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Abstract

How, and how frequently, do foreign children in Japan use languages other than Japanese? This paper analyses change in Japan-residing Pakistani pupils’ choice of language (English, Japanese, Urdu) between two different periods, from naturally occurred interactions in English classes in their religious community. In the first year, the pupils used both Japanese and Urdu as frequently, and some English. In the second year, however, they used Japanese twice as much, Urdu far less, and English only once. Combining ethnographic data, I suggest that the presence of a close peer, be him/her Urdu-speaking or not, influenced the three pupils’ language use.

1. Introduction

At the beginning of the 2012 school year, 71,545 foreign pupils were registered at Japanese state schools. Up to 62.2%, or 44,532 pupils, did not require extra assistance in the Japanese language (Monbukagakusyou, 2013). In addition to this figure, there are many children with foreign ancestry for whom we do not have official statistics on the exact population. We assume that many of these children are often in contact with languages other than Japanese in their everyday lives.

As they socialise in the Japanese-speaking and learning environment, children of foreign background who attend Japanese schools from young age often become Japanese-dominant speakers. This socialisation does not only take place at school, but also outside school through playing with friends, attending different community events, making family visits to their parents’ friends, and engaging in various media practices. Despite the increasing population of children with diverse ethnolinguistic backgrounds, studies are scarce in their use of language other than Japanese.

Although not necessarily addressed in its own right, intergeneration conversation in migrant community contexts has been of interest. In surveys, ethnic Korean students at Korean school in Japan reported to use more Korean towards those older and at formal events in the ethnic community (Ogoshi 2005). Taking into account that the older generations of many respondents were already fluent in Japanese, Ogoshi argued that this could be due to the appropriateness of using the ethnic language as part of traditional Korean social norm to use polite language towards those older than them. Similar account was made in a study of a Chinese community in the United Kingdom (Li 1994).

However, as they use more Japanese in their everyday life, many migrant children lose or do not have enough opportunity to acquire the ability to speak in the heritage language. Ogoshi claims that ethnic
Koreans who are born in Japan tend to use Japanese for their everyday conversation, and Korean in limited domains such as intra-ethnic formal functions (Ogoshi 1995). Saito’s case study describes the language loss of four Chinese mother tongue speakers who moved to Japan in childhood (Saito 1997). In his ethnographic accounts of some conversations between Vietnamese parent and child in Japan, Kawakami associates parents’ loss of face and the dissolution of traditional family structure with the children’s use of Japanese towards them, as well as the relatively low prestige of the heritage languages due to economic reasons (Kawakami 2006). Despite such studies, we know little about how and how much Japanese or heritage language is used by migrant children. With such concerns as a background, this paper examines the actual language use of interaction between a teacher and bilingual pupils at a migrant community classroom quantitatively and qualitatively.

2. On the community and the speakers
2.1 The community and the classroom

G mosque, the field site of this study, is located in a Tokyo suburb. It was chosen because of its activeness in holding regular and frequent mosque activities, as well as the regularity and high frequency of classes offered for children. Although many of the founding and organising members are South Asians, G mosque is a pan-ethnic religious community formed by Muslims of diverse geographical background, including the Japanese. It is a place where members of both genders (though at separate floors) and all ages gather to pray together, celebrate festivals, engage in enhancing religious knowledge through lectures and study groups.

The evening school at G mosque provided classes in mathematics, Islamic Studies, the Qur’an and English. This classroom setting was selected as the site for my data collection and main observation. This was because the classes (1) were a site of intra-community conversation, (2) took place regularly, and (3) were attended by regular participants. This ensured that the linguistic practices that I record were fairly stable and conventional within the community at certain period of time. I was also careful to check whether my presence affected the language use or not. Prior to the 2007 recording, I had been observing the classes for eight weeks. I have also listened to the participants talk from another classroom or before entering the school.

All pupils of this school attend Japanese state school during the day. From my observation, I could assume that all of them do not require extra assistance in Japanese. Out of the two set of classes divided roughly by age group, I have chosen the ‘senior class’ for this study. This was because the ‘senior class’ used the three languages—English, Japanese, and Urdu, where as the ‘junior class’ only used Japanese. This was due to the difference in age, ethnic group, and family background of the pupils.

