5.1.3) as can be seen in Table 7 below.

Topic could not have been the only factor involved, however, because there were also instances of authors varying the amount of code-switching between articles on similar topics. Other factors could have included mood, time spent writing the article, proof-reading by another person (and who), and numerous other possible influences. Furthermore, there was evidence of variation within individual articles, where authors used an English term at one point and its Japanese equivalent at another point (see Table 8). In these cases the code-switching may have been the result of attempts to reduce lexical repetition (see Hoey, 1991).

Author Code	Topic	code-switched sentences
CE	Harvest time in Japan	34.6%
CE	School meeting	14.6%
CE	Trip to Nepal	0.0%
DS	Editorial	19.2%
DS	Advice on weight training	1.1%
JU	Editorial	30.8%
JU	Trip to Vietnam	0.0%
MH	Representative's information	18.8%
MH	Civil rights and Catholicism	0.0%
PM	Trip to Orosima, Japan	31.5%
PM	Music review	0.0%

Table 7: Examples of intra-writer variation in code-switching related to article topic.

Author Code	Word	Frequency within single article
AM	<i>Gaijin</i>	x8
	Foreigner	x1
	Outsider	x1
	Non-Japanese	x2
CE	<i>Gomi</i>	x2
	Garbage	x5
	trash	x2

Table 8: Two examples of articles where Japanese and English equivalents were used.

This section has attempted to describe and explain some of the variation in code-switching frequency in the data. Much of the variation was apparently due to article topic but this was also subject to individual characteristics (such as age) and other factors which have yet to be determined. Ellis (1994, p.136) supports the existence of so-called ‘free variation’ in the insertion of second language structures but admits that the code-switching may well be systematic and “the researcher has simply failed to uncover the factors which make it systematic” (Ellis, 1994, p.136; after Tarone, 1988).

6. Conclusion

This paper has focused on code-switching found in newsletter articles written by and for native English speakers residing in Japan. Most other research concentrates on code-switching in oral interaction, so it is hoped that the current study helps to broaden the picture in this field of sociolinguistic investigation.

It was found that code-switching was quite extensive in the texts under scrutiny, affect-

ing 77.8% of articles and employed by 88.9% of article writers (see Section 3). Further analysis of the data established that most of the switching involved the insertion of single Japanese words but there were also multi-point insertions, word-internal switches, intersentential switches and tag switches (see Section 3). Suggestions were given as to why these writers used code-switching and these included in-group solidarity, discussion of Japanese concepts, respect for Japanese culture and people, richer schema activation, habit, efficiency, comic effect, realism and dramatic effect, framing, and emphasis (see Section 4). Statistical analysis of the variation both between different authors and within the work of individual authors revealed that the greatest influence on switching was probably article topic, but that individual characteristics such as age may also have played a part, although Japanese ability did not seem to have affected use (see Section 5).

Unfortunately this study is rather narrow in that it examines only the code-switching found in a single publication, although the

publication was monitored over a 20-month period. Further research is needed to investigate the extent to which such code-switching occurs in other English-language publications in Japan, especially those with larger and more diverse audiences and where readers are not known to writers. Additionally, systematicity in both inter-writer and intra-writer variation has not yet been fully explained and a great deal more data is required as well as interviews with writers to gain their insights into their own code-switching. Another important area which should be researched is to compare written and spoken discourse in this population to determine how graphic and oral code-switching differ or match each other. If there are differences then it would be useful from both psycho- and socio-linguistic viewpoints to try to understand the reasons why.

It would also be interesting to study, using questionnaires and interviews, the authors' and readers' views on code-switching in their own communications. There were, in fact, a few clues in some of the articles (see extracts 44-46 below) but more direct research is required.

(44) All right, that's my last feeble attempt to impress you with my limited Japanese skills.

(45) The odd Japanese word thrown in here or there is by no means an attempt

to impress you with my Japanese ability. It is simply a pathetic effort to make myself believe that I've actually learned something over the past year.