2.2 The speakers

Although there were at times other pupils around in 2007 data, I have mainly observed language use of the bilingual pupils Jamila, Khareem, and Laila¹. I have also made notes on the language use of Mrs. B, the teacher, and also on other teachers and pupils.

Jamila, Khareem, and Laila are siblings, and were living in Japan with their Pakistani parents in 2009

¹ The names are all pseudonyms chosen by the author.
when they were 10 to 13 years old in 2009. Jamila, Khareem and Laila had lived in Japan since their infancy—Jamila since age 5. They had visited Pakistan several times. The three of them were able to speak in both Japanese and Urdu when needed. There was no noticeable difference among them in their competency in Japanese. They would speak in Japanese all the time among themselves, and with other pupils at the mosque school. According to my mini-survey Jamila, Khareem, and Laila answered, Japanese is the language they feel the most competent in. According to their mother in 2007, the pupils always speak Japanese to her, even though she is not confident in the language. However, at the mosque, I have seen the pupils exclusively using Urdu to her, and using Japanese and sometimes Urdu to their father. In 2009, I asked the mother the competence in Urdu of each child. She commented that Jamila spoke well, Khareem not as well but still fine, and that mistakes could be found in Laila’s Urdu, making her laugh. All three pupils used at least some Urdu at home in both 2007 and 2009. They also engaged in talks in Urdu and in Japanese with the teacher during breaks, and on other occasions.

Mrs. B spoke Urdu and English fluently, although neither was her mother tongue. She came to Japan from South Asia in late 2006, after marrying a Japan-residing South Asian. She studied the Japanese language for few months after her arrival in Japan. Mrs. B started teaching at the mosque classes five months prior to the recording. There, she had been in frequent contact with the Japanese speaking children, which made her more competent in the language than most South Asian women who come to live in Japan. Mrs. B understands and speaks some Japanese with the pupils, although her level is not fully known. This background makes Mrs. B a fairly new member to the mosque at 2007. She was also from a different country, region, and culture from most of the mosque members, and a beginner in learning Japanese. The teacher’s improvement in communicative Japanese was observed from the qualitative analysis of her Japanese utterances. Her vocabulary increased, and she learned the use of quotation particles which she could not use in 2007. However, this did not mean she used more Japanese in the classroom. The number of Japanese utterances in 2007 and 2009 did not differ much (Yamashita, 2009).

In both periods, the teacher did not tell the pupils to use a particular language more or less, except for telling them to answer classroom task questions in English full sentences. Neither did the pupils ask the teacher to use one language more than other.

3. Methods

3.1 Data collection

The digital sound recording was made in July 2007, and January to February 2009, whose details are on Table 1. In 2007, I have recorded four days of the natural interaction occurring at the ‘senior class’. These are indicated by 7A, 7B, 7C, 7D on the data. Except for day 7C, all data were in one classroom session per day. For day 7C, there was a break between, and therefore I took two sets of data within a day. Out of many days I have recorded in 2009, I have picked the first five days of my recording. The total of the data is 180 minutes for 2007, and 191 minutes for 2009. Before obtaining the data, I had asked permissions from the teacher and the parents of the pupils. I had indicated that anyone was allowed to stop the recording as they wish. The digital recorder was visible in front of the class.
Table 1. The length and the number of speakers by day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7A</td>
<td>7B</td>
<td>7C</td>
<td>7D</td>
<td>9A</td>
<td>9B</td>
<td>9C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (min)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of bilingual pupils</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of non-Urdu speaking pupils</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although I have mainly analysed three bilingual pupils’ data in this paper, there were two major environmental differences between the two sets of data. One is the type and number of participants, and the other is the classroom configuration.

In 2007, there were non-Urdu speaking pupils, but not in 2009. Only the three siblings were the Urdu-speaking pupils in 2007, whereas there was a new Urdu speaker (Imran) in 2009. In 2007, there was at least one non-Urdu speaking pupil in three out of four days of recording. However, all four bilingual pupils were present throughout the 2009 data.

In 2007, the pupils were sitting on the carpeted floor with lower tables, and closer to the teacher. In 2009, the pupils were more spread out, each on a chair with a small table attached to it. The teacher was sitting just in front of the pupil in the front row in 2007, whereas the teacher was more than a meter or two away from the closest pupils in 2009. This may have affected the use of deictic expressions in questions, as the pupils and the teacher were too far apart to show intended places in the textbooks or notebooks.

3.2 Procedures for quantitative analysis

To find out how much of each language was used, I have counted the three pupils’ questions towards the teacher. Questions were chosen for several reasons. Firstly, they are more easily distinguishable by form and thus more easily countable than other types of speech. Secondly, they were observed frequently enough throughout the data, allowing quantitative analysis. Thirdly, they are less complicated in syntax, which would ensure that the speakers could choose the languages regardless of their competency. Fourthly, I expected that they are less dependent on the previous utterances especially by the teacher, and thus they would be more spontaneous speech.

Since almost all talk among the pupils were in Japanese, I counted questions which (1) were addressed to the teacher or (2) did not specify the addressee, which may include the teacher as one of the potential addressees. The questions which did not have an addressee specified, may be intended for either the teacher or the pupils, or for both of them or just talking to oneself. Since the address term may not be

---

2 On day 7C, two recordings were made due to a break for the prayer. One consists of 44 minutes, the other, 6 minutes.
3 On day 7D, Laila was late for class, and came in at 14 minutes into the recording.
4 On day 7D, Nadia, a non-Urdu speaking pupil, was also late for class, coming in at 14 minutes into the recording.
present at all times, some questions remain ambiguous as to whom they were addressed. I have included such questions in the count.

In this analysis, I have counted all utterances with question words or with rising intonation at the end. I have excluded some words with rising intonation, which were repeated partially or fully from the utterance just before, as a request for clarification towards the previous speaker. This was because I assumed that in such cases, the speaker would not have the choice to use the same word in other languages, but would be restricted to use the same language as the previous speaker, and therefore not independent as other more spontaneous questions. This type of ‘question’ was often seen in English words that the pupils did not know.

Both in 2007 and 2009, both the teachers and the pupils used three languages (English, Japanese, and Urdu) in their linguistic repertoires during class, though at various levels. In both periods, the pupils were not very competent in English, but they were competent in Japanese and Urdu. Meanwhile, the teacher was not as competent in Japanese as in English and Urdu.

3.3 Hypothesis

I expected that the children would use more, or at least as much, Urdu in 2009 as in 2007. There were three reasons for this.

Firstly, since the pupils and the teacher were now seeing each other five days a week or more, the pupils’ competence in English and Urdu, would improve greatly over the 18 months. If the competence in Urdu is higher, it is likely that they will find switching to and speaking in Urdu easier. Additionally, the more the pupils use English and Urdu through regular interaction, the less hesitant they would feel using Urdu.

Secondly, just like Korean social norms in language use, social norms in Pakistan also dictate the use of V form towards those older. Pakistani children are expected to use the polite form to parents and those of their parents’ generation. If, in migrant conditions such a social norm is translated into the use of the heritage language, as Ogoshi (2005) suggested, the Pakistani pupils would likely be using more Urdu as they become accustomed to the heritage culture through the classes.

The third reason relates to the pupil make-up of the classroom. In 2007, there were days where a non-Urdu speaking pupil was present. In 2009, all four pupils, including the three participating in class understood and spoke Urdu. If the bilingual pupils were with pupils of similar ethnolinguistic background, they may engage in bilingual practices such as codeswitching, as a sign of solidarity and ethnolinguistic identity as in previous studies of young migrant bilingual speakers (Poplack 1980, Nakamizu 2000).

4. Data and Analysis

4.1 How often of which language overall?

Overall, there were 202 questions in 2007, and 140 questions in 2009. As a whole, the number of questions diminished by 69%. Out of all questions found in 2007 and 2009, Japanese questions were 61.1%, Urdu 31.3%, and English 7.6%.

Quantitative analysis of pupils’ questions showed that the pupils used more Japanese, and less of Urdu and English in 2009. The difference in language choice between the two data sets was statistically
significant. The number of Japanese questions rose by 55%, despite the 69% decrease in the number of questions in all questions. In terms of percentage, Japanese questions almost doubled its frequency relative to other languages. On the other hand, the number of Urdu questions diminished by 87%. The percentage of Urdu questions relative to other languages in 2009 was a quarter of that in 2007.