(46) [about returning to the UK and meeting other returnees from Japan]
They... drop "*chotto*" and "*sou desu ne*" into their every conversation. Perhaps this is normal, yet I tend to think that what they represent is fairly sad and to be avoided.

Edwards (1994, p.78) points out that, "attitudes towards code-switching are often negative" and "bilinguals, too, are wont to see their behavior here as 'embarrassing', 'impure', 'lazy', even 'dangerous'..." However, he goes on to point out that "If you have two languages to draw upon, why not maximize this happy circumstance as appropriate?" Thus, rather than frowning upon code-switching and criticizing its use, it is important to recognize its normality in the world and, by demonstrating that even native English teachers (residing in a non-English-speaking community) mix languages when communicating with each other, it is hoped that attitudes may be made less negative. That is not to say code-switching should be actively encouraged, but rather that these same English teachers should be more accepting of the linguistic behaviour of the society in which they find themselves.

Finally, this survey of newsletter articles shows a “live” demonstration of what happens when English speakers come into contact with another language while living in the country in which it is spoken. They absorb many of the words and phrases into their own speech or writing and, for some of the words, this might actually be the beginning of their adoption as loanwords in English. For example, given its popularity among the thousands of native English speakers visiting or residing in Japan, the word *gaijin* seems a prime candidate for becoming a recognized loanword in the not-too-distant future. As stated by Gramley and Patzold:

It would seem that most new loan words nowadays refer to new things for which the foreign term has been taken over (so called cultural borrowings) ... Borrowing [has] also occurred, of course, out of sheer laziness or love of a new term (which may have sounded better, more learned or more fashionable). In more recent times, English has increased its range of donor languages, the main contributors being French, Japanese, Spanish, Italian, Latin, Greek, German, African, Yiddish, Russian and Chinese. (Gramley and Patzold, 2003, p.32-33)

References

- Brown, P. & Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buell, M.Z. (2004). “Code-Switching and Second Language Writing: How Multiple Codes Are Combined in a Text.” In Charles Bazerman and Paul Prior (eds.) *What Writing Does and How It Does It: An Introduction to Analyzing Texts and Textual Practices*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Carrell, P. (1983). “Three Components of Background Knowledge in Reading Comprehension.” *Language Learning*, 33(2), 183-207.
- Cook, V. (1996). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. London: Arnold.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duran, L. (1994). “Toward a Better Understanding of Code Switching and Interlanguage in Bilinguality.” *Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 14, 69-88.
- Edwards, J. (1994). *Multilingualism*. London: Penguin.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (1991). *Language Selection and Switching in Strasbourg*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gramley, S. and Patzold, K.M.(2003). *A Survey of Modern English*. London: Routledge.
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with Two Languages*. Boston: Harvard University Press.

- Gumperz, J.J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoey, M. (1991). *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kachru, B.B. (1983). "On Mixing." In B. Kachru (Ed.) *The Indianization of English: The English Language in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Li Wei (2000). "Dimensions of Bilingualism." In Li Wei (ed.) *The Bilingualism Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- McCarthy, M. & Carter, R. (1994). *Language as Discourse: Perspectives for Language Teaching*. London: Longman.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1988). "Code-Switching as Indexical of Social Negotiations." In Li Wei (ed.) *The Bilingualism Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Dueling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Code-switching*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1995). *Social Motivations for Code-Switching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ogane, E. (1997). "Codeswitching in EFL Learner Discourse." *JALT Journal*, 19(1), 106-122.
- Platt, H., Platt, J., & Richards, J.C. (1992) *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Poplack, S. (1980). "Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in English y termino en Espanol." *Linguistics*, 18, 581-618.
- Poplack, S. (1999). Revised Introduction to Republished Version of "Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in English y termino en Espanol." In Li Wei (ed.) *The Bilingualism Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Procter, P. (Ed.) (1995). *Cambridge International Dictionary of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Romaine, S. (1994). *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tarone, E. (1988). *Variation in Interlanguage*. London: Edward Arnold.