In 2007, Japanese was used for 47.0% of the questions, and Urdu 40.6%. However, in 2009, Japanese was the most frequently used for all days, amounting to over 90% altogether. English was used 25 times in 2007, but only once in 2009. Urdu questions comprised only 9.3% of all questions in 2009, while they comprised over 40% in 2007.

Table 2. Frequency and percentage of all pupils’ questions by language by year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Urdu</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>209</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
<td><strong>342</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing percentage of each language by year](image)

Figure 1. Percentage of each language by year

4.2 Were there differences among class days?

Among the four days in 2007, the ratio of the three languages significantly varied. Meanwhile, the ratio of the three languages in 2009 did not. Urdu was used far more each day in 2007 (7A, 7B, 7C, 7D) than any day in 2009 (9A, 9B, 9C, 9D, 9E) (Figures 2 and 3). On the other hand, Japanese was used far more on any day in 2009 than any day in 2007.

In 2007, the most frequently used language differed by day. For two days, the most frequently used language was Japanese, and for the other two, it was Urdu. For 2009 data, Japanese was the most

---

5 Chi-squared test p<0.01, \( \chi^2(2)=87.874 \)
6 Chi-squared test p<0.01, \( \chi^2(6)=24.654 \)
7 Chi-squared test not significant, \( \chi^2(8)=6.596 \)
frequently used on any day.

7C in 2007 was the day where Urdu was used the most in terms of percentage and the number of tokens. It was used almost twice as much as on other days. Japanese was used for less than 20% on that day; less than half as much as on other days. As I have shown in Table 1, 7C was the day where no pupil other than the three was present. This may have created a space which resembles their family situation where there are Urdu speaking adults and the siblings.

Table 3. Frequency and percentage of all pupils' questions by language by day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7A</th>
<th>7B</th>
<th>7C</th>
<th>7D</th>
<th>9A</th>
<th>9B</th>
<th>9C</th>
<th>9D</th>
<th>9E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>26 (49.1%)</td>
<td>27 (62.8%)</td>
<td>11 (18.3%)</td>
<td>18 (39.1%)</td>
<td>36 (85.7%)</td>
<td>31 (93.9%)</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>8 (100%)</td>
<td>37 (88.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>6 (11.3%)</td>
<td>3 (7.0%)</td>
<td>8 (13.3%)</td>
<td>8 (17.4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>21 (39.6%)</td>
<td>13 (30.2%)</td>
<td>41 (68.3%)</td>
<td>20 (43.5%)</td>
<td>6 (14.3%)</td>
<td>2 (6.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. The percentage of each language by day
Figure 3. Frequency of questions in each language by day

4.3 Were there individual differences?

The distribution of the languages were similar among the speakers for both years, indicating that no particular individual skewed the data and that all pupils shared similar patterns of language choice. The language used most in 2007 was Urdu for Jamila and Khareem, and Japanese for Laila. English was the least used by all pupils in both years.

However, the number of questions each pupil uttered varied in quantity. Khareem spoke more than twice of Jamila or Laila in 2007, whereas in 2009 he spoke less than half as frequently as the either of the two girls. In 2007, Khareem used Urdu for 52% of his questions, while Jamila used it for 42% of hers, and Laila for 38% of hers.
### Table 4. Frequency of questions by each pupil, day, and language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7A</th>
<th>7B</th>
<th>7C</th>
<th>7D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>9A</th>
<th>9B</th>
<th>9C</th>
<th>9D</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamila</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khareem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laila</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for each day</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar Chart](chart.png)

**Figure 4.** Frequency of questions in each language by speaker and by year
4.4 Details of individual language use

Here, individual language use is examined with the quantitative analysis and the ethnographic details which may explain the factor affecting it. Figures 6a to 6c which show each individual’s language choice by day are at the end of this subsection.

Jamila: The eldest sister and the teacher helper

Jamila was the eldest of all pupils at the G mosque evening school, and an elder sister to Khareem and Laila. Being the only pupil wearing the hijab and black burqa coat at the mosque school also made her stand out as the ‘big sister’. It was her whom the teacher would ask if there was any problem or anything they would like to know about the family or the school system in Japan, such as where Khareem was going for his three-day school camp.

Jamila used more English than the other two in 2007, and the only one who also used it in 2009. She used the most Urdu in 2009 out of the three. A couple of Urdu questions she asked in 2007 were not about classroom tasks, but about when the class was ending, or whether the class has already ended. Once, she was using Urdu to help the teacher to find out the Japanese word for ‘fly’.

In the mosque school, she often took the role of looking after the younger pupils, and often was an interpreter who helps Mrs. B. On one of the days in 2007, Jamila voluntarily helped Mrs. B with hovering, showing her how to use it using Urdu. During break times in both 2007 and 2009, she helped Mrs. B by translating the letters and announcements her son gets from his school. When Jamila and Mrs. B spoke to each other during breaks, they used Urdu most of the time in 2007. During break times, in 2009, Jamila started using more Japanese than Urdu, and Mrs. B also increased the use of Japanese with her. On day 7B during class, Jamila commented in Urdu to Mrs. B on young pupils of the junior class coming up and down the classroom, as if she was on the teacher’s side. For some occasions when other pupils do not understand the class, Jamila is asked by the teacher to translate class tasks from English or Urdu into Japanese. Her mother also assessed her Urdu speaking skills as the best among the siblings.
Khareem: Enthusiastic in 2007 turns more introvert in 2009

Khareem is a younger brother to Jamila, and an elder brother to Laila. Khareem may sometimes take on the role of the elder sibling and the teacher’s helper, but to far less extent than Jamila. In 2009, his voice was slightly changing due to his age, and he was about to graduate from the elementary school.

Khareem spoke twice as much as Jamila or Laila in 2007, while he only spoke as much as half of the either two in 2009. Qualitatively speaking, Khareem’s response was shorter, and less engaged in 2009. There are two factors which may have affected his language use.

One was the presence of Imran, a bilingual pupil. Imran was the same age as Khareem, but far more talkative, who gets in trouble by making funny or challenging comments towards the teacher very now and then during the class. When he was not doing the classroom tasks in 2007, Khareem was singing, talking to himself (to be heard by others), or drawing pictures of cartoon characters, sometimes showing to the teacher or other pupils. In 2009, he would still sometimes sing, but he made more meta-comments and jokes around the class task to be heard and picked up by others. He expected some response, especially from Imran. It was often Imran who would respond to Khareem, whereas he did not get much response or was simply dismissed by his sisters. Khareem seemed to enjoy Imran’s company in and out of class. Whereas his break time activities also used to centre around drawing pictures or playing with younger pupils, in 2009 the break time was spent interacting with Imran. Compared to talkative, outspoken and mischievous Imran who is a kind of trickster, Khareem in 2009 appears rather introverted, although he does speak enough in classes on non-task related issues. He was not as responsive and hardworking as in 2007.

The other was the effect of a change in classroom configuration. In 2007, he sat on the floor in front of the teacher (as the classes at the mosque make boys sit in the front row and girls behind), just around a metre away from her. In 2009, he was sitting farther from the teacher on an individual chair, approximately three metres from her. He was still closer to the teacher than Jamila or Laila as they were sitting behind.

Laila: The ‘least competent’ Urdu speaker distracted only by Nadia’s presence

Behind Jamila’s presence and responsibility as the eldest in the whole mosque school, and Khareem’s presence as the eldest boy, the teacher’s attention towards Laila was not always granted. At home, Laila is the youngest of the three bilingual pupils, after Jamila and Khareem. The mother’s comment on Laila’s Urdu as ‘funny’ may suggest that she is belittled, being compared with the elder two.

Laila’s language use on four days in 2007 showed statistical significance. This could be due to the presence of her non-Urdu speaking friend, Nadia. Laila hardly used any Urdu during the days where Nadia was present, (days 7B and 7D on Figure 6c). The only question in Urdu Laila uttered on day 7D was ‘aaye the’ (‘did he come’, referring to her father”), on arriving late for class. It was uttered twice. Meanwhile, she used some Urdu on day 7C, and also on day 7A. She also asked fewer questions than the other two altogether in 2007. The data suggest that she was less attentive in class when Nadia was present.

---

8 Chi-squared test p<0.05, $\chi^2(6)=16.188$
Laila often engaged in talk with Nadia, a non-Urdu speaking friend of her age. As Nadia did not come to the mosque very often, Laila could not stop talking with Nadia during class. In absence of Nadia, Laila sometimes talked with Jamila, but not as frequently as with Nadia. As mentioned above, on day 7D, she came very late to class with Nadia, after going to Nadia’s house.

Despite her mother’s assessment of her competence in Urdu, Laila did ask many Urdu questions on 7C, suggesting that she tries to use Urdu as much as the other two. Furthermore, her overall number of questions is compatible to Jamila’s in 2009. On days 9A and 9B, she asked far more questions than the other two. Such results may show that Laila has tried to take more initiative in 2009 than in 2007, and her competence in Urdu relative to her siblings did not affect her language choice. From the quantitative data alone, we do not know whether Laila is following Jamila’s linguistic trend, or the other way round. However, due to these circumstances, it is likely that a small rivalry and solidarity as sisters play a part in Laila’s language choice, when her close friend is absent.
Figure 6a. Family's choice of language

Figure 6b. Khareem's choice of language

Figure 6c. Individual choice of language

Legend:

Japanese
English
Tibetan

Note: The figure shows the percentage of families choosing a particular language for their children. The data is divided into three categories: TA, TB, TC, TD, and TC, with each category represented by bars of different colors.
5. Conclusion and future directions

At the beginning of the study, the three bilingual pupils used the three languages, using almost as much Urdu as Japanese. Eighteen months later, however, they used Japanese most of the time and very little of the other two despite (1) their improvement in competence in the other two languages, (2) the absence of non-bilingual pupils, and (3) increased familiarity with the teacher. As an explanation, this paper suggested ‘peer influence to speak monolingually’, although other factors such as the pupils’ age and relationship to the teacher may also be a large part of the picture. The pupils did not use significantly less Urdu even when a non-Urdu speaking pupil was present. However, for one pupil, the closeness to a particular non-Urdu speaking pupil affected her language choice. The presence of a bilingual peer did not make the pupils speak more Urdu. This ‘peer influence to speak monolingually’ may come from monolingual norms in Japan where mixing different languages are not common, and frequently switching languages may signify incompetence in the either language.

Qualitatively, classroom questions in Urdu did not necessarily indicate politeness or formality than questions in other languages. Nor were other types of Urdu speech in and out of the classroom necessarily more polite or more formal than Japanese or English forms.

The next step in quantitative analysis of the conversation would be to count Mrs. B’s language use. From casual observation, her language use has changed as well, with less Japanese and more Urdu in 2009 than in 2007. If this was true, then the pupils and the teacher are not accommodating to each other creating convergence, but rather, divergence from each other. In fact, few sociolinguistic studies exist on how language choice of children differ from their parents’ generation, and we await studies in how the younger generation engage in the process of language choice, pick up new features, dismiss or retain old ones.
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モスクコミュニティ英語教室における日本語・ウルドゥー語
バイリンガル児童の言語選択
—教師に向けた質問の経年比較—

山下里香

キーワード： コードスイッチング 言語選択 移民コミュニティの言語 継承語
バイリンガリズム 多言語使用 児童

要旨
本稿では、日本語が流ちょうな南アジア系バイリンガル兄弟3人の宗教コミュニティ内の英語教室での南アジア系教師への言語選択（日本語、英語、ウルドゥー語）を、1年半空けて2回に分けて調査した結果を分析した。初回調査では、3人全員は日本語とウルドゥー語をほぼ同程度使用していた。一方、近年の使用によりウルドゥー語と英語の運用能力が向上したことが期待された後者の調査では、日本語の使用が約2倍に増え（全体の90.7％）、ウルドゥー語の使用が4分の1（同じく9.3％）に減った。この変化は、その友人がウルドゥー語を理解するかしないかに関わらず、親しい友人が同席しているかどうかに関わる可能性があることが、量的・質的なデータから示唆された。

(やました・りか)